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NAARAH (תְּנָאָרָה, nāʿārāh; B, אֵקָוָא אֲטָאָן, hāʾ kōnāʾ aʿtān, A, Naʿarah, Naarah; AV Nacharh): A town in the territory of Ephraim (Josh 16:7). It appears as "Naaran" in 1 Ch 7:28 (B, Naṣarāʾ, Naaranān, A, Naʾarāʾ, Naaranān). Ḫonem (s.v. "Noorath") places it 5 Roman miles from Jericho. The name has not been recovered, and no identification is certain. The position would agree with that of el-Dhejeh, about 5 miles N.E. of Jericho.

NAARAI, nāʾā-rī (תְּנָאָרֵי, nāʿā-rīy): Son of Ezbi, one of David's heroes (1 Ch 11:37). In the 2d passage (2 S 23:35), he is called "Paarai the Arbite." The true forms of the name and description are uncertain (see Budd, Richter u. Samuel, and Curtis, Chronicles).

NAARAN, nāʾā-rān, NAARATH, nāʾā-rāth (תְּנָאָרָן, nāʿā-rān; AV Gr form of "Naarah") (s.v. Nachar). See Naharayim.

NAASHERON, nāʾā-she-rōn, NAASÖN, nāʾā-sōn (Naasōn, Naasōn): AV Gr form of "Naashon." See Nahashon.

NAATHUS, nāʾā-thūs (Nāthos, Naathos): One of the sons of Addi who put away his foreign wife (1 Esd 9:31). It apparently corresponds to "Anda" of Ezr 10:30, of which it is a transposition. B reads Ἄθεος, Láthos, probably confusing A and A.

NABAL, nāḇāl (נַבַּל, nāḇāl, "foolish" or "wicked"); Naḇāḏ, Nabāl): A wealthy man of Maon in the highlands of Judah, not far from Hebron, owner of many sheep and goats which he pastured around Carmel in the same district. He was a churlish and wicked man (1 S 25:2 ff). When David was a fugitive from Saul, he and his followers sought refuge in the wilderness of Paran, near the possessions of Nabal, and protected the latter's flocks and herds from the marauding Bedouin. David felt that some compensation was due him for such services (vs 15 and 25), so, at the time of sheep-shearings—an occasion of great festivities among sheep masters—he sent 10 of his young men to Nabal to solicit gifts of food for himself and his small band of warriors. Nabal not only refused any assistance to David, but sent back insulting words to David, whereupon the latter, becoming very angry, determined upon the extermination of Nabal and his household and dispatched 400 men to execute his purpose. Abigail, Nabal's wife, a woman of wonderful sagacity and prudence as well as of great beauty, having learned of her husband's conduct and of David's intentions, hurriedly proceeded, with a large supply of provisions, dainties and wine, to meet David and to apologize for her husband's unkind words and niggardliness, and thus succeeded in thwarting the bloody and revengeful plans of Israel's future king. On her return home she found her husband in the midst of a great celebration ("like the feast of a king"), drunken with wine, too intoxicated to realize his narrow escape from the sword of David. On the following morning, when sober, having heard the report of his wife, he was so overcome with fear that he never recovered from the shock, but died 10 days later (vs 36-39). When David heard of his death, he sent for Abigail, who soon afterward became one of his wives. W. W. Davies

NABARIAS, nab-a-riʾas (Naβαριας, Nabarias, B, Naβαρειας, Naβarēlas): One of those who stood upon Ezra's left hand as he expounded the Law (1 Esd 9:44). According to the bulk of critics, it gives 6 names whereas Nehemiah (8:4) gives 7. It is probably that the last (Meshullam) of Nehemiah's list is simply dropped and that Naborias = Hashbaddanah; or it may possibly be a corruption of Zechariah in Nehemiah's list.

NABATAEANS, nab-a-ˈtæ-ən, NABATHAEANS, nab-a-ˈthæ-ən (Naβαταῖος, Nabatæos; in 1 Mac 5:25 it reads Ναβαταῖος): AV Nabathaioi, Naabhathioi; AV Nabathæioi, more correctly "Nabataeans"). A Sem (Arabian rather than Syrian) tribe whose home in early Hellenistic times was S.E. of Pal, where they had either supplanted or been mingled with the Edomites (cf Mal and Early 1 1-5). In Josephus' day they were History so numerous that the territory between the Red Sea and the Euphrates was called Nabatene (Ant, I, xii, 4). They extended themselves along the E. of the Jordan with Petra as their capital (Strabo xvi.779; Jos, Ant, XIV, i, 4; XVII, iii, 2; BJ, I, vi, 2, etc). Their earlier history is shrouded in obscurity. Jerome, Quoest in Gen 25:13, following the hint of Jos (Ant, I, xii, 4), asserts they were of the same family that were summoned by Naboth, which is possible, though Nabeo is spelled with 7 and Nabataeans with 2. They were apparently the first allies of the Assyrians in their invasions of Edom (cf Mal 1 1 ff). They were later subjugated by Amanchérib (Sayce, New Light from the Ancient Monuments, II, 430), but before long regained their independence and resisted Arshurbanipal (Rawlinson, note, ad loc.). According to Alexander Polybiator (Fr. 18), they were included in the formidable army led by David. Their history is more detailed from 312 BC (Diod. Sic. xix), when Antigonus I (Cyklops) sent his general Athenaeus with a force against them in Petra. After an initial advantage, the army of Atenaues was almost annihilated. Demetrius, the son of Antigonus, was sent against them a few years later, with little success, though he arranged a friendship with them. The first prince mentioned is Aretas I, to whom the high priest Jason fled in 169 BC. They were friendly to the early Macedonians in the anti-Hellenistic struggle, to Judas Maccabees in 164 BC (1 Macc 5 25) and to Jonathan in 160 BC (9 35).

Toward the end of the 2d cent. BC on the fall of the Ptolemaic and Seleucid empires, but soon back insulating the Nabataeans under King Eutropius founded two 2. A Strong a strong kingdom extending E. of the Kingdom Jordan (in 110 BC). Conscious now of their own strength, they resented the ambition of the Hasmonean Dynasty—their former allies—and opposed Alexander Jannaeus (96 BC) at the siege of Gaza (Jos, Ant, XIII, iii, 3). A few years later (90 BC) Alexander retaliated by attacking Obedas I, king of the Nabataeans, but suffered a severe defeat E. of the Jordan (Jos, Ant, XIII, iv, 5-7; BJ, I, iv, 4). Antiochus of Coele-Syria next led an expedition against the Nabataeans, but was defeated and slain in the battle of Kana (Jos, Ant, XIII, xv, 1-2; BJ, I, iv, 7-8). Consequently, Aretas III seized Coele-Syria and Damascus and gained another victory over Alexander Jannaeus at Adida (in 85 BC). The Nabataeans, led by Aretas (III ?), espoused the cause of Hyrcanus against Aristobulus, be.

3. Conflicts sieged the latter in Jerusalem and provoked a difference between the Romans, by whom under Scarrus they were defeated (Jos, Ant, XIV, i, 4; 4f; BJ, I, vi, 2f). After the capture of Jerusalem, Pompey attacked Aretas, but was satisfied with a payment (Jos, ib), and Damascus was added to Syria, though later it appears to have been ceded into the hands of Antioch (2 Cor 11 32). In 55 BC Gabinus led another force against the Naba-
taeans (Jos, 1b). In 47 BC Malchus assisted Caesar, but in 40 BC refused to assist Herod against the Parthians, thus provoking both the Idumaean Dynasty and the Romans. Antony made a present of part of Malchus' territory to Cleopatra, and the Nabataeans were divided. In 40 BC Sesticus was defeated by Herod and the Romans, and the Nabataeans were again an independent nation.

4. End of the Nation: Nabataeans, who had divided his daughter to marry Herodians. Under King Abias an expedition against Adiabene came to grief. Malchus 11 (48–71 AD) assisted the Romans in the conquest of Jerus (Jos, B. J., III, iv, 2). Rabel (71–106 AD) was the last king of the Nabataeans as a nation. In 106 AD their nationality was broken up by the wise policy of Trajan, and Arabia, of which Petra was the capital, was made a Roman province by Cornelius Palma, governor of Syria. Otherwise they might have at least contributed to protecting the West against the East. Dio. Dur. (loc. cit.) represents the Nabataeans as a wild nomadic folk, with no agriculture, but with flocks and herds and engaged in considerable trading. Later, however, they seem to have imbued considerable Aramaean culture, and became at least the language of their commerce and diplomacy. They were also known as pirates on the Red Sea; they secured the harbor of Elah and the Gulf of 'Akhob. They traded between Egypt and Mesopotamia and carried on a lucrative commerce in myrrh, frankincense and costly wares (KGF, 4th ed [1901], 1, 726–44, with full bibliography).

NABATHITES, nab'a-thîthès: AV = RV "Nabataeans."

NABOTH, nab'ôth (נָבֹ֫וֹת, nabôbôth, from נָבָה, nab, "a sprout"); Nabouâlî, Nabouâlî): The owner of a vineyard contiguous to the palace of King Ahab. The king desired, by purchase or exchange, to add the vineyard to his own grounds. Naboth, however, refused to part on any terms with his paternal inheritance. This refusal made Ahab "heavy and displeased" (1 K 21:4). Jezebel, the king's wife, took the matter to hand, and, by false accusation on an irrelevant charge procured the death of Naboth by stoning (1 K 21:7–14). As Ahab was on his way to take possession of the vineyard he met Elijah the prophet, who denounced the vile act and pronounced judgment on king and royal house. A temporary respite was given to Ahab because of a repentant mood (1 K 21:27–29); but later the blow fell, first upon himself in a conflict with Syria (1 K 22:34–40); then upon his house through a conspiracy of Jehu, in which Jehoram, Ahab's son, and Jezebel, his wife, were slain (2 K 9:25–26.30 if). In both cases the circumstances recalled the foul treatment of Naboth.

HENRY WALLACE

NABUCHODONOSOR, nab'û-kû-dôn-ôr (נַבְעָכֹדדָוֹנָוֹר, Nabuchodonosor): LXX and Vulg form of "Nebuchadnezzar" ("Nebuchadrezzar") found in AV of the Apocalypse in 1 Esd 1:40. 41.45.48; 2 10; 5 7; 6 20; Ad Est 11 4; Bar 9 11.12. It is the form used in AV of the Apocalypse throughout. RV of 4th and Tob 14 15, the form "Nebuchadnezzar" is given.

NACON, nā'kon, THE THRESHING FLOOR OF (נַ֑אָכִ֖ון, nākôn; AV Nachon): The place where Uzzah was smitten for putting forth his hand to steady the ark, hence called afterward "Perez-uzzaah" (2 S 6 8); in the passage (1 Ch 13 9) we have נַמְזָר, nachon, and in Jos (Ant, VII, iv, 2) נַאֲכֵל, Cheledon. In 1 S 23 23 the word "nakhôn" occurs, and is tr4 of a certainty, m. "with the certainty" or "to a set place"; also in 1 S 25 4 it is tr4 of a certainty, m. "to a set place." It is uncertain whether "nakhôn" is a place-name at all, and no successful attempt has been made to identify either Nacoon or Chidon; possibly they are both personal names. E. W. G. MASTERMAN

NACHOR, nák'ôr (נַאֲכּוּר, Nachor) AV; Gr form of "Nahor" (thus RV). Grandfather of Abraham (Lk 3 34).

NADAB, na'dâb (נַאֲדָב, nadjâb): "noble"; Naâbâth, Nadâb,

(1) Aaron's first-born son (Ex 6 23; Nu 3 2; 26 60; 1 Ch 6 3 [Heb 6 29]; 24 1). He was permitted with Moses, Aaron, the 70 elders, and his brother Abihu to ascend Mt. Sinai and behold the God of Israel (Ex 24 1 9). He was associated with his father and brothers in the priestly office (Ex 28 1). Along with Abihu he was guilty of offering "strange fire," and both "died before Jehovah" (Lev 10 1 2; Nu 3 4; 26 61). The nature of their offence is far from clear. The word rendered "strange" seems in this connection to mean no more than "unauthorized by the Law" (see "nêr, zîr, in DDB, and of Ex 30 9). The proximity of the prohibition of the use of officiating priests (Lev 10 8 9) has given rise to the erroneous suggestion of the Midr. that the offence of the brothers was drunkenness.

(2) A descendant of Jerahmeel (1 Ch 2 28 30).

(3) A Gibeonite (1 Ch 8 30).

(4) Son of Jeroboam II after him for two years king of Israel (1 K 14 20; 16 23). While Nadab was investing Gibbethon, a Philistine stronghold, Baasha, who probably was an officer in the army, as throne-robbers were usually, conspired against him, slew him and seized the throne (1 K 15 27 31). With the assassination of Nadab the dynasty of Jeroboam was extinguished, as foretold by the prophet Ahijah (1 K 14). This event is typical of the entire history of the Northern Kingdom, characterized by revolutions and counter-revolutions.

JOHN A. LEES

NADABATH, na'da-bath (Na'dâbâth, Nadâbath; AV Nadabatha, na-dâb'a-thâ): A city of E. of the Jordan from which the wedding party of Jambri were coming, and Jonathan and Simon attacked them and slew very many, designing to avenge the murder of their brother John (1 Mac 9 37 ff). Nebo and Nabathaeans have been suggested as identical with Nadabath. Clermont-Ganneau would read rabathâ, and identify it with Rabbath-ammon. There is no certainty.

NAGGAI, nag'î, nag'â-î (Nagayy, Nagayy; AV Nagge): In Lk 3 25, the Gr form of the Heb name Noah (q.v.).

NAHALAL, na'halal (נַ֓אֱחַלָל, nahalâl; B, Baal- pâr, Baalthonia, A, Nâhâlâl, Nahal, and other forms): A city in the territory of Zebulun assigned with its suburbs to the Merarite Levites, out of which the Canaanite inhabitants were not driven (Josh 19 15; AV [incorrectly] "Nahallal"); 21 35; Jos 18 30, "Nabalot"). In the Tahm Jerus (Meg. 1) it is identified with Mahlu. This name might correspond either with 'Âšî Mâhîl, or with Maâlîl. The former lies about 3 miles N.E. of Nazareth on a hill near the eastern boundary of Zebulun. The latter is situated about 8 1/2 miles W. of Nazareth,
NAHAM, nā'ham (נָהָם), naham, "comfort!": A Judahite chieftain, father of Keilah the Garmite (1 Ch 4 19); the passage is obscure.

NAHAMANI, nā-ha-mānī, naha'ma'-ni (נָהָמָן, naham’ānān, "compassionate"): One of the twelve heroes who numbered with Shiloh (Neh 7 7). The name is wanting in the list (Ezr 2 2). In 1 Esd 5 8 he is called "Enenum" (RvM "Enenius").

NAHARAI, nā-ha-ra (נָהָרַא), Naharai, nā-ha-ra (נָהָרַא), Naharai: One of David’s heroes, Joshua’s armor-bearer (2 S 23 37, AV "Nahari"); 1 Ch 11 39).

NAHASH, nā-haʃ (נָחָשׁ), nāhash, "serpent"); Naḥaš, Naḥaš): (1) The father of Abigail and Zeruiah, the sisters of David (2 S 17 25; cf 1 Ch 2 16). The text in 2 S, where this reference is made, is hopelessly corrupt; for that reason there are various explanations. The rabbis maintain that Nahash is another name for Jesse, David’s father. Others think that Nahash was the name of Jesse’s wife; but it is not probable that Nahash could have been the name of a woman. Others explain the passage by making Nahash the first husband of Jesse’s wife, so that Abigail and Zeruiah were half-sisters to King David.

(2) A king of Ammon, who, at the very beginning of Saul’s reign, attacked Jabesh-gilead so successfully, that the inhabitants sued for peace at almost any cost, for they were willing to pay tribute and serve the Ammonites (1 S 11 15). The heathen king, not satisfied with tribute and slavery, demanded in addition that the right eye of every man should be put out, as "a reproach upon Israel." They were given seven days to comply with these cruel terms. Before the expiration of this time, Saul, the newly anointed king, appeared on the scene with an army which utterly routed the Ammonites (1 S 11 1 ff), and, according to Jos, killed King Nahash (1 K 2, vi. 3).

If the Nahash of 1 S 20 2 be the same as the king mentioned in 1 S 11, this statement of Jos cannot be true, for he lived till the early part of David’s reign. 40 or more years later. It is, of course, possible that Nahash, the father of Hanan, was a son or grandson of the king defeated at Jabesh-gilead by Saul. There is but little agreement among commentators in regard to this matter. Some writer so far so as to claim that "all passages in which this name [Nahash] is found refer to the same individual.

(3) A resident of Rabbath-ammon, the capital of Ammon (2 S 17 27). Perhaps the same as Nahash (2), which see. His son Shobi, with other trans-Jordain chieftains, welcomed David at Mahanaim with sympathy and substantial gifts when the old king was fleeing before his rebel son Absalom. Some believe that Shobi was a brother of Hanun, king of Ammon (2 S 10 1).

W. W. Davies

NAHATH, nā'hath (נָחָהַת, nahath): (1) A grandson of Esau (Gen 36 13; 1 Ch 1 37). (2) A descendant of Levi and ancestor of Samuel (1 Ch 6 26); also called "Toah" (1 Ch 6 34) and "Tohu" (1 S 1 1). (3) A Levite who, in the time of Hezekiah, assisted in the oversight of "the oblations and the tithes and the dedicated things" (2 Ch 31 15).

NAHBI, nā'bi (נָבִי, nabḥi; in the NT Naβέξ, Nachôr): The representative of Nahphati among the 12 spies (Nu 13 14).

NAHOR, nā'hor (נָהָר, nahôr; in the NT Naβέξ, Nachôr): (1) Son of Serug and grandfather of Abraham (Gen 11 22 25; 1 Ch 1 26). (2) Son of Terah and brother of Abraham (Gen 11 20 27 29; 22 20 25; 24 15 24 47; 29 5; Jos 24 2). A city of Nahor is mentioned in Gen 24 10; the God of Nahor in Gen 31 53. In AV Jos 24 2; Lk 3 34, the name is spelled "Nachor."

NAHSHON, nā'shon (נָשִּׁן), nahšōn; LXX and NT Naασσών, Naασσών: A descendant of Judah; brother-in-law of Aaron and ancestor of David and of Jesus Christ (Ex 6 23; Nu 1 7; 1 Ch 2 10 11; Ruth 4 20; Mt 1 4; Lk 3 32).

NAHUM, nā'hum (נָעָם), Naum; AV Naum): An ancestor of Jesus in Lk’s genealogy, the 9th before Joseph, the husband of Mary (Lk 3 25).

NAHUM, nā'hum, THE BOOK OF:

I. Authorship and Date—The name Nahum (נָעָם, nahām; LXX and NT Ναοῦμ, Naoum; Jos, Naoumos) occurs nowhere else in the OT; in the NT it is found in Lk 3 25. It is not uncommon in the Mish, and it has been discovered in Phoen inscriptions. It means "consolation," or "consoler," and is therefore, in a sense, symbolical of the message of the book, which is intended to comfort the oppressed and afflicted people of Judah.

Of the personal life of Nahum, practically nothing is known. In 1 1 he is called "the Elkoshite," that is, an inhabitant of Elkosh. Unfortuntately, the location of this place and home is not known. One tradition, which cannot be traced beyond the 16th century, AD, identifies the home of Nahum with a modern village Elkosh, or Arabosh, not far from the left bank of the Tigris, two days’ journey N. of the site of ancient Nineveh. A second tradition, which is at least as old as the days of Jerome, the latter part of the 4th century, locates Elkosh in Galilee, at a place identified by many with the modern El-Khuzar, near Ramleh. Others identify the home of the prophet with Capernaum, the name of which means "Village of Nahum." A fourth tradition, which is first found in a collection of traditions
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entitled "Lives of the Prophets," says "Nahum was from Elkosh, beyond Bet Gabre, of the tribe of Simeon." A place in the S. is more in harmony with the interest the prophet takes in the Southern tribes, so that the last-mentioned tradition seems to have received its favor, but absolute certainty is not attainable.

The Book of Nahum centers around the fall and destruction of Nineveh. Since the capture of the city is represented as still in the future, it seems evident that the prophecies were delivered some time before 607–606 BC, the year in which the city was destroyed. Thus the latest possible date of Nahum's activity is fixed. The earliest possible date also is indicated by internal evidence. In 3:8 ff. the prophet speaks of the capture and destruction of No-aunom, the Egyp Thebes, as an accomplished fact. The expedition of Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria, against Egyp, which resulted in the fall of Thebes, occurred about 606 BC. Hence the activity of Nahum must be placed somewhere between 663 and 607.

As to the exact period between the two dates there is disagreement among scholars. One thing is made quite clear by the prophecy itself, namely, that at the time the prophecies were written or written Nineveh was passing through some grave crisis. Now we know that during the second half of the 7th cent. BC Assyria was threatened three times: (1) the revolt of Shamash-shumukin of Babylon against his king, the king of Assyria, 660-635 BC; (2) the invasion of Assyria and threatened attack upon Nineveh by some unknown foe, perhaps the Scythians, about 625 BC; (3) the final attack, which resulted in the fall and destruction of Nineveh in 607–606 BC.

The first crisis does not offer a suitable occasion for Nahum's prophecy, because at that time the city of Nineveh was not in any danger. Little is known concerning the second crisis, and it is not possible either to prove or to disprove that it gave rise to the book. On the other hand, the years immediately preceding the downfall of Nineveh offer a most suitable occasion. The struggle continued for about 2 years. The united forces of the Chaldaeans and other enemies met determined resistance; at last a breach was made in the northeast corner of the wall, the city was taken, pillaged and burned. Judah had suffered much from the proud Assyrian, and it is not difficult to understand how, with the threat of the cruel foe before them, the prophet-patriot might burst into shouts of exultation and triumph over the distress of the cruel foe.

"If," says A. B. Davidson, "the distress of Nineveh referred to were the final one, the descriptions of the prophecy would acquire a reality and naturalness which they otherwise want, and the general characteristics of Heb prophecy would be more truly conserved." There seems to be good reason, therefore, for assigning Nahum's activity to a date between 610 and 607 BC.

II. The Book.—Nahum is the prophet of Nineveh's doom. Ch 1 (+1) contains the decree of Nineveh's destruction. Jeh is a God of 1. Contents of vengeance and of mercy (vs 2-3); while he may at times appear sleek in punishing iniquity, He will surely punish the sinner. No one can stand before Him in the day of judgment (vs 4-6). Jeh, faithful to those who rely upon Him (ver 7), will be terrible toward His enemies and toward the enemies of His people (vs 8). The Lord will not forget His covenant; His enemies are doomed (vs 9-14), which will mean the exaltation of Judah (1 15; 2 2). The army appointed to execute the decree:—approaching, ready for battle (2 1-4). All efforts to save the city are in vain; it falls (vs 5-8), the queen and her attendants are captured (ver 7), the inhabitants flee (ver 8), the city is sacked and left a desolation (vs 9-13). The destruction of the bloody city is imminent (3 1-3); the fate is well deserved and no one will bewail her (vs 4-7); natural strength and resources will avail nothing (vs 8-11); the city will be utterly cut off (vs 12-18); the whole earth will rejoice over the downfall of the cruel oppressor (ver 19).

Opinions concerning the religious significance of the Book of Nahum differ. The point of view of Nahum's language and style all students assign to Nahum an exalted place among the prophet-poets of the ancient Hebrews; for all are impressed with the intense force and picturesque quality of his language and style. "Each prophet," says Kirkpatrick, "has his special gift for his particular work. Nahum bears the palm for poetic power. His short book is a Pindaric ode of triumph over the oppressor's fall." So says A. Smith: "His language is strong and brilliant; his rhythm, rumbles and rolls, leaps and flashes, like the horsemen and chariots he describes."

Until recently no doubts were expressed concerning the integrity of the book, but within recent years there have been many who have, with various arguments, denied the certainty that in 1-2 traces of alphabetic arrangement may be found, but even here their method of arrangement is not carried through consistently; in the rest of the chapter the evidence is slight.

The artificial character of acrostic poetry is generally supposed to point to a late date. Hence those who believe that ch 1 was originally an alphabetic poem consider it an exilic or post-exilic production, which was at a still later date prefixed to the genuine prophecies of Nahum.

In support of this view it is pointed out further that the prophecy in ch 1 is vague, while the utterances in chs 2 and 3 are definite. Hence some support for a late date also from the language and style of the poem.

That difficulties exist in ch 1, that in some respects it differs from chs 2 and 3, even the students of the Eng. text can see; and that the Heb text has suffered in transmission, in the presence of all the conjectural emendations. Of the presence of an acrostic poem in ch 1 is not beyond doubt. The apparent evidence of arrangement forms the starting point for a discussion of the whole prophecy, this has been preserved as a general introduction to the more specific denunciation in chs 2 and 3. And a detailed examination shows that in this, as in other cases, the linguistic and stylistic data are decisive. In view of these facts it may safely be asserted that no convincing argument has been presented against the genuineness of 1 2—2 2. "Therefore," says O. A. Smith, "while it is possible that a later poet has prefixed to the genuine prophecies of Nahum, and the first ch supplies many provocations to belief in such a theory, this has been preserved, and the able essays of proof have much against them. The question is open.

III. Teaching.—The utterances of Nahum center around a single theme, the destruction of Nineveh.

The purpose is to point out the hand of God in the imperial power in judgment; and what there is of it is confined very largely to the opening verses of ch 1. These emphasize the twofold manifestation of the Divine holiness, the Divine vengeance and the Divine mercy (1 2-3). The manifestation of the one results in the destruction of the wicked (1 2), the other in the salvation of the oppressed (1 15; 2 2). Faith in Jeh will secure the Divine favor and protection (1 7).
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NAHUM, ná'əm (Naín, Nain): This town is mentioned in Scripture only in connection with the visit of Jesus and the miracle of raising the widow's son from the dead (Lk 7 11). The name persists to this day, and is the form of Naín, the town on the northwestern slope of Jebel ed-Duhur ("Hill of Moreh"), the mountain which, since the Middle Ages, has been known as Little Hermon.

The modern name of the mountain is derived from Nebi Duhur, "the wise one of the village. There are many ancient remains, proving that the place was once of considerable size. It was never inclosed by a wall, as some have thought from the mention of "the gate." This was probably the opening between the houses by which the road entered the town. Tristram thought he had found traces of an ancient city wall, but this proved to be incorrect. The ancient town perhaps stood somewhat higher on the hill than the present village. In the past, the E. are many tombs of antiquity. The site commands a beautiful and extensive view across the plain to Carmel, over the Nazareth hills, and away past Tabor to where the white peak of Hermon glints in the sun. To the S. are the heights and plains of Samaria. The village, once prosperous, has fallen on evil days. It is said that the villagers received such good prices for ingleton that they cultivated it on a large scale. A sudden drop in the price brought them to ruin, from which, after many years, they have not yet fully recovered.

W. EWING

NAIOTH, ná'-o-th (ná'oth, ná'oth; B, Ahd, Ádáth, A, Nawá', Nawáth): This is the name given to a place in Ramah to which David went with Samuel when he fled and escaped from Saul (1 S 19 18, etc.). The term has often been taken as meaning "houses" or "habitations"; but this cannot be justified. There is no certainty as to exactly what the word signified. Clearly, however, it attached to a particular locality in Ramah; and whatever its etymological significance, it denoted a place where the prophets dwelt together. On approaching it in pursuit of David, Saul was overcome by the Spirit of God, and conducted himself like one "possessed," giving rise to the proverb, "Is Saul also among the prophets?"

W. EWING

NADAK, ná'dák, NAKEDNESS, ná-ked'-nes: "Naked" in the OT represents various derivatives of נָקָד, nákád, or נָקָר, nákér, chiefly נָקָד, nákad (adj.), נָקָר, nákér (n.); in the NT the adj. is ἄκατος, ákataós, the noun ἄκατος, ákatoς, with vb. ἀκατωθήσονται, akatowthésontai, in Cor 4 11. In Ex 32 25; 2 Ch 28 19, AV adds πάνερ, pāne,' "break loose," "cast away restraint." Both the Gr and Heb forms mean "without clothing," but in both languages they are used frequently in a metaphorical sense. So the adj. is "without outer garment;" so, probably, is the meaning in Jn 21 7—Peter was wearing only the ἀλίθον (see Dress); and so perhaps in Mk 14 51.52 and Mic 1 8. In Isa 20 2—4, however, the meaning is lit. (for the "three years" of ver 3 see the context). So in Gen 2 25; 3 7, where the act of sin is immediately followed by the sense of shame (see Delitzsch, Bib. Psychology, and Gunkel, ad loc.). A very common use of "naked" is also "without proper clothing" (Job 22 6; 4 11, etc., etc.), and hence, of course, "in which the naked." "Nakedness," in addition, is used as a euphemism in 1 S 20 30. A slightly different euphemistic usage is that of λευκα 18 19, which in Ezek 16 36.37 is played off against the literal sense

In a figurative sense the word is used of the hard or engraving tool: "the sin of Judah is written with a pen of iron, and with the point (lit. "claw," "nail") of a diamond: it is graven upon the tablet of their heart, and upon the horns of your altars" (Jer 17 1). JAMES ORR

2. Nahum's enemy'; but it should be borne in mind that it is not personal hatred that prompts the prophet; he is stirred by a righteous indignation over the outrages committed by Assyria. He considers the sin and overthrow of Nineveh, not merely in their bearing upon the fortunes of Judah, but in their relation to the moral government of the whole world; hence his voice gives utterance to the outraged conscience of humanity.

While Nahum's message, in its direct teaching, appears to be less spiritual and ethical than that of his predecessors, it sets in a clear light Jch's sway over the whole universe, and emphasizes the duty of nations as well as of individuals to own His sway and obey His will. This attitude alone will assure permanent peace and prosperity; on the other hand, disobedience to His purpose and disregard of His rule will surely bring calamity and distress. The emphasis of these ethical principles gives to the message of Nahum a unique significance for the present day and generation. Assyria in his hands, says Ewald, "may be regarded as an object lesson to the empires of the modern world, teaching, as an eternal principle of the Divine government of the world, the absolute necessity, for a nation's continued vitality, of that righteousness, personal, civic, and national, which alone salthe a nation's way in the broad sense. In a broad sense, 1 15 is of Messianic import. The downfall of Nineveh and Assyria prepares the way for the permanent redemption and exaltation of Zion: "the wicked one shall no more pass through thee."

4. The Messianic Rule

Outlook

LITERATURE—Comes on the Minor Prophets by Ewald, Pusey, Keil, Orelli; G. A. Smith, (Expositor's Bible); Driver (New Cont.); B. A. Davidson, com. on Nah., Nah., Zep. (Cambridge Bible); A. F. Kirkpatrick, Doctrine of the Prophets; Eiselen, Prophecy and the Prophets; F. W. Farrar, Minor Prophets ("Men of the Bible" series); Driver, Intro to the Lit. of the OT; D. B. E., art. "Nahum," EB, art. "Nahum."

F. C. EISELEN

NADUS, ná'dús (A, Náús, Nááds, B, Nááds, Nánáds): One of those who had taken "northwestern wives" (Ecd 9 31, apparently = "Be-nááh") of Ezra 10 30, of which it is probably a corruption or the latter part.

NAIL, nál: (1) As denoting the finger-nail, the Heb word is אָ֣ש, asip̂ re (Dt 21 12), the captiv- woman "shall shave her head, and pare her nails." The latter word was probably intended to prevent her from marring her beauty by scratching her face, an act of self-mutilation oriental women are repeatedly reported to have committed in the agony of their grief. Aram. אֲש, tpher (Dnl 4 33, "his nails like birds' claws"); (2) As "peg" (for tent, or driving into the wall on which something is to be hung (ver 24); cf Ecd 12 11, where the word is mas'irás, cognate with mas'ísér below). For nails of iron (1 Ch 22 3) and gold (2 Ch 3 9), and in Is 41 7 and Jer 10 4, the word is קָ֣ש, qass, magmeér. (4) In the NT the word is ἄκατος, ákatoς, used of the nails in Christ's hands (Jn 20 25), and "to nail" in Col 2 14 ("nailing it to the cross") is πυγμέαν, pygmenā. In a figurative sense the word is used of the hard or engraving tool: "the sin of Judah is written with a pen of iron, and with the point (lit. "claw," "nail") of a diamond: it is graven upon the tablet of their heart, and upon the horns of your altars" (Jer 17 1). JAMES ORR

The fierceness of Nahum, and his gle in the thought of Nineveh's ruin, may not be in accord with the injunction, "Love one another"; but it should be borne in mind that it is not personal hatred that prompts the prophet; he is stirred by a righteous indignation over the outrages committed by Assyria. He considers the sin and overthrow of Nineveh, not merely in their bearing upon the fortunes of Judah, but in their relation to the moral government of the whole world; hence his voice gives utterance to the outraged conscience of humanity.
The point of Gen 9 22.23 is a little hard to grasp, but apparently there is here again a euphemism—this time for a particularly horrible act (see the comments of Hlotz 10.5). The name of those who are due to the Massoretic (see OT Texts). The Jews objected vigorously to exposure of the body (even athletes insisting on a loin-loin [cf 2 Mac 4 12.13]), and compulsory nudity was the extreme of shame and degradation (Ps 89 37; Lam 3 19; Hosea 2 3; Nah 3 5 etc). The relation of this attitude to Israel's high sexual morality needs no explanation. BURTON SCOTT EASTON

NAME, nām (נָ֫אָם, šhmn; ὄνομα, ónuma; Lat nomen [2 Esd 4 1]; vgs šnāpetu, anōmaíze; Lot nomino [2 Esd 5 26]). A “name” is that by which a person, place or thing is marked and known. In Scripture, names were generally descriptive of the person, of his position, of some circumstance affecting him, hope entertained concerning him, etc, so that “the name” often came to stand for the person. In Acts 1 15; Rev 3 4, ónuma stands for “person”; cf Nu 26 53, 55.

I. OT Word and Use.—The word for “name” in the OT is also the name of one of the sons of Noah. The etymology is uncertain.

1. General, although it may be from shāmāh (obs.), “to mark a”’; shām is the Aram. form. For the name as descriptive of the person see Names. Besides designating persons, the name also stands for fame, renown, reputation, character gained or expressed, etc (Gen 6 4; 2 S 7 9.23, etc); it might be an “evil name” (Dt 22 14.19); the “name” is also equivalent to a “people” or “nation” that must be “hated and cursed.” (Isa 21 27); to speak or write “in the name” signified authority (Ex 5 23; 1 K 21 8, etc); to “call one’s name” over a place or people indicated possession or ownership (2 S 12 28; Am 9 12, etc); to “act in the name” was to represent (Dt 26 6); to be called or known “by name” indicated special individual notice (Ex 31 2; Isa 43 1; 46 3.4). Gen 2 19.20 even displays a conception of identity between the name and the thing. “To name” is sometimes ʿamar, “to say” (1 S 16 3); dāḥar, “to speak” (Gen 23 16); nāḥab, “to mark out” (Nu 1 17); šādāh, “to call” (Gen 48 16; Isa 61 6). Of a special interest is the usage with respect to the name of God. (For the various Divine names and their significance see GOD. NAMES OF.) He revealed himself to Israel through Moses in a new name (which was at the same time the Divine manifestation, the character of God as revealed in His relations to His people and in His dealings with them (Ex 3 13-16; 15 2). The “name of God” was therefore not a mere word, but the whole of the Divine manifestation, the character of God as revealed in His relations to His people and in His dealings with them (Ex 3 16; 15 2). The “name of Jeh” was pronounced to Moses on Mt Sinai. “Jeh, Jeh, a name meritorious and gracious, slow to anger, and abundant in lovingkindness and truth” (Ex 3 14-6); the name Yehoh (so rendered) was (Ex 3 15) His “memorial name” (so, often, in ARV, see MEMORIAL). He was also known as God of the universe or name in the name that Dt 6 4 f was termed the “Shema” (from shēma, “hearken,” the first word in ver 4), the first article of Israel’s faith, taught to all the children, written on the phylacteries, and still recited as the first act in public and private occasions by every adult Jew. Where Jeh is said to record His name, or to put His name in a place (or person), some special Divine manifestation or significant heavenly person or place is sacred to Him (Ex 20 24; 1 K 8 16). His “name” was also in the angel of His Presence (Ex 25 21); what He does is “for His great name sake” in fire, to that by and vindication of His revealed character and covenant relationship to His people. He should do what He would do “for a name” (Isa 55 13); He would give His people a new name, “an everlasting name” (Isa 56 5); to be called “by the name” of Jeh is “to be his people” (2 Ch 7 14; Isa 43 7); it implies “protection,” etc (Isa 63 10; Jer 14 8.9); to call upon the name of Jeh was “as it was” as God (Gen 21 33; 26 25, etc); “to confess” His name, to “acknowledge” (1 K 8 19, etc); the act in, etc, “the name,” was to love, trust, etc. Jeh Himself (Ps 51 9; 77 17). Very frequently, esp. in the Ps and prophecies of Is and Jer, “the name” of God is used for “God himself”: “to forget his name” was “to depart from him” (Gen 22 18); to name a thing “in the name” of Jeh in His name signified Divine appointment, inspiration, authority (Jer 11 21; 14 14,15, etc); we have “swearing by” or “in the name of Jeh (Dt 16 13); to take His name “in vain” was to swear falsely (Ex 20 7; Lev 19 12); to have “blasphemed the name” (Ps 144 7); cursing (2 K 22 4). In Lev 24 11, we have the case of one who “blasphemed the Name,” and cursed, “the penalty on which was death by fire” (2 K 22 4). In later Jewish usage (of Wisd 14 21) the sacred name Jeh was not pronounced in reference to the name, Āḥānāy (my lord) being substituted for it (the vowels belonging to Āḥānāy were written with the consonants of the hieroglyph, hence the frequent term “the Lord” in ARV, for which ARV substitutes “Jeh.”

II. NT Word and Use.—In the NT ónuma has frequently also the significance of denoting the “character,” or “work” of the person, 1. Character e.g. Mt 1 21, “Thou shalt call his and Work name Jesus, for it is he that shall son of the (Lk 1 31). Person His name is John; of the new names give to Simon, James and John; Saul’s new name of “Paul’). The “name” of God has the same relation to the character of God as in the OT (Mt 16:16; cf Heb 1:18; 12:28); it is manifested by Christ (Jn 17 26; of ver 3); the name of Jesus, as manifesting God, takes the place of the name of Jeh in the OT (cf Jas 2 7 with Jcr 14 9, and see below); to Him is given the name which is above every name; the difference is that in the name of Jesus very knee should bow, that and every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father, Phil 2 10.9.10 (cf Is 45 23). It is not the name Jesus, but the name of Jesus (Lightfoot), i.e. the name (“Lord”) received by Jesus; we have with reference to Jesus simply “the Name” (Acts 6 41, “worthy to suffer dishonor for the Name”); Jas 5 14 [probable text, WH], “in the Name”;

3 Jo ver 7, “for the sake of the Name”); the “name of Christ” is equivalent to “Christ himself” (Mt 10 22; 19 29); it is the same thing as “his manifestation” (Jn 20 31); “to believe on his name” is to believe in Him as manifested in His “name and work” (2 Cor 1 20); again, the “name of God” means sent by God, as representing Him, with Divine authority (Mt 21 9; 23 39); in like manner, we have “prophesying” or “preaching” in the name of Jesus (Acts 4 18; 5 25). The name of Jesus represented His authority and power, e.g. working miracles in His name (Mt 7 22; Mk 9 39; Acts 4 7, “by what name [or ‘power’] have ye done this?”), and it is contrasted with casting out evil spirits by some other name which is above every name (Acts 19 17). The gospel of salvation was to be preached “in his name,” by His authority and as making it effectual (Lk 24 47); sinners were justified “through his name” (Acts 10 43; 1 Cor 6 11); sins were forgiven “for his name’s sake” (1 Jn 2 12); men “called upon the name” of Jesus, as they had done on that of Jeh (Acts 9 14.21 [cf 7 59]; Rom 10 13 14).

The name of Christ was to belong to Him (2 Tim 2 19); the calling of His name on the Gentiles probably signified their meeting their “expected one” (quoted from Am 9 12); cf Rom 1 5); to “hold fast his name” is to be true to Him as made known (Rev 2 10; 3 11); to be “called together in his name” is as “acknowledging him” (Mt 16 20; Col 3 17); all great things that kindred things (Acts 2 38; 25 26, “calling on his name,” contrasted with baptizing into one’s own name in 1 Cor 1 13, 14) is “to call over them his name” (in the rite of, as
claiming them for Christ and as their acknowledgment of Him or of faith in Him—becoming His disciples; similarly, baptism into (on) the name of the Father, and of the Holy Ghost, represents "dedication to" God as He has been revealed in Christ.

"In the name of" means "as representing" (or as being), e.g. "in the name of a prophet," of "a righteous man," or of "a disciple" (Mt 10:41; 42); to receive a little child "in Christ's name," i.e. as belonging to Him, is to receive Himself (Mt 18:5; Mk 9:37; ver 41 to disciples, RV "because ye are Christ's!" "my children, ye are Christ's!""); Lk 9:48; cf Mt 18:20; Mk 13:6, "Many shall come in my name"; Lk 21:8). The significance of the name of Jesus in relation to prayer deserves special notice. To pray in the name of Jesus, to ask anything of the Father, is not to be interpreted as a substitution for prayer, or to supplant the necessity of prayer. It is a continual reminder to the believer that Jesus is the Christ, the One Who was and is the Son of God, and Who has made it possible for believers to come directly to the Father on the basis of that relationship. When Jesus said, "Ye shall ask in my name," He did not mean that one may ask anything in the name of Jesus. Rather, "in my name" was a qualifying phrase or a condition that the one asking must meet in order to enjoy the privilege of praying to the Father in Christ's name. It designates the person of Jesus Christ as the Mediator of the prayer, and as the One who will intercede for the petitioner. The significance of the name of Jesus in relation to prayer might also be that the prayer should be made in the name of Jesus, i.e., the petitioner should be asking for the things that Jesus would ask for, and for the things that Jesus would desire for the petitioner. In this way, the petitioner is aligning their prayer with the will and purpose of Jesus Christ. The name of Jesus is a powerful name, and it is significant in the context of prayer because it is a name that represents the presence and power of God in the lives of believers. The inclusion of the name of Jesus in prayer is a means by which believers can draw closer to God and access His power and provision. It is a reminder that Jesus is the One who has the authority to present prayers to the Father on behalf of believers, and that He is the One who understands their needs and desires. In summary, the name of Jesus is significant in the context of prayer because it represents the presence and power of God in the lives of believers, and it is a means by which believers can draw closer to God and access His power and provision.
When the name was a sentence in Heb, its constituent parts could be transposed without changing the meaning. Thus the father of Bathsheba was called Ammiel, "a sinner of God," and Elhanan, "God is my father," from "God is my strength." Ch Jeconiah transferred also his right to the throne and was called Jeohoshaphat (2 Chr 36:16, 32, 17; 2 K 24:16); 1), a legitimate transposition of the vb. and subject, and meaning in each case, "Jeh hath laid hold.

Not only did transposition take place, but the substitution of a cognate root and even the use of a different part of the vb. also occurred. Thus King Jehoiachin (2 K 24:16; Jer 52:31) was known also as Jeconiah (Jer 24:1; 28:4) and Coniah (22:24, 37:1). The two names Jehoiachin and Jeconiah have exactly the same meaning, i.e., "the establishing of Jehovah." The Divine name which begins Jeconiah is transferred to the end in Jeconiah and Coniah; and the Hipil imperfect of the vb. 1is, which is seen in Jehoiachin, has been replaced by the Qal imperfect form of the vb. 1is, in Jeconiah, and by the construct infinitive of the same species in Coniah. Parallel cases occur in Assyry and Bab lit., among which the same form is used: (1) Assur, Jehovah, and Zimma-sham-shum, exhibit both the transposition of constituent parts and an interchange of prepositions and participles.

Twin forms like Abiner and Abner, Abishalom and Absalom, Elizaphan and Eliphasan, are not the full name and its abbreviation by 4. Methods of abbreviation, but are merely two or three of the variants, equally legitimate, modes of abbreviation combining the constituent parts. The common methods of shortening were:

1. (1) contraction by the rejection of a weak consonant of the formation of a final unaccented vowel, notably by the omission of the Divine name (ps 60:2); or the verb yap at the beginning and yap at the end of proper names: hence Jehoah became Joash (2 K 12:1,9,19), and Amaziah became Azariah (2 K 14:1 HEB text, and S); (2) abbreviation of composite geographical names by the omission of the generic noun or its equivalent: Jerusalem, which to the Hebrews meant "foundation of peace," was shortened to Salem, "peace" (Ps 76:2); Kirjath-baal, "city of Baal" (Gen 16:5), Baal or Baasha (Josh 15:19; 2 S 6:2), Besorah, "house of the temple of Ashtaroth," to Ashoroth; Beth-leboath, "house of fountains," to Leboath; Beth-tezaveth to Azmaveth; Beth-rehab to Rehob; Beth-banath to Banoth (M S I, 27, with Nu 21:19); Beth-haanan to Beth-anan (M S II, 39; 13:17); the same custom existed among the Moshibites who spoke of this town indiscriminately as Beth-baal-meon and Baal-meon (M S II, 9, 30); (3) abbreviation by the omission of the Divine name: thus the name of the idolater Micah, which means, "who is like Jeh?" (Jgs 17:14 [Heb]), was shortened to Micah, "who is like?" (vs 5,8), and similarly in the case of three other men, namely the prophet (Micah, Jer 26:18 ERV, and Mic, Mic 1:1), the Levite musician, with 11:25 and the father of Abdon (2 K 22:12 with 2 Ch 34:20).

The king of Judah, Yauhazai, as he was known to the Assyrians, i.e., Jehoahaz, "Jeh hath laid hold," is called simply Abdon. The king of Judah, Jeconiah, is called Joshua (2 K 23:31). The town of Jachin, "God doth cause to be built," was shortened to Jachin, "he doth cause to be built" (JOSH 15:11; see also 2 Mac 3:45). The name of Solomon, "the glory of God," was curtailed to Pol, "glory" (I K 2:21). Jehoiakim, "Jehovah is a name," was shortened to Kojh, or to Je (2 Ch 38:1 with 2 K 23:21) and Bamoath-baal, "high places of Baal," to Banzo (Josh 13:17 with Nu 21:19). Abergot, "high places," the name of a few other similar names, probably represent curtailment of this sort. The omission of the Divine name has parallels in Assyry and Bab lit.; thus Nebaioth and Nabu-shum-ukin respectively (Dinastical Tablet no. 2, col. iv. 4, 5, with Bab Chron., col. 13, 16).

(1) Abbreviation by the elision of the initial consonant, yet so that the remainder is a synonymous name of complete grammatical form. The name of King Hezekiah was written by the Hebrews both 'hezykijah, and 'hezykijah, and 'hezykijah, and 'hezykijah, and 'hezykijah, and 'hezykijah. Thus the name Hezekiah occurred many times in 2 Ch 29:33. Similarly, Jeconiah was shortened to Coniah, as has already been noticed; the name of the town Jekabzez, "God bringeth together," to Abah, another name, "hill of God together" (Neh 11:25 with Josh 15:21; 2 S 23:20); Meshelemiah, "Jeh is compensating," to Shelumleh, "Jeh's compensating" (1 Ch 26:12 with ver 14); Mshummah, "recompensed," to Shallom, "recompensed" (1 Ch 9:11; Neh 11:11 with 1 Ch 6:12; Ezr 7:2).

II. The Range of Proper Names.—(1) Not exclusively descriptive.—Simenon in his Onomasticon, published in 1741, and Gesenius in his 1. Personal Theaurus, issued during the years from 1835 to 1853, endeavored to interpret the proper names as though they were ordinarily intended to characterize the person who bore them. Embarrassed by the theory, Gesenius's Malechiel by "re Dei, i.e. a Deo conscriptus," and "the king of the bonds of stranger," and "the bonds of stranger" of the same species in Coniah. Parallel cases occur in Assyry and Bab lit., among which the same form is used: (1) Assur, Jehovah, and Zimma-sham-shum, exhibit both the transposition of constituent parts and an interchange of prepositions and participles. The twin forms like Abiner and Abner, Abishalom and Absalom, Elizaphan and Eliphasan, are not the full name and its abbreviation by 4. Methods of abbreviation, but are merely two or three of the variants, equally legitimate, modes of abbreviation combining the constituent parts. The common methods of shortening were:

1. (1) contraction by the rejection of a weak consonant of the formation of a final unaccented vowel, notably by the omission of the Divine name (Ps 60:2); or the verb yap at the beginning and yap at the end of proper names: hence Jehoah became Joash (2 K 12:1,9,19), and Amaziah became Azariah (2 K 14:1 HEB text, and S); (2) abbreviation of composite geographical names by the omission of the generic noun or its equivalent: Jerusalem, which to the Hebrews meant "foundation of peace," was shortened to Salem, "peace" (Ps 76:2); Kirjath-baal, "city of Baal" (Gen 16:5), Baal or Baasha (Josh 15:19; 2 S 6:2), Besorah, "house of the temple of Ashtaroth," to Ashoroth; Beth-leboath, "house of fountains," to Leboath; Beth-tezaveth to Azmaveth; Beth-rehab to Rehob; Beth-banath to Banoth (M S I, 27, with Nu 21:19); Beth-haanan to Beth-anan (M S II, 39; 13:17); the same custom existed among the Moshibites who spoke of this town indiscriminately as Beth-baal-meon and Baal-meon (M S II, 9, 30); (3) abbreviation by the omission of the Divine name: thus the name of the idolater Micah, which means, "who is like Jeh?" (Jgs 17:14 [Heb]), was shortened to Micah, "who is like?" (Ps 5,8), and similarly in the case of three other men, namely the prophet (Micah, Jer 26:18 ERV, and Mic, Mic 1:1), the Levite musician, with 11:25 and the father of Abdon (2 K 22:12 with 2 Ch 34:20).

The king of Judah, Yauhazai, as he was known to the Assyrians, i.e., Jehoahaz, "Jeh hath laid hold," is called simply Abdon. The king of Judah, Jeconiah, is called Joshua (2 K 23:31). The town of Jachin, "God doth cause to be built," was shortened to Jachin, "he doth cause to be built" (Josh 15:11; see also 2 Mac 3:45). The name of Solomon, "the glory of God," was curtailed to Pol, "glory" (1 K 2:21). Jehoiakim, "Jehovah is a name," was shortened to Kojh, or to Je (2 Ch 38:1 with 2 K 23:21) and Bamoath-baal, "high places of Baal," to Banzo (Josh 13:17 with Nu 21:19). Abergot, "high places," the name of a few other similar names, probably represent curtailment of this sort. The omission of the Divine name has parallels in Assyry and Bab lit.; thus Nebaioth and Nabu-shum-ukin respectively (Dinastical Tablet no. 2, col. iv. 4, 5, with Bab Chron., col. 13, 16).
22). Sometimes the name of the tribe or race to which a man belonged became his popular designation, as Cushi, "Cushite." All of these examples have been cited from the records of one period of Israel's history, the times of Samuel and David.

23). In leading to choice. The people in general gathered names for their children freely from all parts of this wide field, but in certain circles influences were at work which tended to restrict the choice to a smaller area. These influences were religious: (a) In the same of piety conscious nearness to God on the part of the parents naturally prompted them to bestow religious names upon their children. The name may be without distinct religious mark in its form and meaning, as Ephraim, "double fruitfulness," Manasseh, "making to forget," and yet have been given in acknowledgment of God's grace and be a constant reminder of His goodness (Gen 41.51,52); or the name may be religious in form, as Shemaiah, "Jeh hath heard," and publicly testify to the parents' gratitude to God. (b) The covenant relation, which Jeh entered into with Israel, made the name Jehovah, and that aspect of God's character which is denoted by this name, peculiarly precious to the people of God, and thenceforth the word Jehovah became a favorite element in the names of the Israelites, though not of course, to the exclusion of the great name El, "God." (c) Among the kings in the line of David, the consciousness of their formal adoption by Jehovah to be His vice-regents on the throne of Israel (2 Sm 7:14,22) found expression in the royal names that the God of Israel was acknowledged in the personal name Abijah, borne by the son and successor of Rehoboam. But his was an isolated case, unless the name Asa is an abbreviated form. But with Jerobeam, Abijah's grandson, this idea was in the 9th cent., the custom became established. Henceforth it was conventional for the king of Judah to have for his name a sentence with Jehovah as its subject. The only exceptions among the 16 successors of Asa on the throne were Manasseh and his son Amaziah, both of whom were notoriously apostate from Jehovah. The full name of Ahaz was Jehovah. Josiah's son Shallum as king was known as Jehovah; and his brother Eliakim, when placed on the throne by Jehovah, bore the name Jehovah. (d) Akin to the influence exerted by the relation of the kings to the God of Israel, and manifesting almost equal power contemporaneously with it, was the influence of official connection with the sanctuary, pious priests, or ecclesiastics, and it frequently led to the choice of an ecclesiastical name containing the word God or Jehovah. During the five centuries and a half, beginning near the close of Solomon's reign and extending to the end of Nehemiah's administration, 22 high priests held office, so far as their names have been preserved in the records. Of these pontiffs 17 bear names which are sentences with Jehovah as subject, and another is a sentence with El as subject. The materials for investigation in this last are not complete, as they are in the case of the kings, and ratios derived from them are apt to be erroneous; but evidently the priests of Jehovah's temple at Jerusalem not only recognized the appropriateness for themselves and their families of names possessing a general religious character, but came to favor such as expressly mentioned God, esp. those which mentioned God by His name of Jehovah.

(4). Popularity of names: hard to determine.—Until abundant data come to light for all periods of the Hebrew nation, it is not possible to determine the relative popularity of the various kinds and types of names in any one generation, or to compare period with period with respect to the use or neglect of a particular class of names. For, first, in no period are the names which have been transmitted by the Heb records many as compared with the thousands in use at the time; and, secondly, the records deal with the historical event which was conspicuous at the moment, and rarely mention persons other than the actors in this event.

At one time men and women from the middle class of society are associations themselves, and the personal names current in the families of farmers, shopkeepers, and soldiers obtained prominence whenever another time, when the activities of the court are of paramount importance, it is mainly names that were current in other circles that are recorded. In another period, when matters of the national worship engrossed the attention of the state, ecclesiastics as men from plious families, whose names were quite likely to have a religious meaning, receive mention. Very few names outside of the particular circle concerned are preserved in the records. It is unwarranted, therefore, to draw inferences regarding the relative use of particular names, secular names, for instance, at different periods of the history of Israel, by comparing the number of these names found in a record of political movements in the army with the number of similar names in the narrative of an episode which occurred at a later date and in which only priests took part. It is comparing things that differ. It is comparing the number of certain names current in many circles with the personal names among ecclesiastics, in order to learn whether these names were more common among the people as a whole in the one period than in that other.

The brine of its waters led the ancient Hebrews to call the Dead Sea the Salt Sea, Bethsaida, "house of mercy," received its name from the belief in the healing virtue of its waters; Lebanon, "white," from the height of the mountain; Tyre, from the great rock in the sea on which it was built; the valley of Elah, from the terebinth tree; Lus, from the almond tree; of these the acacia groves on the eastern terrace of the Jordan valley; Jericho, from the fragrance of its palms and balsams. The "crags of the wild goats" and En-gedi, "kidd spring" (I S 24:12), were in a desolate, rocky region where the wild goats had their home; Aijalon signifies "place of harts," and Etam denotes a "place of beasts and birds of prey." The hopes of a people and pride in their town were expressed in names like Joppa, "beauty," Tirzah, "pleasantness," Beth-el, "house of God," Zophim, "satisfaction," and Salem, "peace." The resemblance of the Sea of Galilee in shape to a harp secured for it its ancient name of Chinnereth. Poetic imagination saw in majestic Mt. Hermon likeness to a soldier's breastplate fitted for conflict. At the summit was called Serion and Senir. The sanctuary of a deity might give name to a town, hence Beth-dagon, Beth-shan, and Ashtaroth. Sometimes the name of a place commemorated a victory, as rock Oreb, rock Zeb, and Eben-ezer (Jgs 7:25; 1 S 7:12); or enshrined a religious transaction or experience, Beth-el and Berachah (Gen 28:17-19; 2 Ch 20:26); or told of a migration, as when colonists gave the name of their native town to their new settlement (Jgs 1:23-25). Names are not confined to the other famous inhabitant became attached to a town, and that for various reasons. It was often necessary to distinguish places of the same name from each other by this method; thus certain of the towns called Gilgal, Benjamin, came Gibeon Gilgal, and Gibeon, Gilpinus. The Jehovah stronghold captured by David was named by him the city of David, and was known by this name, as a quarter of Jerusalem, for many generations (2 S 5:9; 2 K 16:20). The practice was common among the names of the semites contemporaries of Israel, as is also the custom by Dur-sharrukin, "Sargonsburg," and Kish-shalmanasharadu, "Shalmaneser's fortress." A town might also be named after the tribe which inhabited it or after the ancestor of the tribe, as Dan (Jgs 18:29), and possi-
bly under not a few geographical designations a tribal name is hidden, even when the fact has escaped recognition. There are several instances where in an inquiry after the origin of a geographical designation the first consideration is due to the names known to be ordinarily at work in giving rise to names of the same aspect as the one under scrutiny; and only when they fail to yield a suitable explanation are less obvious causes worthy of serious attention.

III. Characteristics of Biblical References.—As a rule, Sem words clearly reveal their origin and structure. The case of Samuel is, indeed, an exception. 1. Derivation of Names current in several significations. This is the case with the vale of békdr, mentioned in Ps 84 (Eng. 6), is open to two interpretations: namely, “valley of Baca,” so called from the balsam trees in it, and “valley of weeping,” as the VSS render the unusual form, regarding it as equivalent to a similar word meaning “weeping.” The pl. békdrm, “mulberry or balsam trees” (2 S 5 23, 24), was understood by Jos to denote a grove known by the name Weepers (Ant, VII, iv, 1; cf. LXX). In those rare cases where several derivations were possible, the Israelite may not always have known which was intended to be embodied in the name which he heard. But he discerned the alternative possibilities; and a parent, in bestowing a name ambiguous in its derivation, might be deliberately taking advantage of its power to be the vehicle for the transmission and expression of opposite thought (Gen 30 23-24; Joseph being derivable from both yṣeph and yṣaph).

That the object of the Bib. writer was not to make the known derivation of the proper names is clearly shown by the burden of the Hebrew text and the contentions of the name, e.g., derived from the Heb vb. ṣaph, and that the name “God doth hear,” yish-ma'ēl, signifies God doth hear, yishma'ēl. These derivations and meanings were plain. The purpose was to make men with which no allusion could be made to the name by the choice of the name. There are instances also where no part of the name reappears in the words that state the reason for the use of the name. For example, the name Maher-shalal-hash-baz is not explained by citing the words which compose it. One noun of the composite name appears, indeed, in the exposition of the meaning, but accidentally as it were, and without prominence or significance of position (Isa 8 3-4). Samuel is a notable example of this method. Hannah called his name Samuel, saying, “Because of Jehovah I asked him.” (1 S 1 20). Simonis, Ewald and Nestle derive the name from šīrhmā'ēl, “heard of God.” This etymology would fully satisfy the reason given for the mother’s choice of the name; but the suggested derivation is far-fetched, for it is not customary for a Heb word to lose the strong guttural w.” The guttural was not lost, but was distinctly heard, in Ishmael, where there is the same concurrence of sounds as in the name. On the other hand, suggested that Samuel is a contraction of šēm mā'ēl, “asked of God”; and Ewald asserts that this origin is the theme of the narrator (Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache, 275, n. 3). This is incredible. Such a contraction is “alien to the genius of the Heb language” (Driver, Text of Samuel, 13), and the absence of the root w in the midst of the name Samuel would of itself prevent the Semite from imagining such an etymology. The derivation and meaning of Samuel were not obscure. The type was common, and was especially signified by the formula, “asked of God” (Gen 32 30). Samuel means “name of God” (Gesenius). As Jacob, upon his return from Paddan-aram, in fulfillment of his vow erected an altar at Beth-el as a memorial of God’s bestowal of the promise and personal protection, he consecrated “The God of Beth-el” (Gen 35 1.3.7), so Hannah having by vow dedicated to Jehovah the son for whose birth she was praying, now that her prayer has been answered and the son given, calls him “The Lord has given.” The Bib. narrator states the motive which led the mother to choose the name Samuel for her child. In this explanation no part of the name is used. Moreover, the slight assent between šēm mā'ēl and šēm dērlī in 1 S 1 20 was unsought, for these words were not intended in the termination, wrote Rubeol: and later the Syr version have the name Kristēl, and the Scholiast’s version as Köbel and Köbbel. The late variations are reasonably explained as a softening of the pronunciation, which had come into vogue? in the Reboboth (Gen, 36 15). Without the etymology furnished by the literature, preference has been given to Reubel as the original form on the ground that “the only plausible explanation of the etymology,” given in Gen 32 32 “is that it is based on the form ro'ebel—ro'ē bēl (Skinner, Gen, 36). An exhibition of the etymology was needless, however, and was not the end which the writer had in view. His purpose was to establish not only the particular name upon the child; and in stating it he does so with all justice to the dear name, and in his choice of the name Reuben. The name signifies either “vision of a son” or “child of God,” yel ‘āḇ. In either case the emphatic word is “son.” As Hannah, pointed out, the son was her own, and her barrenness, besought God to look on her affliction and give her that which would be a crown of beauty, and be the grace of God, yel ‘āḇ, yel ‘āḇ. A male child was to be her a proof of God’s regard for her many, and a guaranty of the future love of her husband for her. Moreover, the name kept the thought constantly before the mind of her husband. Gesenius remarks that Hebrew means properly, “Spoken of” but the sacred writer in Gen 32 explains it as ro’ē bēl (staph qām) bēl, “provided in my affliction” (Leritzon, Thesaurus). This is a serious criticism of etymology may be regarded as the reduction ad absurdum of the hypothesis that the Hebr writers intended to give the derivation of the proper names. The result of endeavoring to force the etymology into an intentional etymology compels the abandonment of the idea that the Heb writer misunderstood one of the simplest phrases of his own language and proposed a construction impossible to himself and utterly foreign to the principles which underlie Heb speech.

Allusions to proper names are made for the purpose of stating the reason for the bestowal of the name, of pointing out a coincidence. 3. Allusions between the name and the character linked with it. His experience of its bearer, or of attaching prophecy to a name. An allusion to link the allusion with the name by employing the root that underlies the name, or a cog-
nate root, or some other word that resembles the name in sound: (1) Statement of the reason for the choice of the name: In the case of Simeon, the root of the name is used (Gen 29 33). Words of this type are related to Romance form nouns and vb.s, and have the force of adjs, diminutives, or abstract nouns, and are sometimes used as concrete nouns (Stade, Lehrbuch der hebräischen Grammatik, § 296). The Israelite at once recognized a form corresponding to the root of the name Simeon, which was a favorite with the Hebrews, and he knew that it could express the abstract idea of hearing. In Gen 29 33 the narrator is not seeking to impart etymological information; but it is clear that the name the root of the name in the form is of an abstract noun meaning “laughing,” or a concrete noun, “laughing one,” or a vb. in the imperfect, “he laughs” or "one who laughs." (cf. Simeon, transl in RE, § 259a). Whichever specific meaning may have been in the mind of Abraham when he gave the name to his son, yet by reason of its ever speaking of laughter the name was a constant reminder to the parents of the laughter of belief with which they had listened to the promise of his birth (Gen 17 17; 18 12). But in due time the child of promise has been born. His name, as determined upon, is Isaac. This Sarah knows (17 19; 21 3). Accordingly, the theme with which she greets his advent is laid in her mouth. She plays upon the name Isaac, using the root of the word in various forms, first as a noun and then as a vb., and giving to the vb. a new subject and to the thought a new turn. Instead of the laughter, unsincere, with which the promise was voiced, "gu'dah, he says, 'hath prepared for me laughter [of joy], everyone that heareth [of the event] will laugh [with joy] for me' (21 6; cf Ps 136 2). (2) The indication of a coincidence between the character or experience of a person and his name: Now returning to her home bereaved and in poverty, saw the contrast between her present condition and her name; and she played upon her name by using a word of opposite meaning, saying: 'Call me not Pleasant, call me Sorrow; for the Lord hath made me very bitter with me' (Ruth 1 20). In whatever sense Nabal's name may have been bestowed upon him originally, at any rate his wife saw the correspondence between his name in its ordinary meaning and his conduct toward David, and she played upon it, saying: 'Fool is his name, and folly is with him' (1 S 25 25). Likewise the agreement between Jacob's character and a meaning that his name has in Heb was seen, and called forth the bitter word-play: 'Is he not rightly named? He is the father of strife, and the root of strife these two times' (Gen 27 36). Isaac, so far as the formation is concerned, may be an abstract noun meaning "laughing," or a concrete noun, "laughing one," or a vb. in the imperfect, "he laughs" or "one who laughs." (cf. Simeon transl in RE, § 259a). Whichever specific meaning may have been in the mind of Abraham when he gave the name to his son, yet by reason of its ever speaking of laughter the name was a constant reminder to the parents of the laughter of belief with which they had listened to the promise of his birth (Gen 17 17; 18 12). But in due time the child of promise has been born. His name, as determined upon, is Isaac. This Sarah knows (17 19; 21 3). Accordingly, the theme with which she greets his advent is laid in her mouth. She plays upon the name Isaac, using the root of the word in various forms, first as a noun and then as a vb., and giving to the vb. a new subject and to the thought a new turn. Instead of the laughter, unsincere, with which the promise was voiced, "gu'dah, he says, 'hath prepared for me laughter [of joy], everyone that heareth [of the event] will laugh [with joy] for me' (21 6; cf Ps 136 2).
undieded," and probably represented originally the productive powers of Nature (genetrix), and as such was the companion of the sun-god. She was identified with Ishtar in Assyria and Ashoreth in Phoenicia by the Greeks as Aphrodite (Clem. Alex. Protr., 19), but sometimes as Artemis the huntress (Paus. iii. 16.8; Plut. Artax. xxvii). Strabo (xv. 733) identifies her with Anatiss (=Anahita), the Asian Artemis. She was the Venus, but sometimes the Diana, of the Romans. There are many variants of the name: Anaca (Strabo xvi. 738), Anetias (Plut. Artax. xxviii), Tanais (Clem. Alex. loc. cit.), also Tanath, sometimes in Phoen inscriptions, Tanata, Anta (Egypt). In 2 Macc 1 13 ff, a fictitious account is given of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, in a temple of Nanaea in Persia, by the treachery of Nanaea’s priests. The public treasury was often placed in Nanaea’s temple; this, Epiphanes was anxious to secure under the pretext of marrying the goddess and receiving the money as a dowry. The priests threw down her reat so she “like thunderbolts” from above, killed the king and his suite and then cut off their heads. But 1 Macc 6 1 ff, which is more reliable, gives a different account of the death of Epiphanes after an attempt to rob a rich temple in Elymais (Strabo xvi. 1.18; Diod. Sic. 573; Justin, xxxii.2). The temple of Nanaea referred to in 2 Macc 1 13 ff may be identified with that of Artemis (Polyb. xxxi.11; Jos. Ant. XII, ix, 1) or Aphrodite (Appian, Syr. 66; Rawlinson, Specker’s Comm.). S. ANOUS

NAOMI, נָוָם, נָוָם, נָוָם (nā‘ām, no‘ām), probably = “pleasantness”; LXX B, Ναομή, Nōōmēn, A, Ναομή[i], Νοομή[n]: Wife of Elimelech and mother-in-law of Ruth (Ruth 1 2–4 17). She went with her husband to the land of Moab, and after his death returned to Bethlehem. When greeted on her return, she told the women of the town to call her, not no‘āmī (“pleasantness”), but mārah (“bitterness”), “for,” she said, “the Almighty hath dealt very bitterly with me.” She advised Ruth in her dealings with Boaz, and helped her to nurse their child. The name may mean “my joy,” “my bliss,” but is perhaps better explained according to the traditional interpretation as “the pleasant one.”

DAVID FRANCIS ROBERTS

NAPHTALI, נָפַתָלי (naph‘ālī, naphtālī; Naphthali; Naph’tah, Naphtali): A son of Ishmael (Gen 25 15; 1 Ch 1 31). Naphish, along with other Hagarite clans, was overwhelmingly defeated by the Israelitish tribes on the E. of the Jordan (1 Ch 6 19, AV “Naphish”). Their descendants are mentioned among the Nethinim by the name “Naphishim,” AV and RV “Nephshim” (Ezr 2 50); “Nepheshim,” AV and RV “Nepheshim” ( Neh 7 52); “Naphish” (1 Esd 5 31).

NAPHEISH, נָפֶהיש (nap‘ēsh, Naphesh, B, Naϕeʃi, Naphesh): The name of one of the families which went up out of captivity with Zerubbabel (1 Esd 5 31) = “Nepheshim” of Neh 7 52; “Nepheshim” of Ezr 2 50. See Naphish.

NAPHOTH-DOR, נָפֹהְתָּדָר (Josh 11 2 RvM). See Dor.

NAPHTHALI, נָפַתָּלי (naph‘ālī, naphtālī; Nephthali; Nephthaleim): I. The Patriarch

1. Name. Circumstances When Its Name was Given

2. Historical and Traditional Details

II. Tribe of Naphthali

1. Its Relative Position

2. Its Location in Palestine

3. Physical Features

4. Distinction of the Tribe

5. Sites and Inhabitants

6. Labors of Jesus in This District

I. The Patriarch.—The 5th son of Jacob, and the 2d born to him by Rachel’s handmaid, Bilhah. He was full brother of Dan (Gen 30 1). Name 7 of the sons.

At his birth Rachel is said to have exclaimed, naphţālī elōkim naphthālī, “wrestlings of God”—i.e. “mighty wrestlings”—“have I wrestled.” Her sister’s fruitfulness was a sure trial to the barren Rachel. The name is sometimes of her artifice she had obtained children, the offspring of her maid nursing as her own; and thus her reproach of childlessness was removed. The name N. given to this son was a monument of her victory. She herself had won the blessing and blessing of God as made manifest in the way yearned for by the oriental heart, the birth of sons.

Personal details regarding the patriarch N. are entirely wanting in Scripture; and the traditions have not much to say about him.

II. Tribe of Naphthali.—When the first census was taken in the wilderness, the tribe numbered 53,400 fighting men (Nu 1 43; 2 30).

1. Relative At the second census, the numbers had shrunk to 45,400 (Nu 26 48 ff); See NRMX.

II. Tribe of Naphthali in the desert was on the N. of the tabernacle with the standard of the camp of Dan, along with the tribe of Asher (Nu 2 25 ff). The standard, according to Tg Pseudojon, was a serpent, or basilisk, with the legend, “Return of Jehovah to the many thousands of Israel” (Tg Pseudojon on Nu 2 25). When the host was on the march, this camp came in the rear (Nu 2 31). The prince of the tribe at Sinai was Ahira ben Enan (2 29).

Among the spies the tribe was represented by Nahbi ben Vophsi (13 14). Prince Pedahel ben Annihud was chosen from N. to assist in the division of the land (34 28). Toward the end of David’s reign the ruler of the tribe was Jeremoth ben Azriel (1 Ch 27 19). Hiram the Tyrian artificer is described as “the son of a widow of the tribe of N.” (1 K 7 14). But in 2 Ch 2 14 he is called “the son of a woman of the daughters of Dan.” Jgs 6 15 does not definitely associate Barak with the tribe of Issachar; his residence was at Kedesh (Jgs 4 6); it is therefore possible that he belonged to the tribe of N.

In the allocation of the land, the lot of N. was the last but one to be drawn (Josh 19 32–39). The 3rd boundaries are stated with great fulness. While it is yet impossible to in Palestine trace them with certainty, the identification of sites in recent years, for which we are mainly indebted to the late Col. Conder, makes possible an approximation. The territory was bounded on the E. by the Sea of
Galilee and the upper reaches of the Jordan. Jos makes it extend to Damascus (Ant, V, i, 22); but there is nothing to support this. The southern boundary probably ran from the point where Wady el-Birch enters the Jordan, westward along the northern side of the valley to Mt. Tabor. The western border may have gone up by way of Hamath (Ziddim) and Yaḥbāk (Hukkok) to Kefr 'Anān (Hamathon), bending there to the W., including the land of er-Rameh (Ramah) until it reached the territory of Asher. Running northward again until nearly opposite Tyre, it bent eastward, and once more northward to the Litāny (Leontes), taking in the larger part of what is called by the Arabs Belad Beḥṣarāh and Belad es-Shaḵīf. Nineteen cities in N. are named in Josh 19: 22 ff. Among them was the famous city of refuge, Kedeš-naph茶tālī (q.v.), on the heights to the W. of the Waters of Merom, where extensive ruins are still to be seen (20 7). It, along with Hammoth-šor and Kartan, was assigned to the Gershonite Levites (21: 23; 1 Ch 6: 76).

The land lying around the springs of the Jordan was included in the lot of N. It is clear that from this part, as well as from the cities named in Jgs 1 33, N. did not drive out the Canaanites. These the Danites found in possession at the time of their raid. There is no indication that N. resented in any way this encroachment of their kindred tribe into their territory (Jgs 18).

The district thus indicated includes much excellent land, both pastoral and arable. There are the broad, rich terraces that rise away to the N. and N.W. of the Sea of Galilee, the mountains immediately N. of the sea are rocky and barren; but when this tract is passed, we enter the lofty and spacious lands of upper Galilee, which from time immemorial have been the joy of the peasant farmer. Great breadths there are which in season yield golden harvests. The richly diversified scenery, mountain, hill and valley, is marked by a finer growth of trees than is common in Pal. The terebinth and pine, the olive, mulberry, apricot, fig, pomegranate, orange, lemon and vine are cultivated, to good purpose, as the soil is comparatively plentiful, supplied by many copious springs. It was one of the districts from which Solomon drew provisions, the officer in charge being the king’s son-in-law, Ahimaz (1 K 4: 15).

The free life of these spacious uplands, which yielded so liberally to the touch of the hand of industry, developed a robust manhood and a wholesome spirit of independence among its inhabitants. According to Jos, who knew them well (Jud, III, iii, 2), the country never lacked multitudes of men of courage ready to give a good account of themselves on all occasions of war. Its history, as far as we know it, afforded ample opportunities for the development of warlike qualities. In the struggle with Sisera, N. was found on the high places of the field (Jgs 5: 18). To David’s forces at Hebron, N. contributed a thousand captives “and with them with shield and spear thirty and seven thousand” (1 Ch 12: 34). Their position exposed them to the first brunt of attack by enemies from the N.; and in the wars of the kings they bore an important part (1 K 15: 20; 2 K 12: 18; 13: 22); and they were the first on the W. of the Jordan to be carried away captive (2 K 15: 29). See GALEL.

The largest town in Mt. Naphthal today is Safed, on the heights due N. of the Sea of Galilee, often spoken of as the “city set on a hill.” It is built in the form of a horsehoe, open to the N., round the Castle Hill, on which are the ruins of the old fortress of the Templars. This is a position of great strength, which could hardly fail 5. Sites and to be occupied in ancient times.

Inhabitants although, it cannot be identified with any ancient city. It contains between 20,000 and 30,000 inhabitants. Over against it to the N.W., beyond the deep gorge of

Naphthal: Safed.

Wādī Leimān, rises Jebel Jerimūk, the highest mountain in Pal proper (c. 4,000 ft.) which may be the scene of the Transfiguration (q.v.). The inhabitants of Safed were massacred by Sultan Bihara in 1296. The city suffered severely from earthquake in 1759; and it shared with Tiberias, also a city of N., the disaster wrought by the earthquake of 1857. It is one of the holy cities of the Jews.

In the land of N. Jesus spent a great part of his public life, the land of Jesus Gennesaret, Bethsaida, Capernaum and Chorazin all lying within its boundaries (cf Mt 4: 15).

NAPHTALI MOUNT (נהפּתָלִי, har naphatālī; ἱπ η το ν εφαλαί, en το orei tο naphthalai): This was the most northerly of the three divisions of the Western Range, which derived their names from those of the tribes holding chief sway over them—Mt. Judah, Mt. Ephraim, and Mt. Naphthali (Josh 20: 7 AV, RV replaces “Mount” by “the hill country of”).

NAPHTHAR, naṭṭār (AV): RV “Nephthar.”

NAPHTH CIM, naf-ṭhim (נהפּתּוּ ה, naphthūhim; LXX Ναπτηθον, Naphthethon): A son of Miriam (Gen 10: 13; 1 Ch 1: 11); but, according to most modern authorities, a district or a dependency of Egypt. Among the many efforts at identification the following deserve notice: Naphthūhim = (1) Nēphēthu (Nēpēthu, Nēphēthu) in the N.E. of Egypt; (2) Na-phath, i.e., the people of Phath, the dwellers in the neighborhood of Memphis; (3) Nithu (according to Herodotus, Nāthā, Nāthō), which occurs in Assurbanipal’s Annals as the name of a part of Lower Egypt; (4) Erman (ZATW, X, 118), by the change of a letter, reads Petimuth, which signifies “The Northland”; (5) Spiegelberg sees in the word an old designation of the Delta, and would therefore render the name, “the people of the Delta” (cf Johns, HDB; Skinner and Holzinger on Gen).

NAPKIN, nap’kin (ῥωμαῖον, rhōmaion; Lat sudarium): In Lk 19: 20, the cloth in which the “unprofitable servant” wrapped the money of his lord; cf Jn 11: 44; 20: 7; see Dress, 7; Hand-kerchief.

JOHN A. LEES
Narcissus
Natural, Nature

THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

NARCISSUS, nār-sis'us (Na·kri̇sōs, Narcissus): In Rom 15 11 St. Paul sends greetings to “them of the household of Narcissus, that are in the Lord.” “The last words may suggest that, though only the Christians in this household have a greeting sent to them, there were other members of it with whom he had relations?” (Dean.)

Narcissus is a common name, esp. among freedmen and slaves. But, as in the case of Aristobulus, some famous person of this name must be meant. Conybeare and Howson mention two, one the well-known favorite of Claudius, the other a favorite of Nero. The latter was put to death by Galba (Dio Cass. lxxiv.3), they think to be the Narcissus meant here (St. Paul, ch xix). On the other hand, Bishop Lightfoot (Phil., 175) holds that “the powerful freedman Narcissus, whose wealth was proverbial (Juv. Sat. xiv.329), whose influence with Claudius was unbounded, and who bore a chief part in the intrigues of this reign, alone satisfies this condition.” Shortly after the accession of Nero, he had been put to death by Agrippina (Tac. Ann. xiv.41, 39, Dio Cass. lxxv.4) in 64 A.D. As this occurred three or four years before the Ep. to the Rom was written, some think another Narcissus is meant. However, as usual in such cases, his property would be confiscated, and his slaves, becoming the property of the emperor, would swell “Caesars’ household” as Narcissus.

S. F. HUNTER

NARD, nārd. See SIKKARD.

NASBAS, nas'bas (Na·bas, Nasbas, Nαβας, Nαβαδ, Nabəd, read by Fritzsche): A name otherwise unknown. It occurs only in Tob 11 18, “And Achicharach, and Nasbas his brother’s son,” came to Tobit’s wedding. Opinions are divided as to whether he was “brother’s son” of Tobit or Achicharach. AV reads the suggestion of Junius, “Achicharach who is also called Nasbas,” thus identifying Nasbas with Achicharach, which might gain support from 1 22 where Achicharach is mentioned as “brother’s son” of Tobit. See ACHICHARACH; AMAN. Nasbas is a person with whom Josephus identically identifies Nasbas, also as 2 12 where Achicharach is mentioned as “brother’s son” of Tobit. See ACHICHARACH; AMAN. The Itala gives “Nabal avunculus [‘maternal uncle’] Illus; the Vulg “Nabal consobrin [‘cousin’] Tobiae; Syr “Laban has no brothers” and this person is possibly identical with the “Aman of Tob 1 10 (see variety of readings under AMAN) and the nephew in Harris’ Story of Ahikar and His Nephew.

S. ANGUS

NASI, na'si (B. Nasi, Nasi, Nασί, Naśi(: AV Nasit): The head of one of the families which went up with Zerubbabel (1 Esd 5 32) = “Neziah” of Ezr 2 54; Neh 7 56.

NASOR, nās'or. See HAZOR.

NATHAN, nāthan (נתָּハン, nōthān, “gift”; Naḥōn, Naḥən, Naḥān): A court prophet in David’s reign and a supporter of Solomon at his accession. There are three main incidents in his career as depicted in the OT.

The two | narratives, 2 S 7 1-17 = 1 Ch 17 1-15, of which the former is the original, relate how David confided to Nathan his intention to build a house for Jeh’s ark and Temple-Plans

1. Nathan and David’s Nathan at first blesses the project, but that same night is given a Divine message, and returns to tell the king that instead of David building a house for Jeh, Jeh will build a house for David: “I will set up thy seed after thee, . . . and I will establish his kingdom. . . . I will be his father, and he shall be my son: if he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men” (2 S 7 12-14). Ver 13 says that “He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever,” but this disturbs the one great thought of the passage, which is that God will build a house for David, and which is also the thought in David’s prayer (vs 18-29).

The word “seed” in vs 12 is collective and so throughout the passage, so that the prophecy does not refer to one individual, but, like Dt 17 18, belongs to the group of generic prophecies. Nor is it Messianic, for ver 14 could not be reconciled with the messianic expectations of the general setting of the ever-merciful providence of God in dealing with David’s family. See, however, W. A. Briggs, Messianic Prophecy, p. 126.) Buddha, who says that the section belongs to the 7th cent. and is certainly prehistoric in the prophetic speech of the idealism of Amos and Hosea, for the prophet teaches that Jeh dwells, not in “a holy place made with hands” (Re 9 11, 34), but rather in the life of the nation as represented by the direct succession of Davids kings. This presents an extension of the teaching of Paul that the very body itself is a sanctuary unto God (1 Cor 6 19).

2 S 12 1-25 narrates Nathan’s rebuke of David for his adultery, and for causing the death of Bathsheba’s child; and David’s va 1-15a, we have Nathan’s parable of Sin of the rich man and the poor man’s ewe lamb, and the application of it to David’s conduct. But several difficulties arise when we ask exactly what Nathan’s message to David was: va 13 f represent the prophet as saying that God has forgiven David but that the child will die, while vs 10-12 speak of a heavy punishment that is to come upon David and his family, and ver 16 does not show any indication of a prophecy as to the child’s death. Commentators regard vs 1-15a as later in origin than chap. 11, 12 in the main, and hold vs 10-12 to be still later than the rest of chap 11-15b, but regards even the rest of the story as interrupting the connection between 11 27b and 12 15b, and therefore of later date.

1 K 1 is a part of “one of the best pieces of Heb narrative in the possession” (H. F. Smith, OT Hist, 153, n. 2). It narrates the part that

3. Nathan Nathan played in the events that led to Solomon’s accession. David was getting old and feeble, and the succession of Adonijah had not been settled. When Adonijah, who was probably thinking of his son living, gave a banquet to some of his father’s state officials, Nathan, who was one of those that had not been invited, inquired Bathsheba, Solomon’s mother, to remind David of his promise to her that Solomon should succeed to the throne. This she did, and in the middle of her audience with David, Nathan appears with the news of Adonijah’s feast and proclamation as king. Solomon is then appointed king by David’s command, Nathan being one of his chief supporters. It has been argued that it is only Nathan who interprets Adonijah’s feast as a claim to the throne, but this contradicts ver 5. Yet, whereas in the two sections treated above Nathan is the prophet of Jeh, he is represented in 1 K as an intriguing court politician, planning very cleverly an opportune entrance into David’s presence at the very time that Bathsheba has an audience with the king. The | narrative of 1 Ch 29 makes no mention of Nathan, Solomon being there represented as Divinely elected to succeed David.

1 K 4 5 mentions a Nathan as father of Azariah and Zahad, two of the chief officers of Solomon. He is probably the same.

1 Ch 29 20; 2 Ch 9 29 refer to “the words” or rather “the acts of Nathan the prophet” as well as those
of Samuel and Gad. “There can be no doubt that these are not references to the narrative Jesus which Samuel, Nathan and Gad are mentioned in our Books of Samuel” (Curris on 1 Ch 29:29). In 2 Ch 29:29, however, a single-machine being commanded by God through Nathan and Gad. Curtis observes that Nathan and Gad is always called nabbî ("prophet") in S and K and not râ'eh or bâchez, "seer."  

DAVID FRANCIS ROBERTS

NATHAN:  
(1) A prophet (2 S 7; Ps 61, title). See preceding article.  
(2) A son of King David (2 S 5 14; 1 Ch 3 5; 1 Ch 11:2).  
(3) Father of Igael, one of David’s heroes (2 S 23 36). In 1 Ch 11 38, we have “Joel the brother of Nathan;” LXX B has “son” in this ver, but it is impossible to say whether Igael or Joel is the correct name.  
(4) A Jerahmeelite (1 Ch 3 36), whose son is called Zabad, whom some suppose to be the same as Zabud (1 K 4 5). On this view Nathan is the same as the prophet (see 1,above).  
(5) A companion of Ezra from Babylon (Ezr 8 10 and 1 Esd 8 44).  
(6) Nathans (1 Esd 9 34), one of those who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10 39).  
(7) Name of a family (Zec 12 12).  

DAVID FRANCIS ROBERTS

NATHANIEL, na-than’iel (Nathanael, Nathanael):  
(1) One of the “captains over thousands” who furnished the Levites with much cattle for Josiah’s Passover (1 Esd 1 9) = “Nathaniel” of 2 Ch 35 9. (2) Nathaniel, Nathandelos, B A om. One of the priests who had married a “strange wife” (1 Esd 9 22) = “Nathaniel” of Ezr 10 22.  
(3) An ancestor of Judith (Jth 8 1).  
(4) One of the Twelve Apostles. See next article.  

NATHANIEL (ΝΑΣΟΥ, nathan’el, “God has given”): Nathânâ`l, Nathanael: Nathanael, who was probably a fisherman, belonged to Cana in Galilee (Jn 21 2). According to the “Genealogies of the Twelve Apostles” (cf Budge, Contendings of the Apostles, II, 50), N. was the same as Simon, the son of Cleopas, and was one of the Twelve. He was among those who met and conversed with Jesus during the preaching of John the Baptist at Bethany beyond Jordan (Jn 1 29). From the account of his conversation extended by him by Philip (Jn 1 45), it is evident that N. was well versed in ancient Scripture, and that in him also the preaching of John had aroused a certain expectancy. His reply to Philip, “Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?” (Jn 1 46), was prompted, not by any ill-repute of the place, but by its petty insincer-  
ificance and familiarity in N.’s eyes. To this question Philip made no direct answer, but replied, “Come and see.” It was the answer best fitted to the man and the occasion; it appealed to N.’s fair-mindedness and sincerity of purpose. He responded nobly to the call, and on approaching Jesus was received with the words: “Beloved, an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile” (Jn 1 47). It was a tribute to that singleness of heart which enabled him to overcome his initial prejudice. The same candor and openness distinguished the after-interview of N. with Jesus, as is evident by his question, “Whence knowest thou me?” (Jn 1 48). The reply of Jesus was addressed to the time he had spent under the fig tree, kneeling, no doubt, in silent prayer and communion with God, and brought to mind all the sacred hopes and aspirations of that hour. It taught him that here was One who read on the instant the innermost secrets of his heart, and was Himself the ideal for whom he was seeking; and it

drew from him the confession, “Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art King of Israel” (Jn 1 49).  

Although N. is mentioned by name only once again in the NT [he is one of the seven who witnessed the appearance of the risen Jesus (Jn 20 21)], it is evident that the connection and companionship of N. with Jesus must be seen as closer than those two incidents would lead us to suppose. Accordingly, attempts have been made to identify him with other NT characters, the most commonly accepted being Bartholomew (of Bartholomew). The principal arguments in support of this identification are: (1) N. is never mentioned by the synoptists, and Bartholomew is never mentioned by John, who further implies that N. was one of the twelve disciples (24 30, 26 24); (2) in the Synoptists, Philip is closely connected with Bartholomew (events of the apostles), and in John with N. (of Jn 1 45 f); (3) the fact that most of the other apostles bear two names. Arguments are also adduced to identify him with Simon the Cananese (of Stox). N. has also been identified with Matthew the tax-gatherer (based on the similarity of its name) and Simon the Zealote, with Stephen, and even with Paul.  

C. M. KERR

NATHANIAS, nath-a-ni’as (Nâthanias, Nathania): One of those who put away their foreign wives (1 Esd 9 34) = “Nathan” of Ezr 10 39.  

NATHAN-MELECH, nath-an-melek (תָּחַת־מְלֶאךְ, “king’s gift”): A Judean official, to whose chamber King Josiah removed the “horses of the sun” (Jr 35 19; 37 11). LXX X, a Nathaniel, the king’s eunuch! (Nâ`thâ`n bâsileus toû eunuchû).  

NATIONS, nás’shun. See GENTILES; GOIM; HEATHEN; Table of Nations.  

NATIVITY, na-tiv’i-ty, OF MARY, GOSPEL OF. See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

NATURAL, na’thâr, NATURE, na’târ (η̲η̲μ̲α̲τ̲η̲, ἐ̲μ̲α̲τ̲η̲, φυ̲κ̲ι̲ς̲, ψυ̲χ̲ι̲ς̲, φυ̲σ̲ι̲ς̲, φυ̲σ̲ό̲ς̲, φύ̲σ̲ε̲ι̲ς̲). “Natural” is the tr of ἐ̲μ̲α̲τ̲η̲, “freshness or vigor” (Dt 34 7). In the NT “natural” (phusis) is frequently found in the latter sense (Rom 1 20, “against nature”; 2 14, “by nature”; 2 27; 11 24, also  

2. As Used “contrary to nature”; 1 Cor 11 14, in the NT “Dost not even nature itself teach you?” Gal 2 15; 4 8; Eph 2 3; in 2 Pet 1 4, we have “that ye might be partakers of the divine nature,” RVm “or, a”; phusis occurs also in Jas 3 7, “every kind of beast,” RVm “Gr nature,” also “mankind” (ver 7), RVm “Gr the human nature.” “Natural” (Rom 11 21 24), is the tr of καθ’ ἐ̲μ̲α̲τ̲η̲s, “according to nature,” according to Paul in 1 Cor speaks of “the natural man” (2 14, ARVm “or unspiritual, Gr psychical”) and of a “natural body” (15 44 bis), the Gr word being psuchikos, “of the soul” (psuchê), the animal, natural principle, as contrasted with the “divine body” (5 16), “natural body” is the principle of the spirit (pneuma). In 1 Cor 15 46 the contrast is expressed, “Howbeit that is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural,” RVm “Gr psychical. The “natural man” is the man in whom the spirit is unquickened, the “natural body” is that corresponding to the psychical or soul-nature, the “spiritual body” that corresponding to the Spirit
**Natural Features**

**Nazareth**
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as the dominant principle of the life. In Jude ver 10, we have phusikós, "naturally," "naturally, as brute beasts," RV "naturally, like the creatures without reason"; γένεσις, "origin," "birth," is trd "natural" (Jas 1 23, "his natural face," RV "the face of his birth") and "nature" (3 6, "the course of nature," RV "the wheel of nature," m "or birth") ("wheel" probably means "circle of nature" [the whole creation; see Cotelae]); gněstós, "genuine" "true to right nature," "legitimate," "true" "naturally" (Phil 2 20, "are) will naturally care for your state," RV "truly," m "Gr genuinely"). W. L. Walker

**NATIONAL FEATURES, ἑαυτῷ.** As has been pointed out by various authors (cf Ἡγίλ), the principal physical features of Pal run in N. and S. lines, or rather about from S.S.W. to N.N.E.

The lowland or Shephelah (AV "vale, valley, plain, or low country") includes the maritime plain and the western foothills.

The hill country consists of the mountains of Judaea, and its features are continued northward to the plain of Esdraelon and southward to the Sinaite peninsula. It is rocky and has very little water. Except for the few fountains, the scanty population depends upon rain water collected during the winter months.

The Arabah (RV) includes the Jordan valley from the Sea of Galilee to the Dead Sea, as well as the depression running from the Dead Sea to the Gulf of Akaba. It is to the latter depression that the name Wādī-ut'Arabah is now applied by the Arabs. It is bounded on the E. by Mt. Seir or Edom, and on the W. by the mountains of the Sinaite peninsula. Its highest point, about half-way between the Dead Sea and the Gulf of Akaba, is a few hundred ft. higher than the level of the Mediterranean, but nearly 2,000 ft. above the level of the Dead Sea. From this point the valley slopes southward to the Gulf of Akaba, and northward to the Dead Sea. The lower Jordan valley slopes from about 600 ft. below ocean-level at the Sea of Galilee to about 1,300 ft. below ocean-level at the Dead Sea.

To the E. are the highlands of Gilead and Moab rising abruptly from the valley, as does the hill country of Judaea on the W. The country to the level of the table-land. The small annual rainfall on the heights near the Ghaur diminishes eastward, and the desert begins within from 20 to 40 miles.

Another term much used by OT writers is South or Négéb, which embraces the southernmost portion of the promised land, and was never effectively occupied by the Israelites. Its uttermost boundary was the "river of Egypt" (al-'Arish), and coincides roughly with the present boundary between the Ottoman territory on the E. and the Anglo-Egypt territory of Sinai on the W.

The term slopes, ḥāshāhā, AV "springs," occurs in Josh 10 40, "so Joshua smote all the land, the hill-country . . . and the lowland, and the slopes, and all their kings"; and again in Josh 12 7, 8. "And Joshua gave it . . . for a possession according to their divisions; in the hill-country, and in the lowland, and in the Arabah, and in the slopes, and in the wilderness, and in the South." In the former passage, it seems to refer to the foothills which form the eastern or higher part of the lowland or Shephelah. In the latter passage, it might mean the same, or it might mean the descent from the Judaean hills to the Ghaur. In Dt 4 17, 4: 40; Josh 12 3, 12 20, we have "the slopes of Pīqah" (ḥāshāhā- kā-pīqāh, "springs of Pīqah"), which denotes the descent from the heights of Moab to the Ghaur. The same word occurs in the sing. in Nu 21 15, referring to the descent to the Arnon. "Slopes," therefore, does not seem to be a term applied to any particular region.

The wilderness is usually the desert of the wandering, including the central part of the Sinaite peninsula, but it is by no means always used in this sense, e.g. Josh 15 20, 24, where it clearly refers to a region near Ai. "The wilderness" of Mt 4 1 is thought to be the barren portion of Judæa between the Arnon and the Jordan. See CHAMPAIGN; COUNTRY; DESERT; EAST; HILL; LOWLAND; SOUTH.

Alfred Ely Day

**NATURAL HISTORY, his-ti¬ri.** See Animal; Botany; Birds; Fishes; Insects; Zoology.

**NATURAL MAN, THE.** See Man, the NATURAL.

NATURE. See NATURAL, Nature.

NAUGHT, nōt, NAUGHTY, nō'ti, NAUGHTINESS, -nes: In the sense of bad, worthless, worthlessness, the words in AV represent the Heb ẓ̄, ṣ̄, changed in RV to "bad" (2 K 2 19; Prov 20 14; Jer 24 2), ṣ̄, retained in RV "naughtiness" (1 S 17 25), ṣ̄, hāvērūm, retained in RV in Prov 11 6 "iniquity," and in 17 4 "mischievous." In Prov 6 12, "naughty person," lit. "man of Belial," is in RV "worthless person." In the NT, "superfluity of naughtiness" in Jas 1 21 (for kaskia, kāsin) becomes in RV "overflowing of wickedness," in "malice," and in Wsd 12 10 AV's "naughty generation" (σωφρονίζω, ponsēra) is made into "by birth . . . evil." James Orr

NAUM, nā'um: AV form, NAUM (q.v.), the name of an ancestor of Jesus (Lk 3 25).

NAVE, nāv (1 K 7 33). See Sea, Mossen.

**NAVE, nāvē (Navî, Nau).** Gr form of the Heb proper name "Num" (so RV), found only in AV of Sir 46 1.

**NAVEL, nāv'il (נַיב, shōr [LXX in Prov 3 8 suggests a different reading, viz. instead of נֱבָש, shōrēkha, נַבְּשָׁה, נַבְּשָׁה, se'rēkha, "thy flesh":) The AV translates the Heb shōrīr in the description of Behemoth (Job 40 16) by "navel," where modern translators have substituted "muscles"; similarly in the tr of shōrēr (Cant 7 2) it has been
replaced by “body.” There remain two passages of RV where "naveel" is retained as the tr of ṣhor. Thus we find it used, ṣhor pro toto, for the whole being: “It [the form of] Jesus was full of grace and of theavour to thy navel, and marrow to thy bones” (Prov 3 8). The uttermost neglect which a new-born babe can experience is expressed by Ezekeil: “In the day thou wast born thy navel [i.e. umbilical cord] was not cut, neither wast thou washed in water to cleanse thee; thou wast not salted at all, nor swaddled at all” (Ezek 16 4).

H. L. E. LURER

NAVY, nā'vi. See SHIPS AND BOATS, II, 1, (2).

NAZAREN, nāz-a-rēn', nāz'a-rēn (Naẓarēnēs, Nazarēnēs; Naẓorāiōs in Mt, Jn, Acts and Lk): A derivative of Nazareth, the birthplace of Christ. In the NT it has a double meaning: it may be friendly and it may be inimical.

On the lips of Christ's friends and followers, it is an honorable name. Thus Matthew sees in it a full-

iment of the old Israelite prophecy (Isa 11 1 [Heb]): “That it might be permissible Title in颏ted which was spoken through the prophets, that he should be called a Nazarene” (Mt 2 23). According to an overwhelming array of testimony (see Meyer, Comm., in loc.), the name Nazareth is derived from the same root, meaning "nipple" or the navel; the term is a term of endearment. We have here undoubtedly to do with a permissible accommodation.

It is not quite certain that Matthew did not intend, by the use of this word, to refer to the picture of the Messiah in Isa 11, on account of the low estimate in which this place was held (Jn 1 46). Nor is it permissible, has been done by Tertullian and Jerome, to substitute the word "Nazarite" for "Nazarene," which in every view of the case is contrary to the patent facts of the life and Saviour.

Says Meyer, “In giving this prophetic title to the Messiah he entirely disregards the historical meaning of the same (LXX Isa 11 1, ἄνθρωπος), keeps by the relationship of the name Nazarene to the word nāsār, and recognizes by virtue of the same, in that prophetic Messianic name ἄνθρωπος, the typical refer-

ence to this—that Jesus through His settlement in Nazareth was to become a ‘Naẓorāiōs, a ‘Naza-

erene,'” This name clung to Jesus throughout His entire life. It became His name among the masses: “The Nazarene” (Acts 10 47; Jn 1 46; 24 19). Perhaps Matthew, who wrote after the event, may have been influenced in his application of the Isian prophecy by the very fact that Jesus was popularly thus known. Even in the realm of spirit He was known by this appellation. Evil spirits knew and feared Him, under this name (Mk 1 24; Lk 4 34), and the angels of the resurrection morning called Him thus (Mk 16 6), while Jesus applied the title to Himself (Acts 22 8). In the light of these facts we do not wonder that the disci-

ples, in their later lives and work, persistently used it (Acts 2 22; 3 6; 10 38).

If His friends knew Him by this name, much more His enemies, and to them it was a title of scorn and derision. Their whole atti-

dude was compressed in that one word of Nathanael, by which He voiced his doubt, “Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?” (Jn 1 46). In the name "Naza-

rene," the Jews, who opposed and rejected Christ, poured out all the vials of their antagonism, and the word became a Jewish heritage of bitterness. It is hard to tell whether the appellation, on the lips of evil spirits, signifies dread or hatred (Mk 1 24; Lk 4 34). With the gatekeepers of the house of the high priest is cleaved up the adulterated scorn (Mt 26 71; Mk 14 67). Even in His death the bitter hatred of the priests caused

this name to accompany Jesus, for it was at their dictation written above His cross by Pilate (Jn 19 19). The entire Christian community was called by the leader of the Nazoraeans; this, however, is based upon a
tempt of the Nazoraeans” (Acts 24 5). If, on the one hand, therefore, the name stands for devotion and love, it is equally certain that on the other side it represented the bitter and undying hatred of His enemies.

HENRY E. DOKER

NAZARETH, nā-zā-reth (Naṭaprē, Nazārtē, Naẓazōth, Nazārēth, and other forms): A town in Galilee, the home of Joseph and the

1. Notice Virgin Mary, and for about 30 years

Confined to the scene of the Saviour's life (Mt 2 the NT 23; Mk 1 9; Lk 2 39:51; 1 16, etc.). He was therefore called Jesus of Nazareth, although His birthplace was Bethlehem; and those who became His disciples were known as Nazoraeans. This is the name, with slight modification, used to this day by Moelmeans for Christians, Naṣarrā— the sing. being Naṣārīn.

The town is not named in the OT, although the presence of a spring and the convenience of the site make it probable that there was a town in old times. Quaresimius learned that the ancient name was Medina Abiat, in which we may recognize the Arab. el-Medina el-batshah, "the white city." Built of the white stone supplied by the limestone rock around, the description is quite accurate. There is a reference in Mish (Mn'a-

hāth, viii.6) to the "white house of the hill" whence wine for the drink offering was brought. An elegy for the 9th of Ab speaks of a "course of priests settled in Nazareth of the Jewish people at Jerus, the ancient midhirsch now lost (Neubauer, Gloege. du Tulm, 82, 85, 190; Delitzsch, Ein Tag in Capernaum, 142). But all this leaves us still in a state of uncertainty.

The ancient town is represented by the modern en-Nāṣīrā, which is built mainly on the western and northwestern slopes of a hollow among the lower hills of Galilee, just before they sink into the plain of Esdraelon. It lies about midway between the Sea of Galilee and the Mediterranean at Haifa. The road to the plain and the coast goes over the south-

west lip of the hollow; that to Tiberias and Damascus goes on the heights to the N. The W. gorge breaks down southward, issuing on the plain between two craggy hills. That to the W. is the traditional Hill of Precipitation (Lk 4 29). This, however, is too far from the city and must have been in the days of Christ. It is probable that the present town occupies pretty nearly the ancient site; and the scene of that attempt on Jesus' life may have been the cliff, many feet in height, not far from the old synagogue, traces of which are still seen in the western part of town. Thus they tell us, he town was built under the Greek Orthodox church at the foot of the hill on the N. The water is led in a conduit to the fountain, whither the women and their children go as in old times, to carry home in their jars supplies for domestic use. There is also a tiny spring in the face of the western hill. To the N.W. rises the height on which stands the sanctuary, now in ruins, of Neby Sa'in. From this point a most beautiful and extensive view is obtained, rang-

ing on a clear day from the Mediterranean, the W. to the Mountain of Bashan on the E.; from Upper Galilee and Mt. Hermon on the N., to the uplands of Gilead and Samaria on the S. The whole extent of Esdraelon is seen, that great battle- field, associated with many historic events in Israel's history, from Carmel and Megiddo to Tabor and Mt. Gilboa.
There are now some 7,000 inhabitants, mainly Christian, of whom the Greek Orthodox church claims about 3,000. Moslem number about 1,600. There are no Jews. It is much the chief market town for the pastoral and agricultural district that lies around it.

In Nazareth, Jesus preached His first recorded sermon (Lk 4:16 ff.), when His plainness of speech aroused the homicidal fury of His hearers. "He did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief." (Mt 13:58.) Finding no rest or security in Nazareth, He made His home in Capernaum. The reproach implied in Nathanael's question, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" (Jn 1:46), has led to much speculation.

By ingenious emendation of the text Cheyne would read, "Can the Holy One proceed from Nazareth?" (Eh, a.v.). Perhaps, however, we should see no more in this than the acquiescence of Nathanael's humble spirit in the lowly estimate of his native province entertained by the leaders of his people in Judaea.

Christians are said to have first settled here in the time of Constantine (Ephiphanus), whose mother Helena built the Church of the Annunciation. In crusading times it was the seat of the bishop of Bethsean. It passed into Moslem hands after the disaster to the Crusaders at Hattin (1183). It was destroyed by Sultan Bibras in 1263. In 1620 the Franciscans rebuilt the Church of the Annunciation, and the town rose again from its ruins. Here in 1799 the French general Junot was assailed by the Turks. After his brilliant victory over the Turks at Tabor, Napoleon visited Nazareth. The place suffered some damage in the earthquake of 1857.

Protestant Missions are now represented in Nazareth by agents of the Church Missionary Society, and of the Edinburgh Medical Missionary Society.

W. Ewing

NAZIRITE, nāzi-rit (ναζήρ, nāzēr), connected with θήρ, nādhar, "to vow"; ἀσχεπ, nāzeir, ναζε-
of Israel's ancient and simpler way of living, and as a protection against luxury in settling nomads. It is worthy of note that with the Scythians the wine growing and wine-drinking have ever been considered foreign to their traditional nomadic mode of life. It was in this same protest that the Rechabites, who were at least akin to the Nazirites, went still further in refusing even in Canaan to abandon the non-alcoholic state. See Rechabites.

The Pent, then, makes provision for the Nazirite vow being taken by either men or women, though the OT does not record a single instance of a female Nazirite. Further, it provides that this Nazirite vow for a limited time, that is, for the case of the "Nazirite of days." No period of duration is mentioned in the OT, but the Mish, in dealing with the subject, prescribes a period of 30 days, while a double period of 60 or even a triple one of 100 days might be entered on. The conditions of Nazirism entailed: (1) the strictest abstinence from wine and from every product of the vine; (2) the keeping of the hair unshorn and the beard untouched by a razor; (3) the prohibition to touch a dead body; and (4) prohibition of unclean food (Jgs 13 5-7; Nu 6).

The ceremonial of initiation is not recorded, the Pent treating it as well known. The Talm tells us that it was only for one to express the wish that he might be a Nazirite. A formal vow was, however, taken; and from the form of renewal of the vow, when by any means it was accidentally broken, we may judge that the hair had been shorn and the hair allowed to grow during the whole period of the vow.

The accidental violation of the vow just mentioned entailed upon the devotee the beginning of the whole matter anew and the serving of the whole period. This was entered on by the ceremonial of re-consecration, in the undergoing of which the Nazirite shaved his head, presented two turtledoves or two young pigeons for sin and burnt offerings, and re-consecrated himself before the priest, further presenting a lamb for a trespass offering (Nu 6 9-12).

When the period of separation was complete, the ceremonial of release had to be gone through, the presentation of burnt, sin and peace offerings with their accompaniments as detailed in Nu 6 13-21, the shaving of the head and the burning of the hair of the head of separation, after which the Nazirite returned to ordinary life.

The consecration of the Nazirite in some ways resembled that of the priests, and similar words are used of both in Lev 21 12 and Nu 6. The priest's vow being even designated nazar. It opened up the way for any Israelite to do special service on something like semi-sacerdotal lines. The priest, like the Nazirite, dared not come into contact with the dead (Lev 21 1), dared not touch wine during the period of service (Lev 10 9), and, further, long hair was an ancient priestly custom (Ezk 44 20).

The only "Nazirites for life" that we know by name are Samson, Samuel and John the Baptist, but to the Jewish tradition adds:

7. Nazirites Absalom in virtue of his long hair for Life We know of no one voluntarily taking the vow for life, all the cases recorded being those of parents dedicating their children. In rabbinical antecedents, the father might vow for the child, and an interesting case of this kind is mentioned in the dedication of Rabbi Chanena by his father in the presence of Rabban Gamaliel (Nazar, 28b).

Samson is distinctly named a Nazirite in Jgs 13 7 and 13 17, but it has been objected that his case does not conform to the regulations in the Pent. It is said that he must have taken the first year's grace that does not follow and would not be so understood, say, in a Moslem country today. It is further urged that in connection with his fighting he must have come into contact with many dead men, and that he took honey from the carcass of a dead lion. To this objection the case of the Nazirite is hypercritical. Fighting was specially implied in his vow (Jgs 13 5), and the remains of the lion would be but a dry skeleton and not so even a lupine as the ass's jawbone, to which the critic do not object.

Samuel is nowhere in the OT called a Nazirite, the name being first applied to him in Sir 46 13 (Heb), but the restrictions of his dedication seem to imply that he was. Wellhausen denies that it is implied in 1 S 1 11 that he was either a Nazirite. "A gift, [one] 'given' unto Job"; cf Nu 3 9; 18 6) or a Nazirite. In the Heb text the mother's vow mentions only the uncut hair, and first in LXX is there added that he should not drink wine or strong drink, but there is no case where we should not regard silence as final evidence. Rather it is to be regarded that the visible sign only is mentioned, the whole contents of the vow being implied.

It is very likely that Nazirites became numerous in Israel in distinctly great religious or political excitement, and in Jgs 6 2 we may paraphrase, 'For the long-haired champions in Israel.' That they should be raised up was considered a special token of God's favor to Israel, and the tempting of them to break their vow by drinking wine was considered an aggravated sin (Am 2 11.12). At the time of the captivity they were looked upon as a vanished glory in Israel (Lam 4 7m), but they reappeared in later history.

So far as we can discover, there is no indication that they formed guilds or settled communities like the "Sons of the Prophets." In a sense the Essenes may have conformed to the form of the consecration of burnt, sin and peace offerings with their accompaniments as detailed in Lev 21 12 and Nu 6. The priest's vow being even designated nazar. It opened up the way for any Israelite to do special service on something like semi-sacerdotal lines. The priest, like the Nazirite, dared not come into contact with the dead (Lev 21 1), dared not touch wine during the period of service (Lev 10 9), and, further, long hair was an ancient priestly custom (Ezk 44 20).

The only "Nazirites for life" that we know by name are Samson, Samuel and John the Baptist, but to the Jewish tradition adds:

8. Samson's Case He has partaken of wine when he made for his first feast for his bride that does not follow and would not be so understood, say, in a Moslem country today. It is further urged that in connection with his fighting he must have come into contact with many dead men, and that he took honey from the carcass of a dead lion. To this objection the case of the Nazirite is hypercritical. Fighting was specially implied in his vow (Jgs 13 5), and the remains of the lion would be but a dry skeleton and not so even a lupine as the ass's jawbone, to which the critic do not object.

Samuel is nowhere in the OT called a Nazirite, the name being first applied to him in Sir 46 13 (Heb), but the restrictions of his dedication seem to imply that he was. Wellhausen denies that it is implied in 1 S 1 11 that he was either a Nazirite. "A gift, [one] 'given' unto Job"; cf Nu 3 9; 18 6) or a Nazirite. In the Heb text the mother's vow mentions only the uncut hair, and first in LXX is there added that he should not drink wine or strong drink, but there is no case where we should not regard silence as final evidence. Rather it is to be regarded that the visible sign only is mentioned, the whole contents of the vow being implied.

It is very likely that Nazirites became numerous in Israel in distinctly great religious or political excitement, and in Jgs 6 2 we may paraphrase, 'For the long-haired champions in Israel.' That they should be raised up was considered a special token of God's favor to Israel, and the tempting of them to break their vow by drinking wine was considered an aggravated sin (Am 2 11.12). At the time of the captivity they were looked upon as a vanished glory in Israel (Lam 4 7m), but they reappeared in later history.

So far as we can discover, there is no indication that they formed guilds or settled communities like the "Sons of the Prophets." In a sense the Essenes may have conformed to the form of the consecration of burnt, sin and peace offerings with their accompaniments as detailed in Lev 21 12 and Nu 6. The priest's vow being even designated nazar. It opened up the way for any Israelite to do special service on something like semi-sacerdotal lines. The priest, like the Nazirite, dared not come into contact with the dead (Lev 21 1), dared not touch wine during the period of service (Lev 10 9), and, further, long hair was an ancient priestly custom (Ezk 44 20).

The only "Nazirites for life" that we know by name are Samson, Samuel and John the Baptist, but to the Jewish tradition adds:
NEAH, nê'áv (עָנָא, han-é'áv, "the neah"; 'Av-vó', Annoa): A town in the lot of Zebulun (Josh 19 13), mentioned along with Gath-hepher and Rimmon. It is possibly identical with “Neiel” (ver 27). No name resembling either of these has yet been recovered, although the district in which the place must be sought is pretty definitely located. It may probably have lain to the N. of Rimmon (Rummanah), about 4 miles N.E. of Safaritjah.

NEAPOLIS, nê-apôlîs (Νεαπόλις, Neapolis; WH, Néo Polis): A town on the northern shore of the Aegean, originally belonging to Thrace but later falling within the Rom province of Macedonia. It was the seaport of Philippi, and was the first point in Europe at which Paul and his companions landed; from Troas they sailed direct to Samothrace, and on the next day reached Neapolis (Acts 16 11). Paul probably passed through the town again on his second visit to Macedonia (Acts 20 1), and he must have again visited it on his last journey from Philippi to Troas, which occupied 5 days (Acts 20 6). The position of Neapolis is a matter of dispute. Some writers have maintained that it lay on the site known as Esaki (i.e. “Old”?) Kavalla (Countryside, Macedonie, 11, 109 ff), and that upon its destruction in the 6th or 7th cent. AD the inhabitants migrated to the place, about 10 miles to the E., called Christopolis in mediaeval and Kavalla in modern times. But the general view, and that which is most consonant with the evidence, both literary and archaeological, places Neapolis at Kavalla, which lies on a rocky headland with a spacious harbor on its western side, in which the fleet of Brutus and Cassius was maintained at the time the battle of Philippi (42 BC; Appian Bell. Civ. iv.106). The town lay some 10 Rom miles from Philippi, with which it was connected by a road leading over the mountain ridge named Symbolum, which separates the plain of Philippi from the sea.

The date of its foundation is uncertain, but it seems to have been a colony from the island of Thassos, which lay opposite to it (Dio Cassius xvii.35). It appears (under the name Naŭpolis, which is also borne on its coins) as a member both of the first and of the second Athenian confederacy, and was highly commended by the Athenians in an extant decree for its loyalty during the Thasian revolt of 411-408 BC (Inact. Gracce, 1, Suppl. 81). The chief cult of the day was that of “The Virgin”; usually identified with the Gr Artemis. (See Leake, Travels in Northern Greece; 1818. Countryside, Voyage dans la Macedonie, 11, 69 ff, 109 ff; Heusey and Daumetz, Mission archéol. de Macedonie, 11 ff.)

M. N. Top

NEEAR, nêr, NIGH, ní (chiefly נֵזָר, korób; ëyys, eggiā): Used of proximity in place (Gen 19 20; 46 10; Ex 13 17; Ps 22 11; Jn 3 23, etc), time (Jer 48 16; Ezek 7 7; 30 3; Mk 13 28), or kinship (Lev 21 2; Ruth 3 12), but also employed of moral nearness. It is “nigh” to them that are of a broken heart (Ps 34 18). God draws nigh to His people, and they to Him (Jas 4 8). The antithesis is God’s “farness” from the wicked.

NEARIAH, nê-á-ri'a (נֵרַיָה, n'ryāh): (1) A descendant of David (1 Ch 3 22 f). (2) A descendant of Simeon (1 Ch 4 42).

In both instances LXX reads “Noadish.”


NEBAIOTH, nê-bâ'îoth, nê-bâ-lîth (נֵבָיוֹת, n'hbayoth; LXX Ναβαΐθ, Nabaiôth): Firstborn of Ishmael (Gen 25 13; 28 9; 36 3; 1 Ch 1 29). Isa 60 7 mentions the tribe Nebaioth with Kedar, with an allusion to its pastoral nature: “the rams of Nebaioth” are to serve the ideal Zion as sacrificial victims. Again associated with Kedar, the name occurs frequently in Assyrs inscriptions. The tribe must have had a conspicuous place among the northern Arabs. Jos, followed by Jerome, regarded Nebaioth as identical with the Nabataeans, the great trading community and capital and stronghold was Petra. This view is widely accepted, but the name “Nabataean” is spelled with a t, and the interchange of t and d, although not unparalleled, is unusual. If the name is Arab, it is probably a foment that could have no connection with the Nabataeans.

A. S. Fulton

NEBAILAT, nê-bâ'âlît (n'hba'llîh), nâbâ'âlît; Na-šâkkâr, (Naballat): A town occupied by the Benja-vites after the exile, named along with Lod and Ono ( Neh 11 34). It is represented by the modern Beit Nebala, 4 miles N.E. of Lydda.

NEBAT, nê-bâ'ât (נֶבַּת, n'hbat): Father of Jeroboam I (1 K 11 26, and frequently elsewhere). The name occurs only in the phrase “Jeroboam the son of Nebat,” and is evidently intended to distinguish Jeroboam I from the later son of Joash. See JEROBOAM.

NEBO, nê-bô (נְבֹא, n'hba; Assyr Nabû): The Bab god of literature and science. In the Bab mythology he is represented as the son and interpreter of Bel-merodach (cf Isa 46 1; Bel and Nebō there represent Babylon). His own special abode was at Borsippa. His planet was Mercury. His name enters into Bib. names, as “Nebuchadnezzar,” and perhaps “Abed-nego” (Dnl 1 7, for “Abed-nebo, servant of Nebo”). See BABYLONIA and ASSYRIA, RELIGION OF.

NEBO (נְבֹא, n'hba; Ναβα, Nabai): (1) This town is named in Nu 33 3 between Sebam and Beon (which latter evidently represents Baal-meon of ver 38), after Heshbon and Elealeh, as among the cities assigned by Moses to Reuben. It was occupied by the Reubenite clan Bela (1 Ch 5 8). Here it is named between Abero and Baalmeon. In their denunciations of wrath against Moab, Isaiah names it along with Medeba (Isa 16 2) and Jeremiah with Kiriathaim (Jer 48 1), and it is again (ver 23) between Dibon and Beth-diblathaim. Mesheh (N M) says that by command of Chemosh he went by night against the city, captured it after an assault that lasted from dawn till noon, and put all the inhabitants to death. He dedicated the place to Ashtar-chemosh. Jerome (on Isa 15 2) tells us that at Nebō was the idol of Chemosh, the site which seems best to meet the requirements of the passages indicated is on the ridge of Jebel Nebâ to the S.W. of Heshbôn, where ruins of an ancient town bearing the name of en-Nebâ are found (Buhl, GAP, 266).
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Then we are familiar with the Hierodouloi of the Greeks, and the Vestal Virgins of the Romans. The word נֵזָר also appears in Syr and was applied to the maidens devoted to the service of Belthas. In the East, too, the same name has always been applied to individuals and societies of ascetics who were practically Nazarites, and the modern dervish in nearly every way resembles him, although it is worthy of record in this connection that the Moslem (an abstainer by creed) while under the vow of pilgrimage neither cuts his hair nor parcs his nails till the completion of his vow in Mecca.

W. M. CHRISTIE
(2) (ר"ח, וּנְבַה; ב, נָבָא, נָבֹא, א, נָבָה, נַבֹּה, and other forms): Fifty-two descendants of the inhabitants of Nebo returned from exile with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:29; Neh 7:35). The place was in Judah and is named after Bethel and Ai. There is nothing, however, to guide us as to its exact position. It may be represented by either Beit Nabá, 12 miles N.W. of Jerusalem, or Neba, which lies about 4 miles S.S.E. of 'Id el-Mád (Adullam).

NEBO, MOUNT (נֵבֹא, נבע; נָבָא, נבָא): A mountain in the land of Moab which Moses ascended at the command of God in order that he might see the Land of Promise which he was never to enter. There also he was to die. From the following passages (viz. Nu 33:47; Dt 32:49; 34:1), we gather that it was not far from the plain of Moab in which Israel was encamped; that it was a height standing out to the W. of the mountains of Abarim; that it lay to the E. of Jericho; and that it was a spot from which a wide and comprehensive view of Pal could be obtained. None of these conditions are met by Jebel 'Affarías, which is too far to the E., and is fully 15 miles S. of a line drawn eastward from Jericho. Jebel O'sha, again, in Mt. Gilead, commands, indeed, an extensive view; but it lies too far to the N., being at least 15 miles N. of a line drawn eastward from Jericho. Both of these sites have had their advocates as claimants for the honor of representing the Bib. Nebo.

The "head" or "top" of Pisgah is evidently identical with Mt. Nebo (Dt 34:1). After Moses' death he was buried "in the valley in the land of Moab," over against Beth-peor.

The name Nebá is found on a ridge which, some 5 miles S.W. of Hebron and opposite the northern end of the Dead Sea, runs out to the W. from the known, but the discovery of Zophim [cf Nu 23:14] confirms the view now generally held, that it is but another title of the Nebo range.

Neither Mt. Hermon nor Dan (Tell el-Kudîy) is visible from that point; neither is Zorah to be seen; and if the Mediterranean is the hinder sea, it also is invisible. But, as Driver says ("Dt," 1 ICC, 419), the terms in Dt 34:1.3 are hyperbolic, and must be taken as including points filled in by the imagination as well as the actual visible to the Eye of God. Mr. Birch argues in favor of Tal'at el-Benâd, whence he believes Dan and Zorah to be visible, while he identifies "the hinder sea" with the Dead Sea (PEFS, 1898, 110 f). W. Ewing

NEBUCHADREZZAR, neb-á-kad-né'zar, NEBUCHADREZZAR, -rez'ar: Nebuchadnezzar, the second king of Babylon of that name, is best known as the king who conquered Judah, destroyed Jerusalem, and carried the people of the Jews captive to Babylon. Of all the heathen monarchs mentioned by name in the Scriptures, N. is the most prominent and the most important. The prophecies of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel, and the last chs of K and Ch centered about his life, and he stands pre-eminently, along with oppression and the exodus, among the foes of the kingdom of God. The documents which have been discovered in Babylon and elsewhere within the last 75 years have added much to our knowledge of this monarch, and have in general confirmed the Bib. accounts concerning him.

His name is found in two forms in the Bible, Nebuchadnezzar and Nebuchadrezzar. In the LXX he is called Ναβουκδωναζαρ, and in the Vulg Ναβουκδωναζαρ. This latter form is found also in the AV Apoc (viz. Ezr, Neh, Est), and in the Dead Sea and Bar, but not Jth or Tob. This change from r to r, which is found in the two writings of the name in the Heb and the Aram. of the Scriptures is a not uncommon one in the Sem languages, as in Burañburjis and Burañburjus, Ben-hadad and Bar-hadad (see Brockelmann's Comparative Grammar, 156, 175, 220). It is possible, however, that the form Nebuchadnezzar is the Aram. tr of the Bab Nebuchadrezzar. If we take the name to be compounded of Nabu-kudurri-usur in the sense 'O Nebo, protect thy servant' the combination usurur would be the best tr possible in Aramaic. Such tr's of proper names are common in the old Verbs and Scriptures and elsewhere. For example, in WAF, V. 4, we find 4 columns of proper names of persons giving the Sumerian forms and the Sem trs of the names. We find Bar-hadad in Aram. for Bar-badad. In early Aram. the s had not yet become ; (see Cooke, Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions, 188 f; so that for any s who thought that kudurri meant "servant" N. would be a perfect tr into Aram. of Nebuchadrezzar.

The father of N. was Nabopolassar, probably a Chaldaean prince. His mother is not known by name. The classical historians mention two wives: Amyitis, the daughter of Astyages, and Nitocris, the mother of Nabonaid. The monuments mention three sons: Evil-merodach who succeeded him, Nabonidus, his son, and Marduk-nadin-ah. A younger brother of N., called Nabu-shum-lisîrî, is mentioned on a building-inscription tablet from the time of Nabopolassar.

The sources of our information as to the life of N. are about 500 contract tablets dated according to the days, months and years of his reign of 43 years; about 30 building and honorific inscriptions; one historical inscription; and in the books of Jer, Est, Dan, and 1 Esdras. The fragments of Ch, Ezr, and the fragments of Berosus, Menander, Megasthenes, Abdyenus, and Alexander Polyhistor, largely as cited by Jos and Eusebias.

From these sources we learn that N. succeeded his father on the throne of Babylon in 604 BC, and reigned till 561 BC. He probably commanded...
Nebuchadnezzar
Needlework
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the armies of Babylon from 609 BC. At any rate, he was at the head of the army which defeated Pharaoh-nechoh at Carchemish on the Euphrates in 605 BC (see 2 K 23 31; 2 Ch 35 20 ff.). After having driven Necoh out of Asia and settled the affairs of Syria and Pal, he was suddenly recalled to Babylon by the death of his father. There he seems quietly to have ascended the throne. In the 4th year of Jehoiakim (or 3rd according to the Bablyonian reckoning) he captured Jer, put Jehoiakim, its king, into chains, and probably killed him. His successor, Jehoiachin, after a three months’ reign, was besieged in Jer, captured, deposed, and carried captive to Babylon, where he remained in captivity 37 years until he was set free by Evil-merodach. In the 9th year of Zedekiah, N. made a 4th expedition against Jer which he besieged, captured, and destroyed (see Jer 52). In addition to these wars with Judah, N. carried on a long siege of Tyre, lasting 13 years, from his 7th to his 20th year. He had at least three wars with Egypt. The first culminated in the defeat of Necoh at Carchemish; the second in the withdrawal of Hophra (Apries) from Pal in the 1st year of the siege of Jerus under Zedekiah; and the third saw the armies of N. entering Egypt in triumph and defeating Amasis in N.’s 37th year. In the numerous building and honorific inscriptions of N. he makes no mention by name of his father or of his battles; but he frequently speaks of foes that he had conquered and of many peoples whom he ruled. Of these peoples he mentions by name the Hittites and others (see Langdon, 148–51). In the W. 3rd year inscriptions he speaks of a special conquest of Lebanon from some foreign foe who had seized it; but the name of the enemy is not given.

The monuments justify the boast of N.: “Is not this great Babylon that I have built?” (Dnl 4 30). Among these buildings special emphasis is placed by N. upon his temples and shrines to the gods, particularly to Marduk, Nebu and Zarapu, but also to Shamash, Sin, Guia, Ramman, Mah, and others. He constructed, also, a great new palace and rebuilt an old one of his father’s. Besides, he laid out and paved with bricks a great street for the procession of Marduk, and built a number of great walls with moats and moat-walls and gates. He dug several broad, deep canals, and made dams for flooding the country to the N. and S. of Babylon, so as to protect it against the attack of its enemies. He made, also, great bronze bulls and serpents, and adorned his temples and palaces with cedars and gold. Not merely in Babylon itself, but in many of the cities of Babylonia as well, his building operations were carried on, esp. in the line of temples to the gods.

The inscriptions of N. show that he was a very religious man, probably excelling all who had preceded him in the building of temples.

6. Religion, in the institution of offerings, and the observance of all the ceremonies connected with the worship of the gods. His larger inscriptions usually contain two hymns and always close with a prayer. Mention is frequently made of the offerings of precious metals, stones and woods, of game, fish, wine, fruit, grain, and other objects acceptable to the gods. It is noteworthy of these offerings differ in character and apparently in purpose from those in use among the Jews. For example, no mention is made in any one of N.’s inscriptions of the pouring out or sprinkling of blood, nor is any reference made to atonement, or to sin.

No reference is made in any of these inscriptions to N.’s insanity or fit aside from the fact that we could scarcely expect a man to publish his own calamity, esp. madness, it should be noted according to Langdon we have but three inscriptions of his written in the period from 580 to 567 BC. If his madness lasted for 7 years, it may have occurred between 580 and 567 BC, or it may have occurred between the Egyptian campaign of 567 BC and his death in 561 BC. But, as it is more likely that the “7 times” mentioned in Dnl may have been months, the illness may have been in any year after 580 BC, or even before that for all we know.

No mention is made on the monuments (1) of the dream of N. recorded in Dnl 2, 3, 4; (2) the image of gold that he set up, or (3) of the fiery furnace. These events are said to be the 3 miracles from which the three children were delivered (Dnl 3). As Langdon (id. col. 465) quite correctly said, however, that a belief in dreams was so universal among all the ancient peoples, that a single instance of this kind may not have been considered as worthy of special mention. The annals of Ashur-bani-pal and Nebuchadnezzar and Xerxes give a number of instances of the importance attached to dreams and their interpretations, and it is almost a commonplace of the ancient peoples believed in them. That the dream recorded in Dnl is not mentioned on the monuments seems less remarkable than that no mention of his is recorded. As to (2), we know that N. made an image of his royal person (salas isharratun). Langdon, XIX, B, col. x, 6; of the image of the royal person of Nabopolassar, id. p. 31), and it is certain that the images of Nebuchadnezzar were venerated in a bark in the New Year’s procession (id. pp. 137, 159, 163, 165) and that there were images of the god in all the temples (id. col. 465). The stone also shipped before these images. That N. should have made
an image of gold and put it up in the Plain of Dura is exemplified by what we know of his other works, "plous deeds." (2) As to the fiery furnace, it is known that Nebuchadnezzar, when asked of his brother, Shamash-shumukin, was burned in a similar furnace. The failure of N. to mention any of the particular persons or events recorded in DnL does not disprove their historicity, any more than his failure to mention the battle of Carchemish, or the siege of Tyre and Jesus, disproves them. The fact is, we have no real historic information except one fragment of a few broken lines found in Egypt.


R. Dick Wilson

NEBUZHADBAN, neb-uh-shah’ban (נבעודב Дан), n’bhourad’ohn = Assyq Nabu’seba’anni, “Nebu delivers me”; AV Nebuzaradon: An important officer (the Rab-saris, “chief captain” or “chief eunuch”) of the Babylonian court, and one of those who were appointed to see to the safety of Jeremiah after the taking of Jerusalem (Jer 39 13).

NEBUZARADON, neb-uh-zar’a-don. -ar’a-don (נבעודדון), n’bhourad’ohn = Assyq Nabu’zara’dôn: Nebuchadnezzar’s general at the siege of Jerusalem (2 K 25 8.11.20) | Jer 52 12 15.26; 39 9. 10.11.13. Under the title of “captain of the guard,” he commanded the army, and, after the fall of the city, carried out his master’s policy with regard to the safety of Jeremiah, the transport of the emblem, and the government of those who were left in the land.

NECHO, NECHON, n’kô. See Pharaoh-Nechoh.

NECK, n’kë (ג’, גואו, נק, גואו', גואו', גואודרן, גואודרן, גואודר, גואודר,ARAM. ג”, גואו [DnL 5 7.16.29], ג^ג, ^ארמ, ^ארמ, ^ארמ, ^ארמ [TENODRA], “loose neck,” “eunuch,” “stairstep,” “mephibesh” [1 S 4 18]; מ’דד, מ’דד, back” [Bar 2 38]; occasionally the words ג’, גדרון [Isa 3 16; Ekk 16 11]; and ג’, גדרון, pl. גדרון, lit. “throat” [BnL 1 3.32.22; 6 21], are tr “neck”): The neck is compared with a tower for beauty (Cant 4 4; 7 4) and is decorated with necklaces and chains (Prov 1 9; 3 32.22; 6 21), Heb garyykh: Ezek 11 12, Heb garykh, “throat”; DnL 5 7.16.29, Heb garyykh. It is also the part of the body where a rich yoke, emblem of labor and hard service, dependence and subjection, is borne (Dn 28 48; Jer 27 8.11. 12; 28 14; Acts 16 10). “To shake off the yoke,” “to break the yoke,” or “to take it off” is expressive of the regaining of independence and liberty, either by one’s own endeavors or through help from outside (Gen 27 40; Isa 10 27; Jer 28 11; 30 8). Certain animals which were not allowed as food (like the firstborn which were not redeemed) were to be killed by having their necks (“eunuch”) broken (Ex 13 13; 34 20); the turtle-doves and young pigeons, which were sacrificed as sin offerings or as burnt offerings, had their heads wrung or pinched off from their necks (Lev 5 8). In 1 S 4 18 the Heb word mephibesh signifies a fracture of the upper part of the spinal column, caused by a fall.

It was a military custom of antiquity for the conqueror to place his foot upon the vanquished. This custom, frequently represented in sculpture on many an Egyptian temple wall, is referred to in Josh 10 24; Bar 25 Camea 13 and probably in Rom 16 24 and Phm 10.13. St. Paul praises the devotion of Aquila and Priscilla, “who for my life laid down their own necks” (Rom 16 4). See Footstool.

To “fall on the neck” of a person is a very usual mode of salutation in the East (Gen 33 4; 46 11; 46 29; Tob 16 20 37). In moments of great emotion such salutation is apt to end in weeping on each other’s neck.

Readiness for work is expressed by “putting one’s neck to the work” (Neh 3 5). Soverign punishment and calamity are said to “reach to the neck” (Isa 4 21; 11 28). The Lord Jesus speaks of certain persons for whom it were better to have had a millstone put around the neck and to have been drowned in the sea. The meaning is that even the most disgraceful death is still preferable to a life of evil influence upon even the little ones of God’s household (Mt 18 6; Mk 9 42; Lk 17 2).

To “make the neck stiff,” to “harden the neck” indicates obstinacy often mingled with rebellion (Ex 32 39; 33 5; 34 9; 2 Ch 30 8; 36 13; Neh 9 16.17.29; Ps 75 5 RV “insolently with a haughty neck!” Prov 29 1; Jer 7 26. Of σηλευταρχείας, σηλευταρχείας, “stiffnecked” (Acts 7 51). Similarly Isaiah (48 4) speaks of the neck of the obstinate sinner as resembling an iron snare. H. E. Luxenburg.

NECKLACE, n’kës (נכשת, נכשת), “chain”:

A neck-chain ornament, worn either separately (Ezk 16 11), or with pendants (Isa 3 19), such as crescents (Isa 3 18) or rings (Gen 38 25); sometimes made of gold (Gen 41 42; DnL 5 29), or of strings of jewels (Cant 1 10). Even beasts of burden were sometimes so adorned by royalty (Jgs 8 26). It was considered suggestive of pride (Ps 73 6) or of filial loyalty (Prov 1 9). The word does not occur in Av, but such adornments have always been popular in all the Bible lands.

NECO, n’kô (נכ, נקה) [2 Ch 35 22; 36 4]. See Pharaoh-Nechoh.

NECODAN, n’kô’dan. See Necorod.

NECROMANCY, n’kô’t’man-see. See Astrology, I; Divination; Witchcraft.

NEDABIAH, nê’d-a-b’ô (נדהביה), n’hadab’îgh: A descendant of David (1 Ch 3 18).

NEEDLE, nê’d’l (נאל, נהל): The word “needle” occurs only 3 t, viz. in the reference to Christ’s use of the proverb: “It is easier for a camel to go through a needle’s eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God” (Mt 19 24; Mk 10 25; Lk 18 25). This saying ought to be accepted in the same sense as Mt 23 24, “Ye blind guides, that strain out the gnat, and swallow the camel!” Christ used them to illustrate absurdities. A rabbinical idiom is cited, “an elephant through a needle’s eye.” Some writers have attempted to show that rhaphis referred to a small gate of a walled oriental city. No evidence of such a use of the word exists in the terms applied today in Biblical lands to this opening. “Rich man” here has the connotation of a man bound up in his riches. If a man continues to trust in his earthly possessions to save him, it would be absurd for him to expect to share in the spiritual kingdom where dependence upon the King is a first requisite.

The fact that needles are not mentioned elsewhere in the Bible should not be taken to indicate that this instrument was not used. Specimens of bone and metal needles of ancient origin show that they were common household objects. See Needlework. James A. Patch

NEEDLEWORK, nê’d’l-wûrk. See Embroidery.
NEEDY, nēdē (נָדֵד, ἐβγύν). See Pook.

NEESING, nē'zing (Job 41 18, AV, ERV "by his neckings a light doth shine," ARV "sneezings"): "Neesse" in Elizabethan Eng. (through two distinct derivations) could mean either "sneeze" or "snort" in the impossible to portray, which sense was intended by the AV editors. The Heb is נֱסִיקָה, 'atābāh, a word found only here, but connected with a Sem √ "sneeze," or, perhaps, "snort." Job 41 18 is part of the description of the "leviathan" or crocodile. This animal has a habit of inflating himself, and after this he discharges through his nostrils a cloud of heated vapor, which sparkles in the sunlight. The act is neither a "sneeze" nor a "snort," but the latter word is sufficiently descriptive. There is no allusion to legendary "fire-spouting" monsters. Cf Job 39 20; Jer 8 16.

In the elder edd of AV "neeced" is found in 2 K 4 35: "and the child neesed seven times" (later edd and RV "sneezed"). BURTON SCOTT EASTON

NEGB, negèb (נָגב, ha-neghēb, "the negeb," or simply, נָגֶב, negèb, from a √ "to be dry," and therefore in the first instance meaning the "dry," "parished" region, generally, in LXX it is usually τὸ ἄφημος, εἴρημος, "desert," also νῆβη, nēgēb): As the Negeb lay to the S. of Judah, the word came to be used in the sense of "the South," and is so used in a few passages (e.g. Gen 13 14) and in such is τὸ ἀφημα, lips (see GEOGRAPHY).

The Eng. τὰ ἄφημα is unsuitable in several passages, and likely to lead to confusion. For example, in Gen 13 1 Abraham is represented as going "into the South," when journeying northward from Egypt toward Bethel; in Nu 13 23 the spies coming from the "wilderness of Zin" are described as coming "from the South" although they were going north. The difficulty in these and many other passages is at once obviated if it is recognized that the Negeb was a geographical term for a definite geographical region, just as Shephelah, lit. "lowland," was the name of another district of Pal. In RV "Negeb" is given in m, but it would make for clearness if it were restored to the text.

This "parished" land is generally considered as beginning S. of ed Dababat—probably the site of Deir (q.v.)—and as stretching S.

2. Description: in a series of rolling hills running in a general direction of E. to W. until the actual wilderness begins, a distance of perhaps 70 m. from the Mediterranean to the E. it is bounded by the Dead Sea and the southern Ghor, and to the W. there is no defined boundary before the Mediterranean. It is a land of sparse and scanty springs and small rainfall; in the character of its soil it is a transition from the fertility of Canaan to the wildness of the desert; it is essentially a pastoral land, where grazing is plentiful in the early months and where camels and goats can sustain life, even through the long summer drought. Today, as through most periods of history, it is a land for the nomad rather than the settled inhabitant, although abundant ruins in many spots testify to better physical conditions at some periods (see I, 5, below). The direction of the valleys E. or W., the general dryness, and the character of the inhabitants have always made it a more or less isolated region without thoroughfare.

The great routes pass along the coast to the W. or up the Arabah to the E. It formed an additional barrier to the wilderness beyond it; against all who would lead an army from the S., this southern frontier of Judah was always secure. Israel could not reach the promised land by this route, through the land of the Amalekites (Nu 13 29; 14 43-45).

The Negeb was the scene of much of Abram's wanderings (Gen 12 9; 13 13; 20 1); it was in this district that Hagar met with the angel (Gen 16 7,14); Issac (Gen 24 62) and Jacob (Gen 37 1; 46 5) both dwelt there. Moses

3. OT references to the hill country (Nu 13 17,22): the Amalekites then dwelt there (ver 20) and apparently, too, in some parts of it, the Avvim (Josh 13 3,4). The inheritance of the children of Simeon, as given in Josh 19 1-9, was in the Negeb, but in Josh 15 21-32 these cities are credited to Judah (see SIMEON). Achish allotted to David, in response to his request, the cities of ZIKLAG (Gen 15 37 5); the exploits of David were against various parts of this district described as the Negeb of Judah, the Negeb of the Jerahmeelites, and the Negeb of the Kenites, while in 1 S 30 14 we have mention of the Negeb of the Cherethites and the Negeb of Caleb. To this we may add the districts of the various clans (see separate arts. under these names). The Negeb, together with the hill country and the Shephelah, was according to the Hebrews (17 26; 32 44; 33 13) to have renewed prosperity after the captivity of Judah was ended.

When Nebuchadnezzar took Judah to the East with wild captives (see LAM 4 21; Ezek 36 3-15; Ob 14 9) history, and after that the Jews in the Roman and Byzantine times until Judah had been lost to them from Southern Judaea (164 BC) and John Hyrcanus conquered their country and compelled them to become Jews (109 BC). It was to one of the cities here—Malathia—that Herod Agrippa withdrew himself (Jos, Ant., XVIII, vi, 2).

The palm days of this district appear to have been during the Byzantine period: the existing ruins, so far as they can be dated at all, belong to this time. Beer-sheba was an important city with a bishop, and Elusa (mentioned by Ptolemy in the 3d cent.) was the seat of a bishop in the 4th, 5th and 6th cents. After the rise of Mohammedanism the land appears to have lapsed into primitive conditions. Although lawlessness and want of any central control may account for much progress, yet it is probable that Professor Ellsworth Huntington (q.v.) is right in the opinion that a change of climate has had much to do with the rise and fall of civilization and settled habitation in this district. The district has long been given over to the nomad, and it is only quite recently that the Turkish policy of planting vineyards in off-White (q.v.). At Beer-sheba and at oveh has produced some slight change in the direction of a settled population and agricultural pursuits.

It is clear that in at least two historic periods the Negeb enjoyed a very considerable prosperity.

What it may have been in the days of the

5. Its prosperity it is difficult to judge; all we Ancient read of them suggests a purely nomadic read of them suggests a purely nomadic prosperity life similar to the Bedouin of today but with better pasturage. In the division of the land among the tribes mention is made of many cities—the Hebronite 29 (Josh 15 21; 32; 19 1-9; 1 Ch 4 28-33)—and the wealth of the cattle evidently was great (of 1 S 15 9; 27 9; 30 16; 2 Ch 14 14). The condition of things must have been far different from that of recent times.

The extensive ruins at Bir es Seba' (Beer-sheba) Khalsa (Elusa), Ruhebeh (Rehoboth, q.v.), oveh and other cities, together with the signs of orchards, vineyards and gardens scattered widely throughout these and other sites, show how comparatively well preserved this area was in Byzantine times in particular. Professor Huntington (loc. cit.) concludes from these ruins that the population of the large towns of the Negeb alone at this period must have amounted to between 45,000 and 50,000.
NEHEMIAH, nê-hê-mî'a, nê-hêm-î'a (נְחֶמְיָה, נְחֶמְיָֹה, "comforted of Jeh"):
1. Family
2. Youth
3. King's Cupbearer
4. Governor of Judæa
5. Death

LITERATURE

Nehemiah, the son of Hananiah, or Hanun, was born near the time of the return from exile (Ezra 6:15) and was a Levite, and therefore a son of Iddo (Neh 11:11). He is a leading figure in the narrative of Ezra 7:7-10 and Nehemiah 1-13, which probably belong to the 6th century B.C. Nehemiah was a priestly scribe, which means that he was a Levite and a member of the family of Iddo (Neh 11:11). He was a contemporary of Ezra, and his name appears in the list of the latter's companions (Ezra 8:7), which suggests that he was also a contemporary of Ezra. Nehemiah was a wise and just ruler, who was able to restore the city of Jerusalem after the return from exile, and he was also a successful administrator and a statesman. He was a man of integrity, who was able to resist the temptations of wealth and power, and he was a man of courage, who was able to stand up to the opposition of the Persian officials, and he was also a man of faith, who was able to trust in the promises of God, and he was also a man of love, who was able to show compassion to the poor and the needy.

The mention of the sons of Sanballat, governor of Samaria, in a letter written to the priests of Jerus in 407 BC, among whom Johanan is esp. named, proves that Sanballat must have ruled in the time of Artaxerxes I rather than in that of Artaxerxes II.

The office of cupbearer was "one of no trifling honor" (Herod. iii.34). It was one of his chief duties to taste the wine for the king to see that it was not poisoned, and he was even admitted to the king while the queen was present (Neh 2:6). It was on account of this position of close intimacy with the king that Nehemiah was able to obtain his commission as governor of Judæa and the letters and edicts which enabled him to restore the walls of Jerusalem.

The occasion of this commission was as follows: Hanani, the brother of Nehemiah, and other men of Judah came to visit Nehemiah 4. Governor while he was in Susa in the 9th month of Judæa of the 20th year of Artaxerxes. They reported that the Jews in Judæa were in great affliction and that the wall thereof was broken down and its gates burned with fire. Thereupon he grieved and fasted and prayed to God that he might be granted favor by the king. Having appeared before the latter in the 1st month of the 21st year of Artaxerxes, 444 BC, he was granted permission to go to Jerus to build the city of his fathers' sepulchers, and was given letters to the governors of Syria and Pail and esp. to Asaph, the keeper of the king's forest, ordering him to supply timber for the wall, the fortress, and the temple. He was also appointed governor of the province of which Jerus was the capital.

Armed with these credentials and powers he repaired to Jerus and immediately set about the restoration of the walls, a work in which he was hindered and harassed by Sanballat, the governor of Samaria, and others, some of them Jews dwelling in Jerus. Notwithstanding, he succeeded in his attempt and eventually also in providing gates for the various entrances to the city.

Hearing accomplished these external renovations, he instituted a number of social reforms. He appointed the heads of the fathers' sepulchers as judges, which caused the people to be instructed in the Law by public readings, and expositions; celebrated the Feast of Tabernacles; and observed a national fast, at which the sins of the people were confessed and a new covenant solemnly confirmed. The people agreed to avoid marriages with the heathen, to keep the Sabbath, and to contribute to the support of the temple. To provide for the safety and prosperity of the city, one out of every ten of the people living outside Jerus was compelled to settle in the city. In all of these reforms he was assisted by Ezra, who had gone up to Jerus in the 7th year of Artaxerxes.

Once, or perhaps oftener, during his gubernatorialship Nehemiah returned to the king. Nothing is known as to when or where he died. It is stated that he was no longer governor in 407 BC; for at that time according to the Aram. letter written from Elephantine to the priests of Jerus, Bagohi was occupying the position of governor over Judæa. One of the last acts of Nehemiah's government was the charging away of one of the sons of Joiada, the son of Elahash, because he had become the son-in-law to Sanballat, the governor. This Joiada was the father of Johanan (Neh 12:22) who, according to the Aram. papyrus, was high priest in 407 BC, and according to Jos (Ant. X, viii.1) was high priest while Bagohi (Bogos) was general of Artaxerxes' army, it is certain that Nehemiah was at this time no longer in power.

From the fact that Nehemiah was so grieved at the desolation of the city and the people of Judah and his fathers and that he was so jealous for the laws and the welfare of Judah, we can infer that he was brought up by pious parents, who instructed him in the history and law of the Jewish people.

Doubtless because of his probity and ability, he was apparently at an early age appointed by Artaxerxes, king of Persia, to the responsible position of cupbearer to the king.

3. Cupbearer of the King

There is now no possible doubt that this king was Artaxerxes, the first of that name, commonly called Longimanus, who ruled over Persia from 464 to 424 BC.
NEHEMIAH, BOOK OF. See Ezra-Neemiah.

NEHEMIAH, nê-hè-mi'as: Gr form of Heb Nehemiah.

NEHEMIAH, nê-hè-mi'as: One of the leaders of the return under Zerubbabel (1 Esd 5 8) = "Nehe-

NEHEMIAH, nê-hè-mi'as: One of the leaders of the return under Zerubbabel (1 Esd 5 8) = "Nehe-

NEHUM, nê-hûm (נְהֻם, nê-hûm): One of the twelve heads of the people who returned with Zerubbabel (Neh 7 7). In the I passage (Ezr 2 2), the name appears as Râum (q.v.), and in 1 Esd 5 8 as "Reimus."

NEHUŠTA, nê-hûsh'tâ (נֹעֶשְׁתָ, nê-hûsh'tâ): Mother of King Jehoiachin (2 K 24 8). She was the daughter of Eliakim of Jerus. After the fall of Jerusalem, she was exiled with her son and her court (2 K 24 12; Jer 29 2).

NEHUŠTAN, nê-hûsh'tân (נֹעֶשְׁתָנ, nê-hûsh'tân; cf נֹעֶשְׁתֶו, nê-hûsh'tâv, "brass," and נֶעֶשְׁתָ, nê-hûsh'tâ, "serpent"): The word occurs but once, viz. in 2 K 18 4. In the account there given of the reforms carried out by Hezekiah, it is said that "he brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made; for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it; and he called it Nehustan." According to RVm the word means "a piece of brass." If this be correct, the sense of the passage is that Hezekiah not only breaks the brazen serpent in pieces but, setting the word to the act, scornfully calls it "a [more] piece of brass." But this takes place as a true reformer, and as a champion of the purification of the religion of Israel. This is the traditional interpretation of the passage, and fairly represents the Heb text as it now stands.

There are at least three considerations, however, which throw doubt upon this interpretation. In the first place, the word N. is not a common noun, and cannot mean simply "a piece of brass." The point of the Bib. statement is entirely lost by such a con-

construction. It is emphatically a proper noun, and is the special name given to this particular brazen serpent. It was, therefore, given to all worshippers of the brazen ser-

2. Derivation: A pent, and familiar to all who fre-

Proper noun

Nehemiah, Book
Nephthar

Walter, E., "Die Eponymenlehre in der alttestamentlichen Sprach-
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S. ANGES

NEHILOTH, ne-hîl'oth, ne'-hi-loth (Ps 6, title). See Misc.

NEHUM, nê-hûm (נְהֻם, nê-hûm): One of the twelve heads of the people who returned with Zerubbabel (Neh 7 7). In the I passage (Ezr 2 2), the name appears as Râum (q.v.), and in 1 Esd 5 8 as "Reimus."

NEHUSHTA, nê-hûsh'tâ (נֹעֶשְׁתָ, nê-hûsh'tâ): Mother of King Jehoiachin (2 K 24 8). She was the daughter of Eliakim of Jerus. After the fall of Jerusalem, she was exiled with her son and her court (2 K 24 12; Jer 29 2).

NEHUSHTAN, nê-hûsh'tân (נֹעֶשְׁתָנ, nê-hûsh'tân; cf נֹעֶשְׁתֶו, nê-hûsh'tâv, "brass," and נֶעֶשְׁתָ, nê-hûsh'tâ, "serpent"): The word occurs but once, viz. in 2 K 18 4. In the account there given of the reforms carried out by Hezekiah, it is said that "he brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made; for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it; and he called it Nehustan." According to RVm the word means "a piece of brass." If this be correct, the sense of the passage is that Hezekiah not only breaks the brazen serpent in pieces but, setting the word to the act, scornfully calls it "a [more] piece of brass." But this takes place as a true reformer, and as a champion of the purification of the religion of Israel. This is the traditional interpretation of the passage, and fairly represents the Heb text as it now stands.

There are at least three considerations, however, which throw doubt upon this interpretation. In the first place, the word N. is not a common noun, and cannot mean simply "a piece of brass." The point of the Bib. statement is entirely lost by such a con-
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NEHUM, nê-hûm (נְהֻם, nê-hûm): One of the twelve heads of the people who returned with Zerubbabel (Neh 7 7). In the I passage (Ezr 2 2), the name appears as Râum (q.v.), and in 1 Esd 5 8 as "Reimus."

NEHUSHTA, nê-hûsh'tâ (נֹעֶשְׁתָ, nê-hûsh'tâ): Mother of King Jehoiachin (2 K 24 8). She was the daughter of Eliakim of Jerus. After the fall of Jerusalem, she was exiled with her son and her court (2 K 24 12; Jer 29 2).

NEHUSHTAN, nê-hûsh'tân (נֹעֶשְׁתָנ, nê-hûsh'tân; cf נֹעֶשְׁתֶו, nê-hûsh'tâv, "brass," and נֶעֶשְׁתָ, nê-hûsh'tâ, "serpent"): The word occurs but once, viz. in 2 K 18 4. In the account there given of the reforms carried out by Hezekiah, it is said that "he brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made; for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it; and he called it Nehustan." According to RVm the word means "a piece of brass." If this be correct, the sense of the passage is that Hezekiah not only breaks the brazen serpent in pieces but, setting the word to the act, scornfully calls it "a [more] piece of brass." But this takes place as a true reformer, and as a champion of the purification of the religion of Israel. This is the traditional interpretation of the passage, and fairly represents the Heb text as it now stands.

There are at least three considerations, however, which throw doubt upon this interpretation. In the first place, the word N. is not a common noun, and cannot mean simply "a piece of brass." The point of the Bib. statement is entirely lost by such a con-
him, defraud him, frame malicious devices or harbor evil thoughts against him (Ex 20 17; Lev 6 2; 19 13; Dt 23 24 f.; Ps 16 3; 101 5; Prov 24 28; Jer 22 13; Zec 8 17), or to lead him into larger conduct (Hab 2 12) or to wage war on him by lying carnally with his wife (Lev 18 20). But the supreme law that underlies these negative injunctions is stated positively, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Lev 19 18). In this verse, the term "neighbor" is defined by the expression, "the children of thy people." Here, and generally in the OT, the term implies more than mere proximity; it means one related by the bond of nationality, a fellow-countryman, compatriot. Jeh being regarded as a national God, there was no religious bond regulating the conduct of the Hebrews with other nations. Conduct which was prohibited between fellow-Jews was permitted toward a foreigner, e.g. the exactness of interest (Dt 23 19,20).

In the NT, this limitation of moral obligation to fellow-countrymen is abolished. Christ gives a wider interpretation of the commandment in Lev 19 18, so as to include in it those outside the tie of nation or kinship. This is definitely done in the parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk 10 25-37), where, in answer to the question, "Who is my neighbor?" Jesus shows that the relationship is a moral, not a physical one, based not on kinship but on opportunity, need and capacity for mutual help. The word represents, not so much a rigid fact, but an ideal which one may or may not realize (ver 36, "Which of these three, thinkest thou, proved [lit. became, not was] neighbor," etc). This com connotation follows naturally as a corollary to the doctrine of the universal Fatherhood of God. The commandment to love one's neighbor as one's self must not be interpreted as if it implied that we are to hate our enemy (an inference which the Jews were apt to make); human love should be like the Divine, impartial, having all men for its object (Mt 5 44 f). Love to one's fellow-men in the broad sense is to be placed side by side with love to God as the essence and sum of human duty (Mt 22 37-40 || Mk 12 28-31). Christ's apostles follow His example in giving a central position to the injunction to love one's neighbor as one's self (Jan 2 8, where the term is called "the royal law," i.e. the supreme or governing law; Rom 13 9; Gal 5 14).

D. M. Edwards

NEKEB, nē'keb: This name occurs only in combination with "Adami" (בֵּדֹאָמִי, 'abāmi) and "ha-nekēb, "Adami of the passa"); LXX reads the names of two places: καὶ Ἀδαμ καὶ Ἀδαιμ, καὶ Ἀρμαὶ καὶ Ἀξιάβ (B); καὶ Ἀρμαὶ καὶ Ἀξιαβ, καὶ Ἀρμαὶ καὶ Ὀνταη (Josh 19 33), so we should possibly read "Adami and Nekēb." Neubauer says (Géog. du Talm, 225) that later the name of Nekēb was Cydadatha. It may therefore be represented by the modern Sëydâdel, not far from ed-Dâmîeh to the E. of Tabor, about 4 miles S.W. of Tiberias. The name of Nekēb, a town in Galilee, appears in the list of Towns III of the NEKODA, nē'kō'da (נְכֹּדָא, někō'dā): (1) Head of a family of Nethinim (Ezr 2 48; Neh 7 50; cf 1 Esd 5 31). (2) Head of a family which failed to prove its Levitical origin (Ezr 2 60; Neh 7 62; cf 1 Esd 5 31). In the || vs of 1 Esd the names are given thus: NEBKA and NEKODAN (q.v.).

NEKODAN, nē'kō'dân (נְכֹּדָן, někō'dān; RVm "Nekoda"); AV Necodon: (1) Head of a family which returned from exile, but "could not show their families nor their stock" (1 Esd 5 37) = "Nekoda" of Ezr 2 60; Neh 7 62. (2) See NEBKA.

NEMU, nemů'el, nemů'el (נְמֻּל, němů'el): (1) A Reubenite, brother of Dathan and Abiram (Nu 26 9). (2) A son of Simeon (Nu 26 12; 1 Ch 4 24). The name occurs also in the form "Jemuel" (Gen 46 10; Ex 6 15). According to Gray (HPN), either form is etymologically obscure; but Nemuel is probably correct, for it is easier to account for its corruption into Jemuel than vice versa. The patronymic Nemuelites occurs once (Nu 26 12).

NEMUELITES, nemů'el-its, nemů'el-its (נְמֻּליאֵהוֹת, nemů'el-ē): See NEMU, (2).

NEPHEA, nē'feh. See Music.

NEPHEG, nē'fēg (נְפֶהֶג, nephegh), "sprout," "shoot"): (1) Son of Jahar, and brother of Korah of the famous trio, Korah, Dathan and Abiram (Ex 6 21). (2) A son of David (2 S 5 15; 1 Ch 3 7; 14 6).

NEPHEW, nē'fu. See Relationships, Family.

NEPHI, nē'fi. See Nephi.

NEPHILIM, nē'fil-im (נְפֶהִי, nēphilim): This word, used "giants" in AV, but retained in RV, is found in passages of the OT—one in Gen 6 4, relating to the antediluvians; the other in Nu 13 33, relating to the sons of Anak in Canaan. In the former place the Nephiim are not necessarily to be identified with the children said to be born by "the daughters of men" to "the sons of God" (vs 24); indeed, they seem to be distinguished from the latter as upon the earth before this unholy commingling took place (see Sons of God). But it is not easy to be certain as to the interpretation of this strange passage. In the second case they clearly represent men of gigantic stature, in comparison with whom the Israelites felt as if they were "grasshoppers." This agrees with Gen 6 4, "the mighty men that were of old, the men of renown." LXX, therefore, was warranted in translating by gigantes.

James Orr

NEPHIS, nē'fis. See Nephis.

NEPHISH, nē'fis, NEPHISIM, nē'f-sim, NEPHISHEIM, nē'f-s-him, NEPHISHIM, nē'f-s-him (נְפֶהִישִם, nēphishim, נְפֶהִישָּה, nēphishāh): The former is the Ktibh (Heb "written") form of the name adopted in RV; the latter the Qere (Heb "read") form, adopted in AV and RVm (Ezr 2 50). See NAPHI; NEPHISHIM.

NEPHITHAI, nē'fith, nēfith-al. See Nepi.

NEPHITHALIM, nēf-tha-lim (Mt 4 13): The Gr form of NAPHTALI (q.v.).

NEPTHAR, nēf-thār (נֶפְתָר, Naphthār; A and Swete, Nephthār, AV and Vulg Naphthār), NEPHTHALI (Nēphā, Naphthāl, al. Nephā, Naphthāl, Naphthāl, AV, Nephēl, Naphēl, AV and Vulg, following Old Lat., Nephī; Swete, following A, gives Nephtar twice): According to 2 Macc 1 19-36, at the time of the captivity the godly priests took of the altar fire of the temple and concealed it "privily in the hollow of a well that was without water," unknown to all. "After many years"
NEPHTOAH, neʔt-oʔ, neʔt-oʔ (יִתְפָּא, nephthoah), occurs only in the expression יִתְפָּא צְיָרָה, ma’yan ma net, “the fountain of the waters of Nephtoah”; LXX πηγὴ ὑδάτος νεφθοα, πηγὴ ὑδάτος Νεφθοᾶ (Nephthoah): This spring was on the border line between Judah and Benjamin (Josh 15 9; 18 15). The place is usually identified with Līfāṭ, a village about 2 miles N.W. of Jerusalem, on the east bank of the Wady Beit Hanina. It is a village very conspicuous to the traveler along the high road from Jaffa as he approaches Jerusalem. There are ancient foundations, cut-out tombs, and a copious spring which empties itself into a large masonry reservoir. The situation of Līfāṭ seems to agree well with the most probable line of boundary between the two tribes; the spring as it is today does not appear to be so abundant as to warrant such an expression as “spring of the waters,” but it was, like many such sources, probably considerably more abundant in OT times.

Condor would identify Līfāṭ with the ancient Eleph (q.v.) of Benjamin, and, on the ground that the Talm (see Talm Bah, Yoma 31a) identifies Nephtoah with Etam (q.v.), he would find the site of Nephtoah at ’Ātin ’Ālān, S. of Bethlehem. The Talm is not a sufficiently trustworthy guide when unsupported by other evidence, and the identification creates great difficulty with the boundary line. See PEF, Ill, 18, 43, Sh XVII.

E. W. G. Masterman

NEPHUSHESIM, nē-fish’ē-sim, NEPHUSHE-SIM, nē-fish’ē-sim (נְפּוֹשֵׁשֶּם, nephushesim, נְפּוֹשֵׁשְׁם; nē-fish’ē-sim): The former is the K’thibh (Heb “written”) name adopted in RV; the latter the Kēb (Heb “read”) form adopted in AV and RVm (Neh 7 52). See Naphsh; Nephusim.

NER, nēr (“2, nēr, “lamp”): Father of Abner (1 S 14 50 f; 26 5.14, etc); grandfather of Saul (1 Ch 8 35). Other references, though adding further information are 2 S 2 8.12; 3 22.5; 28.37; 1 K 2 5.32, etc.

NEREUS, nēr’ūs, nēr’ē-us (Νερος, Nereus): The name of a Rom Christian to whom with his sister St. Paula he dedicated the sacrifices. Nehemiah then commanded them to pour (καταψηληνθει, καταψηληθει, καταψηληθει, καταψηληθει) the rest of the liquid upon great stones. Another flame sprang up which soon spent itself; “whereas the light from the altar still” (RVm, the exact meaning being doubtful). When the king of Persia investigated it, he inclosed the spot as sacred. Nehemiah and his friends called the thick liquid “Nephthar,” which is by interpretation “cleaning” (καθαρισμός). “but most men call it Nepthai”.

No satisfactory explanation is to hand of either name, one of which is probably a corruption of the other. And no word exists in the Heb like either of them with the meaning of “cleaning,” “purification,” or the name to the spot (hunc locum), not the story. The thing probably originated in Persia, where naphtha was abundant. The ignition of the liquid by the hot rays of the sun and the appearance of the words render it highly probable that it was the inflammable rock-oil of naphtha, the combustible properties of which were quite familiar to the ancients (Pliny, NH, ii. 100; Plutarch, Alex, 35; Diodor, i.101; Strabo, Geogr. xvi.1, 15); the words then are probably corruptions of what the Greeks termed καθαρόν, naphtha. Ewald (Hist., V, 163) says: “This is but one of the many stories which sought in later times to enhance the very sanctity of the Temple, with reference even to its origin.” S. Angus

NERGAL, nār’gäl ([נָרְגַל], nērgal): A Bab. deity, identified with the planet Mars, and worshiped at Cutha (cf 2 K 17 30). See BABYLONIA AND ASSIA, RELIGION OF.

NERGAL-SHARERER, nēr-gal-shar-e’zer (נֶרְגַל-שָׁרָאָר, nērgal-shar’erē), Heb form of Assyr Nergal-sar-uaš, “O Nergal, defend the prince!”; A Bab officer, the “Ban-mag,” associated with Nebushazban in the care of Jeremiah after the fall of Jerusalem (39 3.13). According to Hommel (art. “Babylon,” HDB) and Sayce (HDB, s.v.), Nergal-sharerer is to be identified with Neriglissar who succeeded Evil-merodach on the throne of Babylon (cf Cheyne and Johns, EB, s.v.).

NERI, nē’ri (Νερί, Nērī [Tisch., Treg., WH], TR, Nēp, Nēri; for Heb נֶרְיָד, nēryād): The name of an ancestor of Jesus, the grandfather of Jerubbabel (Lk 3 27). See NERIAH.

NERIAH, nē’rā (נֶרְיָה, nēryāh, “whose lamp is Jehovah”): The father of Seraiah and of Baruch, Jeremiah’s friend and secretary (Jer 32 12.16; 46 4.8.32; 43 3). In Bar 1 1 the Gr form of the name, Nēp(e)ias, Nēr(e)ias, is given, and this shortened, Ner, occurs in the genealogy of Jesus Christ.

NERIAS, nē’rē-ās (Nēp(e)ias, Nēr(e)ias): The Gr form of Heb Neriah found only in Bar 1 1 as the father of Baruch = “Neriah” of Jer 32 12; 36 4; 43 3. To Baruch’s brother, Seraih, the same genealogy is ascribed in Jer 51 59.

NERO, nē’ro (Νερός, Nērō): I. Name, Parentage and Early Training II. Agrippina’s Ambition for Nero III. Nero’s Reign

1. Quintus Servius Sulpicius Nero
2. Poppaea Sabina
3. Poppea and Tigellinus
4. Burning of Rome
5. Persecution of Christians
6. Conspiracy of Piso
7. Nero in Greece
8. Death of Nero

IV. Downfall and Character

1. Seven Causes of Downfall
2. Character
3. Nero Redivivus
4. Nero and Christianity
5. Nero and the NT
6. Nonrian Policy and Christianity

Literature

The fifth Rom emperor, b. at Antium December 15, 37 AD, began to reign October 13, 54, d. June 9, 68.

I. Name, Parentage and Early Training.—His name was originally Lucius Domitius Ahenobarbus.
but after his adoption into the Claudian gens by the emperor Claudius, he became Nero Claudius Caesar. His father was Emperor Domitian Ahenobarbus ("Brazen-beard"), a man sprung from an illustrious family and of vicious character. His mother was Agrippina the younger, the daughter of Germanicus and the elder Agrippina, sister of the emperor Caius (Caligula) and niece of the emperor Claudius. On the birth of the child, his father predicted, amid the congratulations of his friends, that any offspring of himself and Agrippina could only prove abominable and disastrous for the public (Suet. Nero vi: detestabule et malo publico). At the age of three the young Domitian lost his father and was robbed of his estates by the rapacity of Caius. In 39 his mother was banished for supposed complicity in a plot against Caius. N. was thus deprived of his mother and at the same time left almost penniless. His aunt, Domitia Lepida, new undertook the care of the boy and placed him with two tutors, a dancer and a barber (Suet. vi). On the accession of Claudius, Agrippina was recalled, and N. was restored to his mother and his patrimony. (43 AD).

II. Agrippina's Ambition for Nero.—She cared little for her son's moral education, but began immediately to train him for high position. She aimed at nothing less than securing the empire for N. With a view to this she must gain influence over her uncle, the emperor Claudius, who was very susceptible to female charms. At first the path was by no means easy, while the licentious empress, Messalina, was in power. But on the fall and death of Messalina (48 AD)—for which Agrippina may have intrigued—the way seemed opened. With the assistance of the emperor's freedman, Pallus, Agrippina proved the successful candidate for Claudius' affections. She now felt secure to carry out the plans for the elevation of her son: (1) to betroth him to Octavia, the daughter of Claudius, having previously, by the villainy of Vitellius, broken off the engagement between Octavia and Lucius Silanus (ib. xlvii). Later, N. married this unfortunate lady. (2) Vitellius again obliged by securing a modification of Rom law so as to permit a marriage with a brother's (not sister's) daughter, and in 49 Agrippina became empress. (3) In the meantime she had caused Seneca to be recalled from banishment and had entrusted to him the education of N. for imperial purposes. (4) The adoption of her son by Claudius (50 AD). (5) She next secured early honors and titles for N. in order to mark him out as Claudius' successor. (6) She caused Britannicus, Claudius' son, to be kept in the background and treated as a mere child, removing by exile or death suspected supporters of Britannicus. (7) Agrippina was far-sighted and anticipated a later secret of Rom imperialism—the influence of the armies in the nomination of the emperor. For this cause she took an active interest in military affairs and gave her name to a new colony on the Rhine (modern Cologne). But she did not forget the importance of securing the praetorian guard and Burrus the prefect. (8) She persuaded Claudius to remove his friends. All was now ready. But Claudius did not like the idea of excluding his son Britannicus from power, and murmurs were heard among the senate and people. Delay might prove fatal to Agrippina's plans, so (9) Claudius must die. The notorious Lucusta administered poison in a dish of mushrooms, and Xenophon, Agrippina's physician, thrust a poisoned feather down Claudius' throat on the pretence of helping him to vomit. Burrus then took N. forth and caused him to be proclaimed emperor by the praetorians.

III. Nero's Reign.—Nero's reign falls into three periods, the first of which is the celebrated quinquennium, or first 5 years, characterized by good government at home and increase of the provinces and popularity with both senate and people. Agrippina, having seated her son on the throne, did not purpose to relinquish power herself; she intended to rule along with him. And at first N. was very devoted to her and had given as watchword to the guard, "the best of mothers" (Tac. Ann. xii.2; Suet. ix). This caused a sharp conflict with Seneca and Burrus, who could not tolerate Agrippina's arrogance and unbounded influence over her son. In order to do him honor, his mother they encouraged him in an amour with a Gr. freedwoman, Acte (Tac. Ann. xiii.12). This first blow to Agrippina's influence was soon followed by the dismissal from court of her chief protector Pallus. She esteemed his influence for the benefit of her grandson, Germanicus, and present him as the rightful heir to the throne. This cost Britannicus his life, for N., feeling insecure while a son of Claudius lived, compassed his death at a banquet. A hot wine cup was offered Britannicus, and to cool it it was added which had been adulterated with a virulent poison. The victim succumbed immediately. All eyes fastened on N. in suspicion, but he boldly asserted that the death was due to a bit of epilepsy—a disease to which Britannicus had been subject from childhood. Such was the fate of Agrippina's first protégé. She next took up the cause of the despised and ill-treated Octavia, which so incensed her son that he deprived her of her guards and caused her to remove from the palace. Agrippina now disappears for the next few years to come into brief and tragic prominence later. Seneca and Burrus undertook the management of affairs, with results that justified the favorable impression which the first 5 years of N.'s reign made upon the Roman people. Many reforms were initiated, financial, social and legislative. These ministers treated N. to counsels of moderation and justice, dictating a policy which left considerable liberty to the senate. But perceiving in the height of his evil nature, they allowed him to indulge in low pleasures and excesses with the most profligate companions, thinking, perhaps, that this excess would end the republic at once. He grew more and more with the most dissolute companions, conspicuous among whom were Salvidius Otho and Claudius Seneceo.

The former had a wife as ambitious as she was unprincipled, and endowed, according to Tacitus, with every gift of nature except an "honorable mind." Already divorced before marrying Otho, she was minded to employ Otho merely as a tool to enable her to become N.'s consort. With the appearance of Poppea, Sabina (58 AD), whose name opens the second period of N.'s reign. She proved his evil star. Under her influence he shook off all restraints, turned a deaf ear
to his best advisers and plunged deeper into immorality and crime. She allowed, if not persuaded, N. to give her husband a commission in the distant province of Lusitania. Her jealousy could tolerate no possible rival. She plotted the death of Agrippina to which she easily persuaded N. to consent. This was carried on with the greatest cunning. Anicetus, admiral of the fleet, undertook to construct a vessel that would sink to order. N. invited his mother to his villa at Baiae at the Quinquagenarian celebration. After the banquet he showed her his "secret garden" by the vessel prepared. But the plan did not succeed, and Agrippina saved herself by swimming ashore. She pretended to treat the matter as an accident, sending a freedman to N. to inform him of her escape. Anicetus, however, relieved N. of the awkward position by pretending that Agrippina's freedman had dropped a dagger which was considered proof enough of her guilt. Deserted by her friends and slaves except one freedman, she was quickly dispatched by her murderers. N. gave out that she had killed herself by suicide (Suet. xxxiv; Tac. Ann. exi–cxviii).

N., no longer made any secret of taking Poppaea as his mistress, and, under her influence, led defiance to the best Rom traditions and the professed principles of paganism. He was 62 AD matters grew much worse by the death of the praetorian prefect, Burrus. Seneca lost in him a powerful ally, and Poppaea gained in one of the new prefects, Sosonius Tigellinus, a powerful ally. She succeeded in causing Seneca to retire from the court. Next she determined to remove Octavia. A charge of adultery was first tried, but as the evidence proved too weak, N. simply divorced her because of barrenness. Then Anicetus was persuaded to confess adultery with her, and the innocent Octavia was banished to the island of Pandateria, where a little later she was executed at Poppaea's orders and her head brought to her rival (62 AD). Poppaea was now empress, and the next year bore a daughter to N., but the child died when only three months old. Two years later Poppaea herself died during pregnancy, of a cruel kick inflicted by N. in a fit of rage (65 AD). He pronounced a eulogy over her and took as her wife, Statilia Messalina, of whom he had no issue.

N., having by his extravagance exhausted the well-filled treasury of Claudius (as Catus did that of Tiberius), was driven to fill his coffers by confiscations of the property of rich nobles and his对策 Tigellinus could trump the slightest plausible charge. But even this did not prevent a financial crisis—the beginning of the bankruptcy of the later Roman empire. The provinces which at first enjoyed good government were now plundered; new and heavy taxes were imposed. Worst of all, the gold and silver coinage was deprecat ed, and the senate was deprived of the right of copper coinage.

This difficulty was much increased by the great fire which was not only destructive to both private and state property, but also necessitated the providing thousands of homeless with shelter, and lowering the price of corn. On July 18, 64, this great conflagration broke out in Circus Maximus. A high wind caused it to spread rapidly over a large portion of the city, sweeping before it ill-built streets of wooden houses. At the end of six days it was extinguished. It was extensively for lack of material when another conflagration started in a different quarter of the city. Various exaggerated accounts of the destruction are found in Roman historians: of the 14 city regions 7 were said to have been totally destroyed and 4 partially. N. was at Antium at the time. He hastened back to the city and apparently took every means of arresting the spread of the flames. He superintended in person the work of the fire brigades, often exposing himself to danger. After the fire he threw open his own gardens to the homeless and ordered the public property caused great consternation, and, for whatever reasons, suspicion seemed to fix upon N. Rumor had it that on hearing the Greek verse, "When I am dead let the earth be wrapped in fire," he interrupted, "Nay rather, when will it be put out?" (Suet. xxvii) and had often deplored the ugliness of the city. This led to N.'s offering an opportunity to rebuild it; that he purposefully set fire in order to find room for his magnificent Domus Aurea ("Golden House"); that when the city was burning he gazed upon it from the tower of Maecenas delighted with what he termed "the beauty of the conflagration"; that he recited in actor's costume the sack of Troy (Suet. xxviii; Tac. Ann. xv.38 ff.). In spite of all these reports N. must be absolved of the guilt of incendiaryism.

Such pardoned indulgences were attributed to the wrath of the gods. In the present case everything was done to appease the offended deity. Yet, in spite of all, suspicion still clung to N. "Wherefore in order to explain his incendiaryism he was guilty (subsiditi reos), and afflicted with the most exquisite punishments those who were hated for their abominations [flagitia] and called Christians' by the populace. Christians, from whom the name was derived, was named by the tribune of the Flavian people Pontius Pilatus in the reign of Tiberius. This noxious form of religion [zitiobilia superstitionis], checked for a time, broke out again not only in Judaea its original home, but also throughout the empire (Tac. Hist. v). who among its abominations met and find devotees. Therefore first of all those who confessed [i.e. to being Christians] were arrested, and then as a result of their information a large number [multitudo ingens] were implicated [reading conjuncti, not convicti], not so much on the charge of incendiaryism as for hatred of the human race. They died by methods of mockery; some were covered with the skins of wild beasts and then torn by dogs, some were crucified, some were burned as torches to give light at night . . . . whence [after scenes of extreme cruelty] consummation was required for them, although guilty and deserving the worst penalties, for men felt that their destruction was not on account of the public welfare but to gratify the cruelty of one who was a [Nero]" (Tac. Ann. xxv.44). Such is the earliest account of the first heathen persecution (as well as the first record of the crucifixion by a heathen writer). Tacitus here clearly implies that the Christians were innocent (subsiditi reos), and that N. employed them simply as scapegoats. Some regard the conclusion of the paragraph as a contradiction to this—"though guilty and deserving the severest punishment" (adversus santes et novissima exempla meritis). But Tacitus means by so few that the Christians were 'guilty' from the point of view of the populace, and that they merited extreme punishment also from his own standpoint for other causes, but not for arson. Fatebantur does not mean that they confessed to incendiaryism, but to being Christians, and qui fatebantur means there were some who boldly confessed, while others tried to conceal or perhaps even denied their faith.

But why were the Christians selected as scapegoats? Why not the Jews, who were both numerous and had already offended the Rom people of which the great fire had been in great numbers? Or why not the most notorious (1 Peter) and who bore a name derogatory to Judaism and had certainly enough influence over N.
to protect the Jews; she was regarded by them as a proselyte and is termed by Jos (Ant. XX, VIII, 11) ἐθνοῦσα, "god-fearing." When the populace and the Jews were discussing retiring for the night, the Jews were not allowed to depart; they have been glad of the opportunity of putting forward their cause. The Jews have been embroiled in the Thirty Years' War. 

Farrar (Early Days of Christianity, 1, ch iv) 

sees, "In the proselytism of Poppaea, guided by Jewish microbes, and the attacks of the first Christian persecution." (2) Closely connected with this was the theme of the reaction by the Roman government that Christianity was the "enemy of the state." This may have been the first rebuff to the proselytism of Poppaea, guided by Jewish microbes, and the attacks of the first Christian persecution.

(3) As Christianity formed a society apart from Roman society, all kinds of crimes were attributed to its followers. Thys- 

tean feasts, nightly orgies, hostility to temples and images. These feasts seemed summed up in "adum humani generis," "hatred for the human race." (4) They were easily selected as being so numerous and making most progress in a line opposed to Roman spirit: of magna multitudem (Tac. Ann. xx. 44; Clemens Rom. Cor. 1: 6, 8, εν τοις παραμετρεσιν, of other "great multitude" of Rev 7: 9; 18: 1). (5) No doubt, too, early Christian enthusiasm was unequivocal in its expressions, esp. in its belief in the sovereignty of Christ and his world and the divine faith amidst the despair of others.

In the meantime Tigellinus' tyranny and confisca- 

tions to meet N.'s expenses caused deep dis- 

content among the nobles, which cul- 

minated in the famous conspiracy at Cilicia. Calpurnius Piso (65 AD) was murdered. The plot was prematurely betrayed by Milichius. An insurrection followed in which the most illustrious victims who perished were Seneca the philosopher, Lucan the poet, Lucretia, the beautiful and famous sister of Seneca and father of Lucan, T. Petronius Arbiter, "the glass of fashion." Finally, "N. having butchered so many illustrious men, at last desired to extirpate virtue itself by the death of Thraseas, Paetus and Barca Soranus" (Tac. Ann. xvi. 21f).

Having cleared every suspected person out of the way, he abandoned the government in Rome to a freedman Helius, and started on a long visit to Greece (65-66 AD), where he had to oust the local contests and games, himself winning prizes from the obsequious Greeks, in return for which N. bestowed upon them "freedom." N. was so un-Roman that he was perfectly at home in Greece, whereas he had been unappreciated by cultured people. In the meantime the revolt of Vindex in Gaul commenced (66 AD), but it was soon quelled by Verginius Rufus on account of its national Gaulic character. Galba of Hither Spain next declared himself legatus of the senate and the Roman people. N. was persuaded to return to Rome by Helius; he confiscated Galba's property, but his weakness and hesitancy greatly helped the cause of the latter.

Nymphidia Sabinus, one of the prefects, won over the guard for Galba, by persuading the irreso- 

lute emperor to withdraw from Rome and then told the praetorians that N. had deserted them. N. was a coward, both in life and in death. While he had the means of escape, even from Galba, he was revolving plans of despair in his Servilian gardens, whether he should surrender himself to the mercies of the Partisans or to those of Galba; whether Galba would allow him the province of Egypt; whether he would forgive him, and, if not, if he would show penitence enough. In his distraction a comforter asked him in the words of Virgil, "Is it then so wretched to die?" He could not summon the courage for suicide, nor could he find one to inflame the blow for him: "Have I then neither friend nor foe?" Phan a freedman offered him the shelter of his villa a few miles from Rome. Here he prepared for suicide, but with great cowardice. He kept exclaiming, "What an artist I am to perish!" (Quaest. art. p. 6, Stuet. xlix). On learning that he was condemned to a cruel death by the senate, he put the execution of his plans to the test in the fatal blow by Epaphroditus his secretary. A centurion entered pretending he had come to help: "Too late—this is fidelity," were Nero's last words.

His remains were laid in the family vault of the Domitii by the money of Vindex and his comrade Acte (Suet. I). Thus perished on July 9, 68 AD the last of the line of Julius Caesar in his 31st year and in the 14th of his reign.

IV. Downfall and Character. — The causes of his down- 

tum were, N., like his three predecessors, being very 

burdensome taxation and financial inse- 

curity; (2) tyranny and cruelty of his favoritism. His cruelty both bred dissatisfaction to fasten suspicion on N. and to secure the disposal of his wealth. (3) The immediate cause of his downfall was the secession of "god-fearing." (4) The unpopular measure of the extension of Christianity, especially, and the security engendered by the success with which the con- 

spiracy of Piso was crushed; (5) the "secret of empire," that an emperor could be created elsewhere than at Rome, that the succession of emperors was not hereditary, but rested with the people; (6) the cowardice and weakness which N. displayed in the revolt which threatened to destroy his reign.

His reign is memorable for the activity of Seneca, the great fire, the persecution of Christians, the beginning of the bankruptcy of the later República, the Chris- 

tian disaster of Pacetus (62 AD) corrected by Corbulo and the humiliation of Paphia, the outbreak of the insurrec- 

tion in Judaea (66 AD), which ended in the destruction of 

Jews.

Nero ranks with Galba for folly and vice, while his cruelties recall the worst years of Tiberius. Very offem- 

inate in his tastes, particular about the arrangement of his palace, from the carvings on his voice, his greatest fault was inordinate vanity which courted applause for performances on non-Rom lines. He neglected his high office and deserted Rom standards by zeal for secondary pursuits. N., like his three predecessors, was very sus- 

ceptible to female charms. He was licentious in the extreme, often to guilt of that nameless vice of antiquity — love of a man's favor. He was, however, so un-Roman and his virtues clearly recall the worst years of Tiberius. Very offem- 
inate in his tastes, particular about the arrangement of his palace, from the carvings on his voice, his greatest fault was inordinate vanity which courted applause for performances on non-Rom lines. He neglected his high office and deserted Rom standards by zeal for secondary pursuits. N., like his three predecessors, was very sus- 

ceptible to female charms. He was licentious in the extreme, often to guilt of that nameless vice of antiquity — love of a man's favor. He was, however, so un-Roman and his virtues clearly recall the worst years of Tiberius. Very offem-
and the smitten head whose “deathstroke was hoarded” as N., and some scholars take Rev 17 10 f as referring to N. The “scarlet-colored beast” of 17 3 may be intended either for N.’s personal or for Rome’s general rule. The latter seems more likely, N. in particular. That the number 666 (Rev 13:18) represents N.’s name seems probable, for 666 is equivalent to Neron Kesar is significant, for the Jewish Christians would be familiar with simooms of the numerical equivalent and would have been told to “make no account of it.” 

Neron was a former senator of Rome. He was a politician, a poet, and a statesman. He was also a deeply religious man, and his government was marked by a number of religious policies. He was a proponent of the philosophy of Stoicism, which emphasized the importance of reason and virtue. He was also a supporter of the cult of Isis, which was a popular religious movement in Rome at the time.

The book of Revelation is a complex and symbolic text, and the interpretation of its symbols has been a matter of dispute among scholars. Some scholars believe that the beast of the Apocalypse represents Neron, while others believe that it represents a political or economic entity.

VI. Neron and Christianity. — The name Neron does not occur in the NT; but he was the Caesar to whom Paul appealed (Ac 25 11).

1. Neron and the tribunum Paulus tried the NT after his first imprisonment. It was quite likely that N. heard Paul’s case in person, for the emperor showed much interest in the trial of the Christians. The case was either an Antiochian or a Jewish one, for the Gentiles; cf. esp. Commodian, Carm. Apol. (926): “To us N. became Antichrist, to the Jews the other Antichrist, to the Romans.”

There was an alternate theory that N. had really been killed and that the persecutions would rise again (8th B 516 f; Augustine, De Civ. Dei, xi.19: under the name of Neron rex resurrectionem et Juturn Antichristi suspicantur).

2. Neronian Policy and Christianity. — Any disturbance of society or was con- founded by the Romans with Judaism (sub umbra Tyri beina Judaeorum religiosi: Pert. Apol., xxi.). Paul, writing to the Christians of the capital, urged them to be subject to subjection for the welfare of their country as “ordained of God” (Rom 13 1 f), and his high estimate of the Roman government as a favorite with the emperor was enhanced by his mild captivity at Rome which permitted him to carry on his defense there. He was at home again on the first trial (accepting the view of a first acquittal and subsequent activity before condemnation). But soon after, he was transferred to the trial of Paul, a Roman citizen, at Rome (about 60), and was again acquittal. During this time and on the progress of the new religion, the distinction between Christianity and Judaism became apparent to the Roman authorities. If it had not been proscribed as a religio illicita (“unlicensed religion”), neither had it been admitted as a religio licita. Christianity was not in itself a crime: its adherents were not liable to persecution “for the name.”

According to one view the Neronian persecution was a spas-modic act and an isolated incident in imperial policy: the Christians were on this occasion put forward merely to remove suspicion from N. They were not persecuted either as Christians or as incendiaries, but on account of flagellum. According to another hypothesis, Oedipus incest and nightly orgies were attributed to them, and their withdrawal from society and exclusive manners were assumed to be charges of the sect for society. The evidence of Tacitus (Ann. xv.44) would bear out this view of the Neronian persecution as accidental, isolated, to satisfy the revenge of the mob, confined to Rome and of brief duration. The other view is, how- ever, supported by Church history (Acts 21; the Rom. Empire, ch xi.) and E. G. Hardy (Studies in Paul’s apostolic speeches, p. 31). The persecution of Christians as a permanent police regulation in a list of other seemingly permanent measures (Neron xiii.40; cf. Paul’s criticism of the legionaries in 1 Thess, ii.20), which is inconsistent with the account in Acts, has been the result of the initial state of things and inveterate the permanent result. The Christians by these trials, though not convicted of incendiarism, were brought into honorable prominence; their social and exclusive manners, their withdrawal from the duties of the state, their active proselytism, together with the charges of immorality, thus established them in Rome as the enemies of society. Christianity thus became a crime and was banned by the police authorities. Suetonius gives a summary of the general principle of the Neronian laws: “It was necessary that the sects should be put down by force, and that the name of Christian should be witches, malefactors, and vagabonds.”
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The charge of vagabonds was made against the Christians by the Roman authorities, who disliked their opposition to the state religion.

The charge of witches was made against the Christians by the Jewish sect of the Gnostics, and was used as a convenient term for all who opposed the official religion of the state.
demanded their use, at least in the case of pigeons and doves, for sacrifice. In 29:18, Job cries, "Then I said, I shall die in my nest, And I shall multiply my days as the sand." That is, he hoped in his days of prosperity to die in the house he had built for his wife and children. In Ps 84:3 David sings, "Yea, the sparrow hath found her a house, And the swallow a nest for herself, where she may lay her young. Even shine altars, O Jeh of hosts, My King, and my God."

These lines are rich and ripe with meaning, for in those days all the world protected a temple nest, even to the infliction of the death penalty on anyone interfering with it. This was because the bird was supposed to be claiming the protection of the gods. Hebrew, Arab and Egyptian guarded all nests on places of worship. Pagan Rome executed the shoemaker who killed a raven that built on a temple, and Athens took the same revenge on the man who destroyed the nest of a swallow. Isaiah compared the destruction of Assyria to the robbing of a bird's nest: "And my hand hath found as a nest the riches of the peoples; and as one gathereth eggs that are forsaken, have I gathered all the earth: and there was none that moved the wing, or that opened the mouth, or chirped" (Isa 10:14; cf 16:2). Matthew quotes Jesus as having said, "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the heaven have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head." (Mt 8:20=Lk 9:58).

NET. See Fishing; Fowler.

NETAIM, nē-ta-im, nē-ta-im, nē-tā-im (νηταίμ, nē’tāim; B, ἄστις, ἀστιαί, A, ἀστια, ἀστιαί). In 1 Ch 4:23 AV reads "those that dwell among plants and hedges," RV "the inhabitants of Netaim and Gederah." The latter may be taken as correct. Gedera or was in the Judaean Shephelah. Here also we should seek for Netaim; but no likely identification has yet been suggested.

NEATHANEL, nē-than’el, ne’tha-nel (νηθαναήλ, nēthanēl; God has given); Ἀναθάναλ, Nathanahal; NA, Nethanæel, nēthan’el). See also Medan (nēthan’el). (1) A chief or prince of Issachar (Nu 1:8; 2:5; 7:18; 23:10; 15). (2) The 4th son of Jesse (1 Ch 2:14). (3) One of the trumpet-blowers before the ark when it was brought up from the house of Obed-edom (1 Ch 15:24). (4) A Levite scribe, the father of Shemiah (1 Ch 24:6). (5) The 8th son of Obed-edom (1 Ch 26:4). (6) One of the princes whom Jehoshaphat sent to teach in the cities of Judah (2 Ch 17:7). (7) A Levite who gave cattle for Josiah's Passover (2 Ch 35:19). (8) One of the priests who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:22; cf 1 Esd 9:22). (9) A priest registered under the high priest Joakim (Neh 12:21). (10) A Levite musician who assisted at the dedication of the walls (Neh 12:26). JOHN A. LEES


NETHINIM, nēth’i-nim (νηθινίμ, nēthiṇim, "given"); Ναθινεὶμ, Nathineim; AV Nethinims). A group of temple-servants (1 Ch 9:2). The word has always the article, and does not occur in the singular. The LXX translators usually transliterate, but in one passage (1 Ch 9:2) they render, "the given ones" (hoi dedemonioi). The Syr (Pesh) also, in Ezr, Neh, transliterates the word, but in 1 Ch 9:2 renders it by a word meaning "sojourners." The meaning is uncertain, of a state of servitude, and Jeos seems to confirm the suggestion by calling the N. "temple-slaves" (hierōdoulou) (Ant, XI, 1, 1). It should, however, be noted that another form of this word is employed in the directions regarding the Levites: "Thou shalt give the Levites unto Aaron and to his sons: they are wholly given unto him on behalf of the children of Israel" (Nu 3:9; cf also 8:16-19).

Of the history of the N. in earlier times there are but few and uncertain traces. When Joshua discovered that he had been beguiled by the Gibeonites into a covenant to let them live, he reduced their tribe to servitude, and declared, "Now therefore ye are cursed, and there shall never be numbering of your children, both of trees of wood and drawers of water for the house of my God" (Josh 9:23-27). It is no doubt tempting to see in the Gibeonites the earliest N., but another tradition traces their origin to a god of Davi for the service of the Levites (Ezr 8:20). Their names, too, indicate diversity of origin; for besides being mostly un-Hebrew in aspect, some of them are found elsewhere in the OT as names of non-Israelitish tribes. The Neumim, for example (Ezr 2:50—Neh 7:52), are in all likelihood descended from the Moabites or Moanites who are mentioned as harassing Israel (Jgs 10:12), as in conflict with the Simeonites (1 Ch 4:41), and as finally overcome by Uzziah (2 Ch 26:7). The next name in the lists is that of the children of NePam. These may be traced to the Hagrite clan of Naphsh (Gen 25:15; 1 Ch 5:19). In both Ezr and Neh, the list is immediately followed by that of the servants of Solomon, whose duties were similar to, and may be even humbler than, those of the N. These servants of Solomon appear to be descendants of the Canaanites whom Solomon employed in the building of his temple (1 K 5:15). All these indications are perhaps slight; but they point in the same direction, and warrant the assumption that the N. were originally foreign slaves, mostly prisoners of war, who had from time to time been given to the temple by the kings and princes of the nation, and that to them were assigned the lower menial duties of the house of God. At the time of the return from the exile the N. had come to be regarded as important. Their number was considerable: 392 accompanied Ezra after the first Return in 538 BC (Ezr 2:57—Neh 7:60). 3. Post-exilic History When Ezra, some 50 years later, organized the second Return, he secured a contingent of N. numbering 220 (Ezr 8:20). In Jerus they enjoyed the same privileges and immunities as the other religious orders, being included by the scribes' letters among those who should be exempt from toll, custom and tribute (Ezr 7:24). A part of the city in Ophel, opposite the Water-gate, was assigned them as an official residence (Neh 3:31), and the situation is certainly appropriate if their duties at all resembled those of the Gibeonites (see Ryle, "Ezra and Nehemia, " in Cambridge Bible, Intro, 57). They were
also organized into a kind of guild under their own leaders of the profession.

The N. are not again mentioned in Scripture. It is probable that they, with the singers and porters, became gradually incorporated in the general body of Levites; their name passed ere long into a tradition, and became at later times a butt for the scorn and bitterness of the Talmudic writers against everything that they regarded as un-Jewish.

John A. Lees

Netophah, nē-te'fā (_NETOPH), nē'tophāh; LXX Nerōphā, Netophā, Nepōrhā, Nepōthō, and other variants: The birthplace of two of David's heroes, Manases and Helez (2 Sam 23, 22; 1 Chron 11, 22); and so of Seraph, the son of Tanhumeth the Netophathite, one of the captains who came to offer allegiance to Gedaliah (2 K 25 23; Jer 40 8). "The villages of the Netophathites" are mentioned (1 Ch 9 16) as the dwellings of certain Levites (and Neh 12 18; AV "Netophathi") of certain "sons of the singers."

The first mention of the place itself is in Ezr 2 22; Neh 7 26; 1 Esd 8 18 (RV "Netophai"); where we have lists of the exiles returning from Babylon under Zerubbabel; the place is mentioned between the Bethlehem and Anathoth and in literary association with other cities in the mountains of Judah, e.g. Gibea, Kiriat-jeerom, Chepherhe and Beeroth. In this respect it is most plausible to identify it with Netophai, although the disappearance of the terminal guttural in the latter creates a difficulty. Conder has suggested a site known as Kh. Umm-Tuba, N.E. of Bethlehem, an ancient site, but not apparently of great importance. Beit Netāfim, an important village on a lofty siting in the Shephelah near the "Vale of Elah," also appears to have an echo of the name, and indeed may well be the Beth Netophah of the Mish (שְׁבֹאָד, ix; 5; Neubauer, Geogr., 128), but the position does not seem to agree at all with that of the OT Netophai. For Kh. Umm-Tuba see PEF, III, 128; for Beit Netāfim, PEF, III, 24; RBR, II, 17f; both Sh XVII.

E. W. Masterman

Netophai, nē-te'fās (B. Netōphās, Netōbas, A. Netophai, Netōpah): A town named in 1 Esd 8 18, identical with "Netophai of" Ezr 2 22; Neh 7 26.

Netophath, nē-tof'āthi, Netophathites, nē-tof'ā-thites. See Netophai.

Netties, net'ls: (1) הָרָעל, hā'rel (Job 30 7; Prov. 24 31; Zeph 2 9 m, in all, "wild vetches"); the tr. "nettles" is due to the supposed derivations of הָרָעל from an (obs.) הָרָע, hā'rel, meaning "to be sharp" or "stinging," but a tr. "thorn" (as in Vulg) would in that case do as well. LXX has φλογάρα ἄμφα, phlogará ampha, "wild bushwood," in Job, and certainly the association with the "salt-wort" and the "broom," in the passage would best be met by the supposition that it means the low thorny bushes plentiful in association with these plants. "Vetch" is suggested by the Aram., but is very uncertain. (2) בְּנֵי נֶטֶפָּה, b'nē'ne-te'fāh (Isa 34 13; Hos 9 6), and pl. בְּנֵי נֶטֶפָּה בְּנֵי נֶטֶפָּה (Prov 24 31), " NETAI (RV) "thorns" because of the tr. of הָרָעל as "nettles" in the same ver. From Isa 34 13 b'nē-ne-te'fāh is apparently distinct from thorns, and the tr. "nettle" is very probable, as such neglected or deserted places as described in the three references really become overgrown with nettles in Pal. The common and characteristic Pal nettle is the Urtica pilulifera, so called from the globular heads of its flowers.

E. W. Masterman

Network, net'wark (NETAI, s'bakhāhāh): RV in 2 K 26 17; 2 Ch 4 13 (also in pl., vs 12,13), for "wreathe work" and "wreath" in AV (of the adornment of the capitals of the pillars of Solomon's temple; see Jachin and Boaz). "Networks" in Isa 19 9 is in RV correctly rendered "white cloth."

In ARV "network" is substituted for "pictures" in AV (Prov 25 11), "baskets" in ERV, "filigree work."

New, nō, NEWNESS, nōnes (!=-, ḫādāhāh; kainōs, kainōs, νέος, νέος): The word commonly tr. "new" in the OT in ḫādāhāh, "bright," "fresh," "new" (special interest was shown in, and importance attached to, fresh and new things and events); Ex 1 8; Dt 20 5; 25 8; 24 5; 1 S 6 7; 2 S 21 16; Ps 33 3, "a new song"; Jer 31 31, "new covenant"; Ezk 11 19, "a new spirit"; 18 31, "new heart"; 36 26, etc; ḫādāhāh is "the new moon," "the new-moon day" in the first of the lunar month, a festival, then "month" (Gen 29 14, "a month of days"); it occurs frequently, oft tr. "month"; we have "new moon" (1 S 20 5 19 24, etc); trōth is "new [sweet] wine" (Neh 10 9; in Jer 1 5; 3 18, it is ḫādāhāh, RV "sweet wine"); in Jer 2 13, "a new heart and a new spirit".

Other words in the OT for "new" are ḫādāhāh, Aram. (Ezr 6 4): ḫāl, "fresh" (Jgs 15 15, RV, "fresh jawbone of an ass"); ḫāl, "a creation" (Nu 16 30, if ḫāl make a distinction in the things of earth and heaven, so does ḫāl, "first fruits," "first fruit," "firstfruits." Ezk 47 12; so RV); ḫāl, "setting," is tr. newly" (Gen 1 10; also mi-kāšāh, "recently" (Dt 32 17, RV "of late"); news is shērāmēth, "report," "tidings"; Prov 25 25, "good news from a far country."

In the NT the "new" (mostly kainōs, "new," "fresh," "newly made") is an important word. We have the title of the "New Testament" 2. In the NT, the itself, rightly given by ARV as "New Covenant," the designation of the "new dispensation" ushered in through Christ, the words relating to which the volume contains. We have "new covenant" (kainōs) in Lk 22 20, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood!" (ERV "treaty"); in Mt 26 28; Mk 14 24, "new" is omitted in RV, but in Mt m "many ancient authorities insert new," and in Mk "many ancient authorities: 1) Cor 11 25, ERV "or covenant"; 2 Cor 3 6, ERV "or covenant"; He 8 8, ERV "or covenant"; in ver 13, "covenant" is supplied (cf He 12 24, neos).

Corresponding to this, we have (2 Cor 5 17, AV and RV): "The old things have passed away; behold, they are become new"; ib. "If any man is in Christ, he is a new creation." RV, "there is a new creation"; Gal 6 15, "or creation," "new man" (Eph 2 15); 4 24; Col 3 10 (neos): "new commandment" (Jn 13 34) "new doctrine" (Acts 17 19); "new thing" (17 21); "newness of life" (kainōtēs) (Rom 6 4): "newness of the spirit" (7 6; cf 2 Cor 5 17); "a new name" (Rev 2 17; 12 12): "new heavens and a new earth" (2 Pet 3 13); "new Jerusalem" (Rev 3 12; 21 2); "new song" (Rev 5 9; cf "new friend" and "new wine" (Sib 9 106); "newly anointed," "newborn" (1 Pet 2 2); "prosphoriānos, newly slain" (He 10 20, RV, "new and living way, through the blood that is to give, through the door that is to be slain") in Mk "new" (Jh 4 3): "new is the tr. of neos, "new," "young" (1 Cor 5 7; Col 3 10, "new man": He 12 24, "new covenant").

The difference in meaning between kainōs and neos, is, in the main, that kainōs denotes new in respect of quality, "the new as such; new age that which has seen service, the outworn, the effete; or marred through age"); neos, "new in [respect of time, that which has recently come into existence," e.g. kainōn mnēmeōn, the "new tomb" in which Jesus was laid, was one specially made, but one in which no other dead had ever lain; the "new covenant," the "new man," etc, may be contemplated under both aspects of quality and of time (Trench, Synonyms of the NT, 209 f).

In Mt 9 16; Mk 2 21; aγναπόθος, "unsoothed,"
“unfinished,” is tr. “new,” “new cloth,” RV “undressed.” For “new bottles” (Lk 5 38 and |s), RV has “fresh wine-asks.” W. L. Walker

NEW BIRTH. See Regeneration.

NEW COMMANDMENT. See Brotherly Love.


NEW EARTH. See Eschatology of the NT; Heaven, New.

NEW HEAVENS. See Heavens, New.

NEW JERUSALEM. See Jerusalem, New; Revelation of John.

NEW MAN. See Man, New.

NEW MOON. See Moon, New; Fast and Feasts.

NEW TESTAMENT. See Bible; Canon of the NT; Criticism.

NEW TESTAMENT CANON. See Canon of the NT.

NEW TESTAMENT LANGUAGE. See Language of the NT.

NEW TESTAMENT TEXT. See Text of the NT.

NEW YEAR. See Time; Year.

NEZIHAH, nê-zî'â (נֶזְיָה, nêzyâb): The head of a family of Nethinim (Exz 2 54; Neh 7 56), called in 1 Esd 5 32, “Nazi” (AV and RVm “Naisith”).

NEZIB, nê-zîb (נֶזְיָב, nêzyib; B, Naezûb, Nascb, A, Nezzûb, Nezûb): A town in the Judaean Shephelah, mentioned along with Keilah and Marshesh (Josh 15 43). Onom places it 7 miles from Eleutheropolis (Beit Jibrîn), on the road to Hebron. It is represented today by Beit Nasib, a village with ancient remains some 2 miles S.W. of Kharbet Kila (Keilah).

NIBHAZ, nib'haz (ניבazaar, nibhaz): Given as the name of an idol of the Avrites, introduced by them into Samaria (2 K 17 31), but otherwise unknown. The text is supposed to be corrupt.

NIBSHAN, nib'shan (ניבשון, nibshon): ha-nibshôn, B, Naösîn, Nabshôn, Nophshôn, A, Naosien, Nebshôn): A city in the Judaean wilderness named between Seccach and the City of Salt (Josh 15 62). Onom knows the place but gives no clue to its identification. The site has not been recovered. Wellhausen suggests the emendation of nibshôn to kibshôn, “furnace” (Proelg 3, 344).

NICANOR, ni-kâ'nôr, ni-kâ-nôr (Νικάνωρ, Nîkânôr): The son of Patroclus and one of the king’s “chief friends” (2 Macc 8 9), a Syrian general under Antiochus Epiphanes and Demetrius Soter, after the defeat of Saron by Judas, Epiphanes instigated his chancellor Lysias with the reduction of Judaea (1 Macc 3 34 ff). Nicanaus was one of the three generals commissioned by Lysias—the others being Ptolemy, son of Dorymenes, and Gorgias (3 38). The campaign began in 166 BC; the Syrians were defeated at Emmaus (3 57 ff), while Gorgias at a later stage gained a victory at Jamnia over a body of Jews who disobeyed Judas (5 58). The account given in 2 Macc differs considerably, both in omissions and in additions (2 Macc 8 9 ff). There Nicanaus, not Gorgias, is the chief in command. The battle of Emmaus is not mentioned, but “the thrice-acursed Nicanaus,” having in overweening pride invited a thousand small dealers to accompany him to buy the Jewish captives, was humiliated, and his host was destroyed, he himself escaping “like a fugitive slave” to Antioch (2 Macc 8 34 ff). After the death of Epiphanes, Eupator and Lyons (the last two at the hands of Demetrius and Judas Maccæus), Nicanaus appears again under King Demetrius in the struggle between Alcimus and Judas. Alcimus, having been seated in the priesthood by Demetrius’ officer Bacchides, could not hold it against Judas and the patriots. He appealed again to Demetrius, who this time selected Nicanaus, now governor of Cyprus (2 Macc 12 2) and known for his deadly hatred of the Jews, to settle the dispute and slay Judas (14 12 ff; 1 Macc 7 26 ff). Nicanaus was appointed governor of Judaea on this occasion. Again 1 and 2 Macc differ. According to 1 Macc, Nicanaus sought in vain to seize Judas by treachery. Then followed the battle of Capharsalama (‘village of peace’), in which the Syrians were defeated, though Jos (Ant, XII, x, 5) says Judas was defeated. Nicanaus retired to Jerusalem, insulted the patriots and threatened the destruction of the temple unless they delivered up Judas. He then retired to Beth-horon to find Judas posted opposite him at Adasa (1 Macc 7 39 ff), 3/4 miles distant. Here on the 15th of the 12th month Adar (March), 160 BC, the Syrians sustained a crushing defeat, Nicanaus himself being the first to fall. The Jews cut off his head and proud right hand and hanged him up beside Jerus. For a little while Adasa gave the land of Judah rest. The people ordained to keep this “day of great gladness” year by year—the 13th of Adar, “the day before the day of Mordecai” (Feast of Purim). 2 Macc mentions that Simon, Judas’ brother, was worsted in a first engagement (14 17), omits the battle of Capharsalama, and represents Nicanaus, struck with the manliness of the Jews, as entering into friendly relations with Judas, urging him to marry and lead a quiet life, forgetful of the king’s command until Alcimus accused him to Demetrius. The latter peremptorily ordered Nicanaus to bring Judas in haste as prisoner to Antioch (14 27). The scene of the final conflict (Adasa) is given only as “in the region of Samaria” (15 1). According to this account, it was Judas who ordered the mutilation of Nicanaus and in a more gruesome fashion (15 20 ff). It is possible that the Nicanaus, the Cyriarch or governor of Cyprus of 2 Macc 12 2, is a different person from Nicanaus, the son of Patroclus—a view not accepted in the above account. S. Axvus

NICANOR (Νικάνωρ, Nikànôr): One of the “seven” chosen to superintend “the daily ministration” of the poor of the Christian community at Jerusalem (Acts 6 5). The name is Gr.

NICODEMUS, nik-ô-de'mus (Νικόδημος, Nikôdêmos): A Pharisee and a “ruler of the Jews,” mentioned only by St. John. He (1) interviewed Christ at Jerusalem and was taught by Him the doctrine of the New Birth (Jn 3 1-15); (2) desired Him before the Sanhedrin (Jn 7 50-52); (3) witnessed at His burial (Jn 19 39-42). This meeting, which it has been surmised took place in the house of St. John (Jn 3 1-15), was one of the results of Our Lord’s ministry at Jerusalem during the last Passover (Jn 11 5; 12 1). Although N. had been thus won to believe
in the Divine nature of Christ’s mission, his faith was yet very incomplete in that he believed Him to be inspired only after the fashion of the OT prophets. To this faint-hearted faith corresponded his timidity of action, which displayed itself in his coming to him at night, lest he should offend his colleagues in the Sandhedrin and the other hostile Jews (ver 2). In answer to the veiled question which the words of N. implied, and to convince him of the inadequacy of mere intellectual belief, Christ proclaimed to him the necessity for a spiritual regeneration: “Except one be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God” (ver 3). This was interpreted by N. only in its materialistic sense, and therefore caused him bewilderment and confusion (ver 4). But Christ, as on another occasion when dealing with His questioners on a similar point of doctrine (cf Jn 6 52,53), answered his perplexity only by repeating His previous statement (ver 5). He then proceeded to give further explanation. The rebirth is not outward but inward, it is not of the body but of the soul (ver 6). Just as God is the real agent in the birth of the body, so also is He the Creator of the New Spirit; and just as no one knoweth whose womb hath brought forth “the Spirit’s birth,” yet all can feel its effects who come under its influence, so is it with the rebirth. Only those who have experienced it as a change in themselves, wrought by the Divine Power, are qualified to judge either of its reality or of its effects (ver 7,8). But N., since such experience had not yet been his, remained still unenlightened (ver 9). Christ therefore condemned such blindness in one who yet professed to be a teacher of spiritual things (ver 10), and emphasized the reality in His own life of these truths which He had been proclaiming (ver 11). With this, Christ returned to the problem underlying the first statement of N. If N. cannot believe in “earthly things,” i.e. in the New Birth, which, though coming from above, is yet realized in this world, how can he hope to understand “heavenly things,” i.e. the deeper mysteries of God’s purpose in sending Christ into the world (ver 12), of Christ’s Divine sonship (ver 13), of His relationship to the abomination and the salvation of man (ver 14), and of the living water which He had been offering (ver 11). And whether N. will accept this, Christ is in itself Divine life (ver 15; cf Jn 6 25–65).

The above interview, though apparently fruitless at the time, was not without its effect upon N. At the Feast of Tabernacles, when the Prophet said, “If anyone thirst, let him ask of Me, and I will give him living water” (Jn 7 37,38), N. was emboldened to stand up in His defence. Yet here also he showed his natural timidity. He made no personal testimony of his faith in Christ, but sought rather to defend Him on a point of Jewish law (Jn 7 50–52; cf Ex 23 1; Dt 1 16,17; 17 6; 19 15). By this open act of reverence N. at last made public profession of his being of the following of Christ. His wealth enabled him to partake of the “meat indeed and not merely alms, about a hundred pounds,” with which the body of Jesus was embalmed (Jn 19 39 ff).

The Gospel of Nicodemos and other apocryphal works narrate that N. gave evidence in favor of Christ at the trial before Pilate, that he was deprived of office and banished from Jesus by the hostile Jews, and that he was the last to follow and to worship Christ. His remains were said to have been found in a common grave along with those of Gamaliel and st. Stephen. Nicodemos is a type of the “well-instructed and thoughtful Jew who looked for the consummation of national hope to follow in the line along which he had himself gone, as being a continuation and not a new beginning” (Westcott). The manner in which the Gospel narrative traces the overcoming of his natural timidity and reluctant faith is in itself a beautiful illustration of the working of the Spirit, of how belief in the Son of Man is in truth a new birth, and the entrance into eternal life.

NICODEMUS, GOSPEL OF. See Apocryphal Gospels, III, 3, (6).

NICOLAITANS, nik-6-lai-tans (Nicotiai, Nikolaitai). A sect or party of evil influence in early Christianity, esp. in the 7.

1. The Sect of churches of Asia. Their doctrine was similar to that of Balaam, “who taught Balak to cast a stumbling-block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed to idols, and to commit fornication” (Rev 2 14.15). Their practices were strongly condemned by St. John, who praised the church in Ephesus for “hating their works” (Rev 2 6), and blamed the church in Pergamum for accepting in some measure their teaching (Rev 2 15). Except that reference is probably made to their influence in the church at Thyatira also, where their leader was “the woman Jezebel, who calleth herself a prophetess” (Rev 2 20), cf ver 14, no further direct information regarding them is given in Scripture.

Reference to them is frequent in post-apostolic literature. According to Irenaeus (Adv. Haer., i. 26,3; iii.10,7), followed by Hippolytus (Philos., vi.86), they were founded by Nicocles, the proselyte of Antioch, who was one of the seven chosen to serve at the tables (Acts 6 5). Irenaeus, as also Clement of Alexandria (Strom., ii.20), Tertullian and others, unite in condemning their practices in terms similar to those of St. John; and reference is also made to their gnostic tendencies. In explanation of the apparent incongruity of such an immoral sect being founded by one of “good report, full of the Spirit and of wisdom” (cf Acts 6 3), Simcox argues that their lapse may have been due to re-action from original principles of a too rigid asceticism. A theory, started in comparatively modern times, and based in part on the similarity of meaning of the Greek term “Nicoclane” by which the word puts forward the view that the two sects referred to under these names were in reality identical. Yet if this were so, it would not have been necessary for St. John to designate them separately.

The problem underlying the Nicolaitan controversy, though so little direct mention is made of it in Scripture, was in reality most important, and concerned the whole relation of Christianity to paganism and its usages. The Nicolaitans disobeyed the command issued to the gentle churches, by the apostolic council held at Jerusalem in 49–50 AD, that they should refrain from the eating of “things sacrificed to idols” (Acts 15 29). Such a restriction, though seemingly hard, in that it prevented the Christians from mingling in public festivities and so brought upon them suspicion and dislike, was yet necessary to prevent a return to a pagan laxity of morals. To this danger the Nicolaitans were themselves a glaring witness, and therefore God was justified in condemning them. In writing to the Corinthian church St. Paul gives warning against the same evil practices, basing his arguments on consideration for the weaker brethren (cf I Cor 8).


C. M. KERR.
NICOLÁUS, nik-ó-nás (EV), NICOLAS, nik-ó-las (Nikolaos, Nikolaos): One of the ‘seven’ chosen to have the oversight of the daily distribution’ to the poor of the church in Jerusalem (Acts 6.5). He is called ‘a proselyte of Antioch’; the other 6 were therefore probably Jews by birth. This is the first recorded case of the admission of a proselyte into office in the Christian church. Some of the church Fathers (Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Pseudo-Tertullian) state that he was the founder of the sect called Nicolaitans (q.v.) (Rev 2.15). Other Fathers seem to suggest that this was a vain claim made by this sect in seeking apostolic authority for its opinions. It may be that the opinions of this sect were an antimonic exaggeration of the preaching of Nicolás.

S. F. HUNTER

NICOPOLIS, nik-ó-pó-lis (Nikopolis, Nikópolis): A city in Peloponnesus, between Jaffa and Jerusalem, now called Amman, mentioned in 1 Mace 3.40.57 and 9.50. The earlier city (Emmaus) was burnt by Quintilius Varus, but was rebuilt in 223 AD as Nicopolis. The Nicopolis, however, to which Paul urges Titus to come (2 Tim 1.14), was in Illyricum, and to which the statement made by some writers that from Eastern Greece (Athens, Thessalonica, Philippi, Corinth) Paul’s labours extended to Italy, that he never visited Western Greece, requires modification. It is true that we do not hear of his preaching at Patras, Zacynthus, Sophœlia, Corcyra (the modern Corfu), which, as a way-station to and from Sicily, always held preeminence among the Ionian islands; but there can be little doubt that, if his plan of going to Nicopolis was carried out, he desired to evangelize the province of Epirus (as well as Acaarnia) in Western Greece. Indeed, it was in this very city of Nicopolis, probably, that he was arrested and taken to Rome for trial—during one of the winters between 64–67 AD.

Nicopolis was situated only a few miles N. of the modern Preveza, the chief city of Epirus today, the city which the Greeks bombarded in 1912 in the hope of wresting it from the Turks. The ancient city was founded by Augustus, whose camp happened to be the scene of the battle before the famous fight with Antony (31 BC). The gulf, called Ambracia in ancient times, is now known as Arta. On the southern side was Actium, where the battle was fought. Directly across, only half a mile distant, on the northern promontory, was the encampment of Augustus. To commemorate the victory over his antagonist, the Roman emperor built a city on the exact spot where his army had encamped (‘Victory City’). On the hill now called Michalitsi, on the site of his own tent, he built a temple to Neptune and instituted games in honor of Apollo, who was supposed to have helped him in the sea-fight. Nicopolis soon became the metropolis of Epirus, with an autonomous constitution, according to Greek custom. But in the time of the emperor Julian (362) the city had fallen into decay, at least in part. It was plundered by the Gothic, Justinian, and finally disappeared entirely in the Middle Ages, so far as the records of history show. One document has Νικόπολις ἡ νῦν Πρέβεζα, Nikopolis hē nýn Přeběza, “N., which is now Preba.” In the time of Augustus, however, Nicopolis was a flourishing town. The emperor concentrated his troops in Epirus and Acaarnia, and made the city a leading member of the Amphictyonic Council. There are consider-

able ruins of the ancient city, including two theaters, a stadium, an aqueduct, etc.

J. E. HARRY

NIGER, ni-jer (Nyger, Nijer). See Simeon (5).

NIGH, n. See NEAR.

NIGHT, n. (for the natural usage and the various terms, see DAY AND NIGHT):

Figurative uses: The word ‘night’ (γητή, λαγ-θή, ους) is sometimes used fig. in the OT. Thus Hosea compares the coming of God to a “watch in the night” (Hos 2.20, 3.5). Adversity is depicted by it in such places as Job 30.15; cf Isa 8.20; Jer 16.9. Disappointment and despair are apparently depicted by it in the ‘burden of Dumah’ (Isa 21.11); and spiritual blindness, coming upon the false prophets (Mic 3.6); again sudden and overwhelming confusion (Am 5.8; Isa 59.10 AV, νυσθή, “twilight” as in RV).

On the lips of Jesus (Jn 9–4) it signifies the end of opportunity to labor; repeated in that touching little allegory spoken to His disciples when He was called to the grave of Lazarus (Jn 11.910). Paul also uses the figure in reference to the Parousia (Rom 13.12), where ‘night’ seems to refer to the present aeon and ‘day’ to the aeon to come. He also uses it in 1 Thess 5.5.7 where the status of the redeemed is depicted by ‘day,’ that of the unregenerate by ‘night,’ again as the context shows, in reference to the Parousia. In Rev 21.25 and 22.5, the passing of the ‘night’ indicates the realization of that to which the Parousia looked forward, the establishment of the kingdom of God forever. See also Delitzsch, Iris, 35.

HENRY E. DOKSER

NIGHT-HAWK, ni-thok (Nighthawk), tahmâs, "tach-mas"; γαλακτης, gleæx, but sometimes streulhabës, and seiréthos; Lat caprimulgus): The Heb tahmâs means “to tear and scratch the face,” so that it is very difficult to select the bird intended by its use. Any member of the eagle, vulture, owl or hawk families driven to desperation would “tear and scratch” with the claws and bite in self-defence. The bird is mentioned only in the lists of abominations (see Lev 11.15; De 14.15). There are three supposed reasons why the hawk, vulture, eagle, etc. were more properly, was intended. The lists were sweeping and included almost every common bird unfit for food. Because of its peculiar characteristics it had been made the object of fable and superstition. It fed on wing at night and constantly uttered weird cries. Lastly, it was a fierce fighter when disturbed in brooding or raising its young. Its habitat was to lie on its back and fight with beak and claw with such ferocity that it seemed very possible that it would “tear and scratch the face.” Some commentators insist that the bird intended was an owl, but for the above reasons the night-jar seems most probable; also several members of the owl family were clearly indicated in the list. See Hawk.

GENE STRAWLEY, GENES

NIGHT-MONSTER, ni-thون-ster (Nimh, night, LXX ωνικαιταροι, onikentairos; Vulg lamus):

I. THE ACCEPTED TRANSLATION
1. Professor Rogers’ Statement
2. Excision to the Statement

II. FOLKLORE IN THE OT
1. Peculiarity of References
2. Reference here and in Acts of Poetical Passages
3. The References Allusive
4. Possibility of Non-mythological Interpretation
5. The Term myths.
I. The Accepted Translation.—The term "night-monster" is a hypothetical transliteration of the Heb term לילה, used only once, in Isa 34:14. The word is "night-owl," RV "night-monster," in the "night-monster" is also an interpretation, inasmuch as it implies that the Heb word is a Loan-Hebrew, and that the reference indicates a survival of primitive folklore.

Concerning this weird superstition, and its strange, single appearance in the Book of Isa, Professor Rogers has this to say: "The *lil* was only to cast out with many incantations. The *lil* was attended by a serving maid, the aralil ("maid of night"), which in the Semitic development was transferred into the fem. *liltu*. It is most curious and interesting to observe that this ghost-demon lived on through the history of the Heb religion, and was carried over into the Heb religion, there to found at least one single mention in the words of one of the Heb prophets (cf. "Lilith, the Youth of the Sea," Isa. 34:14).

Exception is to be taken to this statement, admitting the etymological assumption upon which it rests, that "lilith" is a word in a new translation of the night-ghost. In the religion of the Hebrews as found in the Scriptures, it is certainly worthwhile of more than passing notice that a conception which is so prominent in the Heb mythology, and is worked out with great fulness of doctrinal and ritualistic detail, has, among the Hebrews, so far receded into the background as to receive but one mention in the Bible, and that a bald citation without detail in a highly poetic passage.

The most that can possibly be said, with safety, is that if the passage in Isa is to be taken as a survival of folklore, it is analogous to those survivals of obsolete ideas still to be found in current speech, and in the lit. of the modern world (see LUTAT). The problem is to decide whether the starting of the night-ghost in this belief is a survival of a folk-tale, or of interest in it as such, on the part of the prophetic writer. On the contrary, the nature of the reference implies that the word was used simply to add a picturesque detail into a vivid, imaginative description. In the former case, there is no evidence of active participation in this belief, or even of interest in it as such, on the part of the prophetic writer. On the contrary, the nature of the reference implies that the word was used simply to add a picturesque detail into a vivid, imaginative description. In this kind of folklore, the emphasis is on the possibilities of active participation, and on the part of the prophetic writer. On the contrary, the nature of the reference implies that the word was used simply to add a picturesque detail into a vivid, imaginative description. In the latter case, there is no evidence of active participation in this belief, or even of interest in it as such, on the part of the prophetic writer. On the contrary, the nature of the reference implies that the word was used simply to add a picturesque detail into a vivid, imaginative description. In the latter case, there is no evidence of active participation in this belief, or even of interest in it as such, on the part of the prophetic writer.

II. Folklore in the OT.—Attention has been called elsewhere to the meagerness, in the matter of detail, of OT demonology (see DEMON, DEMONOLOGY; Compare Demonology). A kindred fact of great importance should be briefly noticed here, namely, that the traces of mythology and popular folklore in the Bible are surprisingly faint and indistinct. We have the following list of items in which such traces have been discovered: "Lilith" (כֶּלֶת), mentioned in Job 9:13, 26:12; Isa 51:9; "Tanin" (תַּנִּין), Isa 27:1; "Leviathan" (לֵיטָהְּן), mentioned in Job 34, 27:3; Job 41:23; Job 51:9; "Tanin" (תַּנִּין, תַּנִּין), Isa 27:1; "Leviathan" (לֵיטָהְּן, לֵיטָהְּן), Job 3:8; Ps 74:14; Isa 27:1; Ezek 29:3; Job 41:23; the "serpent in the sea," in Am 9:3; "Scirin" (כֶּרֶת, כֶּרֶת), 2 Ch 11:5; Lev 17:7; 2 K 22:3; Isa 13:21, 34:14; "Alkah" (גּוֹלָה, גּוֹלָה), Prov 30:15; "Azazel" (אֶזֶר, אֶזֶר), Lev 16:8, 10, 26; "Lilith" (from sup.), Isa 34:15.

A review of these passages brings certain very interesting facts to light.

The references are few in number. "Rahab" is mentioned 3 times; Tanin (in this connection), once; Leviathan, 5 times; the serpent in the sea, once; Seirim, 5 times (twice with reference to idols); and Azazel, also.

1. Paucity of sea, once; Seirim, 5 times (twice with reference to idols); and Azazel, also.

2. References to sea, once; Seirim, 5 times (twice with reference to idols); and Azazel, also.

3. The References to sea, one ch and in the same connection; Lilith, one.

These references, with the single exception of Azazel to which we shall return a little later, are all in highly poetical passages. On general grounds of demonology alone, we should not ascribe conscious and deliberate mythology to writers or speakers of the Bible in passages marked by imaginative description and poetic imagery, any more than we should ascribe such beliefs to modern writers under like circumstances.

3. The References to sea, one ch and in the same connection; Lilith, one.

All these references are in the highest degree allusive. They exhibit no exercise of the mythological fancy and have received no particular elaboration or embellishment, but no longer interesting in itself.

Every one of these words is sufficiently obscure in origin and uncertain in meaning to admit the possibility of a non-mythological interpretation; indeed, in several of the cases we have reached to the point of a complete parallelism a non-mythological use is evident. Bible-Dictionary writers are apt to say (e.g. concerning "lilith") that there is no doubt concerning the mythological reference. The reader may discover for himself that the lexicographers are more cautious (see BDB, in loc.). The use of "Rahab" in Job 26:12 is not mythological for the simple reason that it is figurative; the use of "Leviathan" in Isa 27:1 and Ezek 29:3 comes under the same category. In Job 40 and 41, if the identification of beasts of burden is made, the existence of a nummus and crocodile be allowed to stand and the mythical significance of the two be admitted, we have the stage where mythology has become a fixed and universal symbolism which can be used to convey truths derived from the one (see LEVIATHAN; "Job," New Ext. Bible, 1965; Meth. Rev., May, 1913, 429 ff.). The sea serpent of Am 9:3 is not necessarily the dragon or Tiamat, and the use of the term is merely suggestive. The term is used in literal use for "he-goat" (Nu 15:24, et al.) and is doubtless throughout. Ewald translates it "he-goat" in Isa 34:14 and "Satyr" in Is 13:21. It means lit. "shaggy monster" (Vulg. pilosus). We do not hesitate on the basis of the evidence to assign the term "Alkah" (Prov 30:15, RV "vampire," by some tr "vampire") and "Azazel" (Lev 16:8, et al.) as interpreted as a "demon of the desert," from the list of mythological words altogether. As ripe a scholar as Perowne ("Prov., Cambridge Bible") combats the idea of vampire, and Kellogg ("Lev., Expositor's Bible, in loc.") has simply put to rout the mythological-demonic interpretation of Azazel. Even in the case of lilith the derivation is obscure, and the objections urged against the demonic idea by Alexander have not altogether lost their force (see Conn, in loc. Theology). The problem is one of balance of probabilities in one direction or the other.

One further fact with regard to lilith must be considered. The term occurs in a list of creatures, the greater part of which are matter-of-fact animals.
or birds. A comparative glance at a half-dozen trs of the passage Isa 34:11-14 will convince any reader that there are a great many obscure and difficult words to be found in the list. Following Delitzsch's tr we have: "pelican," "hedge-hog," "horned-owl," "raven," "wild-dog," "ostrich," "forest-demon" (e'tfr), "night-monster." This is a curious mixture of real and imaginary creatures. Alexander acutely observes that there is too much or too little mythology in the passage. One of two conclusions would seem to follow from a list so constructed: Either all these creatures are looked upon as more or less demonic (see Whitehouse, HDB, art. black or blue. This name does not occur in the Heb of the OT or in the Eng. tr):

5. The Term or.t

I. The Nile in Physical Geography
1. Description
2. Geological Origin
3. The Making of Egypt
4. The Inundation
5. The Infiltration

II. The Nile in History
1. The Location of Temples
2. The Location of Cemeteries
3. The Damming of the Nile
4. Egyptian Families

III. The Nile in Religion
1. The Nile as a God
2. The Nile in the Osiran Myth
3. The Celestial Nile

"Demon," with which cf W. M. Alexander, Demonic Possession in the NT, 16), or, as seems to the present writer far more probable, none in the list is considered otherwise than as supposed literal inhabitants of the wilderness. The writer of Isa 34:14, who was not constructing a scientific treatise, but using his imagination, has constructed a list in which are combined real and imaginary creatures popularly supposed to inhabit unpeopled solitudes. There still remains a by no means untenable supposition that none of the terms necessarily are mythological in this particular passage.

LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET

NIGHT-WATCH, ntw'och (.getLabel) sh'mrah, 'ashmūrah ba-laylah, "watch in the night"): One of the three or four divisions of the night. See Watch; Time.

NILE, nI (Ne'elos, Neilos, meaning not certainly known; perhaps refers to the color of the water, as

A river of North Africa, the great river of Egypt. The name employed in the OT to designate the Nile is in the Heb nn, y'ôr, Egypt dâr, earlier, dôtir, usually trd 'river,' also occasionally 'canals' (Ps 78:44; Ezk 29:3f). In a general way it means all the water of Egypt. The Nile is also the principal river included in the phrase לנהר הים, naḥar ha-yâma, "rivers of Ethiopia" (Isa 18:1). Poetically the Nile is called דרך ים, 'yam, 'sea' (Job 41:31; Nah 3:8; probably Isa 18:2), but this is not a name of the river. שִׁיבֹר, shêbôr, not always written fully, has also been interpreted in a mistaken way of the Nile (see Simon). Likewise דרך ים, naḥar me-yâma, "brook of Egypt," a border stream in no way connected with the Nile, has sometimes been mistaken for that river. See River of Egypt.

I. The Nile in Physical Geography.—The Nile is formed by the junction of the White Nile and
Nile
Nineveh
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the Blue Nile in lat. 15° 45' N. and long. 32° 45' E. The Blue N. rises in the highlands of Abyssinia, lat. 12° 30' N., long. 33° E., and flows
1. Description
N.W. 500 miles to its junction with the White N. The White N., the upper branch of the Blue N., rises in Victoria Nyanza, a great lake in Central Africa, a few miles N. of the equator, long. 33° E. (more exactly the N. may be said to rise at the headwaters of the Ruzegga River, a small stream on the other side of the lake, 3° S. of the equator), and flows N. in a tortuous channel, 1,400 miles to its junction with the Blue N. From this junction-point the N. flows N. through Nubia and Egypt, 1,900 miles and empties into the Mediterranean Sea, in lat. 32° N., through 2 mouths, the Rosetta, E. of Alexandria, and the Damietta, W. of Port Said. There were formerly 7 mouths scattered along a coast-line of 140 miles.

The Nile originated in the Tertiary period and has continued from that time to this, though by the subsidence of the land 220 ft. along the Mediterranean shore in the Pluvial times, the river was much shortened. Later in the Pluvial times the land rose again and is still rising slowly.

Cultivable Egypt is altogether the product of the N., every particle of the soil having been brought down by the river from the heart of the continent and deposited along the banks and sps. in the delta at the mouth of the river. The banks have risen higher and higher and extended farther and farther back by the deposit of the sediment, until the valley of arable land varies in width in most parts from 3 or 4 miles to 9 or 10 miles. The mouth of the river, however, after the time of elevation of the land in Pluvial times, was at first not far from the lat. of Cairo. From this point northward the river has built up a delta of 140 miles on each side, over which it spreads itself and empties into the sea through its many mouths.

The watering of Egypt by the inundation from the N. is the most striking feature of the physical character of that land, and one of the most interesting and remarkable physical phenomena in the world. The inundation is produced by the combination of an indirect and a direct cause. The indirect cause is the rain and melting snow on the equatorial mountains in Central Africa, which maintains in the White N. a great volume of water in the month of July. The direct cause is torrential rains in the highlands of Abyssinia which send down the Blue N. a sudden great increase in the volume of water. The inundation has two periods each year. The first begins about July 15 and continues until nearly the end of September. After a slight recession, the river again rises early in October in the great inundation. High Nile is in October, 25 to 30 ft., low Nile in June, about 125 ft. The Nilometer for recording the height of the water of inundation dates from very early times. Old Nilometers are found still in situ at Edfu and Assuan. The watering and fertilizing of the land is the immediate effect of the inundation; its ultimate result is that making of Egypt which is still in progress. The settling of the sediment from the water upon the land has raised the surface of the valley about 1 ft. in 300 to 400 years, about 9 to 10 ft. near Cairo since the beginning of the early great temples. The deposit varies greatly at other places. As the deposit of sediment has been upon the bottom of the river, as well as upon the surface of the land, though more slowly, on account of the swiftness of the current, the river also has been lifted up, and thus the inundation has extended farther and farther to the E., and the W., as the level of the valley would permit, depositing the sediment and thus making the cultivable land wider, as well as the soil deeper, year by year. At Heliopolis, a little N. of Cairo, this extension to the E. has been 3 to 4 miles since the building of the great temple there.

5. The N. percolating through the porous Infiltration soil. This percolation is called the infiltration of the N. It always extends as far as possible away from the river and the level of the water in the river at the time will permit. This infiltration, next to the inundation, is the most important physical phenomenon in Egypt. By means of it much of the irrigation of the land during the dry season is carried on from wells. It has had its influence also in the political and religious changes of the country (cf. below).

II. The Nile in History.—Some of the early temples were located near the N., probably because of the delification of the river. The rising of the surface of the land, and at the same time the bed of the river, from the inundation, lifted both the old and its great river, but left the temples down at the old level. In time the infiltration of the river from its new higher level reached farther and farther and rose to a higher level until the floor of these old temples was under water even at the time of lowest N., and then gods and goddesses, priests and ceremonial all were driven out. At least two of the greatest temples and most sacred places, Heliopolis and Memphis, had to be abandoned. Probably this fact had as much to do with the downfall of Egypt's religion, as political disasters and the actual destruction of its temples by eastern invaders. Nature's God had driven out the gods of Nature.

Some prehistoric burials are found on the higher ground, as at Kef Amur. A thousand years of history would be quite sufficient to teach Egyptians that the N. was still making Egypt. Thenceforth, cemeteries were located at the mountains on the eastern and the western boundaries of the valley. Here they continue to this day: for the most part still entirely above the waters of the inundation—and usually above the reach of the infiltration.
III. The Nile in Religion.—One of the gods of the Egyptian pantheon was Hapi, the Nile. In early times it divided the honors with Ra, the Sun-god. No wonder it was so. If the Egyptians set out to worship Nature-gods at all, surely then the sun and the Nile first.

The origin of the Osirian myth is still much discussed. Very much evidence, perhaps conclusive evidence, can be adduced to prove that:

1. The Nile sungod. No wonder it was so. If the Egyptians set out to worship Nature-gods at all, surely then the sun and the Nile first.

2. The Nile it rose originally from the Nile; that in Osirian Myth Osiris was first of all the N., then the water of the N., then the soil, the product of the waters of the N., and then Egypt, the product of the soil.

Egypt was the Egyptian's little world, and Egypt was the Nile. It was thus quite natural for the Egyptians in considering the celestial world to image it in likeness of their own little world, with a celestial Nile flowing through it. It is so represented in the mythology, but the conception of the heavens is vague.

M. G. KYLE

NIMROD, nim'rod (נִרְוָד, nî'rôd; B, נִמְרֹד, Nîmrôd, Nebîrîd; Nehbîrîd): A descendant of Ham, mentioned in the “generations of the sons of Noah” (Gen 10: 1 1 Ch 1 10) as a son of Cush. He established his kingdom “in the land of Shinar,” including the cities “Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh” (ver 10), of which only Babel, or Babylon, and Erech, or Urrik, have been identified with certainty. “The land of Shinar” is the old name for Southern Babylon, afterward called Chaldæa (erech kassim), and was probably more extensive in territory than the Sumer of the inscriptions in the ancient royal title, “King of Shumer and Accad,” since Accad is included here in Shinar. Nimrod, like other great kings of Mesopotamian lands, was a mighty hunter, possibly the mightiest and the prototype of them all, since to his name had attached itself the proverb: “Like Nimrod a mighty hunter before Jeh,” (ver 9). In the primitive days of Mesopotamia, as also in Pal, wild animals were so numerous that they became a menace to life and property (Ex 33 30; Lev 26 22); therefore the king as benefactor and protector of his people hunted these wild beasts. The early conquest of the cities of Babylon, or their federation into one great kingdom, is here ascribed to Nimrod. Whether the founding and colonization of Assyria (ver 11) are to be ascribed to N. will be determined by the exegesis of the text. EV reads: “Out of that land 3e [i.e. Nimrod] went forth into Assyria, and built Nineveh,” etc, this tr assigning the rise of Assyria to N., and apparently being sustained by Mic 5 6 (ef J. M. F. Smith, “Nimrod,” ICC, in loc.); but ARVm renders: “Out of that land went forth Asshur, and built Nineveh,” which tr is more accurate exegetically and not in conflict with Mic 5 6, if in the latter “land of Nimrod” be understood, not as parallel with, but as supplemental to, Assyria, and therefore as Babylon (cf comm. of Cheyne, Pusey, S. Clark, in loc.).

N. has not been identified with any mythical hero or historic king of the inscriptions. Some have sought identification with Gilgamesh, the flood hero of Babylon (Sinimer, Skinner, Cheyne, W. J. Pal, others with a later Kassite king (Haupt, Hilprecht), which is quite unlikely; but the most admissible correspondence is with Marduk, chief god of Babylon, probably his historic founder, just as Asshur, the god of Asshur, appears in ver 11 as the founder of the Assyrian empire (Wellhausen, Price, Sayce). Lack of identification, however, does not necessarily indicate mythical origin of the name. See Astronomy, II, 11; Babylonia and Assyria, Religion of, IV, 7; Merodach, Orion, Edward Mack

NIMSHI, nim'shi (נִמשי, nimshē): The grand-father of Jehu (2 K 9 2). Jehu's usual designation is "son of Nimshi" (1 K 19 16).

NINEVEH, nin'e-ve (נינבש, ninevē): Nineveh, Ninevah, Nisibis; Gr and Rom writers, Ninus, Ninos):

1. Beginning, Name, Position

i. Place of Biblical Mention

ii. Etymology of the Name

iii. Position on the Tigris

2. Nineveh and Its Surroundings

i. Its Walls

ii. Principal Mounds and Gateways

iii. Externals and Population Within the Walls

iv. Extent outside the Walls

v. Canal, Resen and Rehoboth-ir

vi. Khorassand

vii. Sherif Khan and Selameh

viii. Nimroud
THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

III. PALACES AT NINEVEH PROPER
1. The Palace of Assur-bani-apli

IV. SENNACHERI'S DESCRIPTION OF NINEVEH
1. The Walls
2. The Gates—Northwest
3. The Gates—South and East
4. The Gates—West
5. The Outer Wall: the Plantations
6. The Water Supply, etc.
7. How the Bas-Reliefs Illustrate the King's Description
8. Nineveh the later Capital

V. LAST DAYS AND FALL OF NINEVEH

I. Beginnings, Name, Position.—The first Biblical mention of Nineveh is in Gen 10:11, where it is stated that Nimnóq (q.v.) or Assur went out into Assyria, and built N. Biblical and Rel. Ir, and Calah, and Mention Resen between N. and Calah, with the addition, "the same is the great city."
Everything indicates that these statements are correct, for N. was certainly at one time under Bab.
rule, and was at first not governed by Assyrian kings, but by petty or viceroyes of Assur, the old capital.
To all appearance N. took its name from the Bab Nair near LAGÁS in South Babylonia, on the
Euphrates, from which early foundation it was probably colonized. The native name appears as Ḍáiná or Šín (q.v.), written with the character for "water enclosure" with that for "fish."
2. Etymology of the Name Bab Nair was a place where fish were very abundant. Ištar or Šin, the goddess of the city, was associated with Nin-máh, Merodach's spouse, as goddess of reproduction. Fish are also plentiful in the Tigris at Mosul, the modern town on the other side of the river, and this may have influenced the choice of the name by the Bab settlers, and the foundation there of the great temple of Ištar or Šín. The date of this foundation is unknown, but it may have taken place about 3000 BC.

N. lay on the eastern bank of the Tigris, at the point where the Khor falls into that stream. The outline of the wall is rectangular on the E., but of an irregular shape on the W., and of an irregular shape on the W., but of an irregular shape on the E. E. The western fortifications run from N.H. to S.E., following roughly, the course of the river, which now flows about 1,500 yards from the walls, instead of close to them, as anciently.

II. NINEVEH AND ITS SURROUNDINGS.—According to the late G. Smith, the southwestern wall has a length of about 2½ mi., and is joined at its 1. Its Walls its western corner by the southwestern wall, which runs in a northeasterly direction for about ½ mi. The northeastern wall, starting here, runs at first in a southeasterly direction, but turns southward, gradually approaching the southwestern wall, to which, at the end of about 3½ mi. it is joined by a short wall, facing nearly S., rather more than half a mile long.

The principal mounds are Kouyunjik, a little N.E. of the village of Amusiyeh, and Nebi-Yunas, about 1½ mi. to the S.E. Both of these lie just within the S.W. wall.

2. Principal Mounds Extensive remains of buildings occupy and gate-ways the fortified area. Numerous openings occur in the walls, many of them ancient. Though some seem to have been made after the abandonment of the site. The principal gate on the N.W. was guarded by winged bulls (see Layard, Monuments of Nineveh, 2d series, pl. 3; Nineveh and Babylon, 120). Other gates gave access to the principal roads of the country, such as the E. passing through the curved outlooks and the double line of fortifications which

protected the northeastern wall from attack on that side, where the Ninevites evidently considered that they had most to fear.

According to G. Smith, the circuit of the inner wall is about 8½ mi., and Captain Jones, who made a trigonometrical survey in 1854, estimated that, allotting to each inhabitant 50 sq. yards, the city may have contained 174,000 inhabitants.

In the statement of Jon 4:11, that the city contained 120,000 persons who could not discern between their right hand and their left, be intended to give the number of the city's children only, then the population must have numbered about 600,000. Now, however, the three cities of the same extent would have been needed to contain them. It has therefore been supposed—and that with great probability—that there was a large extension of the city outside its walls. This Wall is not only indicated by Jon 3:3, where it is described as "an exceedingly great city of three days' journey" to traverse, but also by the extant ruins, which stretch S.E. along the banks of the Tigris as far as Resen (Koioûri, Coioûri), while its northern extension may have been regarded as including Khorsabad.

Concerning the positions of two of the cities mentioned with N., namely, Calah and Resen, there can be no doubt, notwithstanding that Resen has not yet been identified with a modern city. The Ashur-ban-apli, Rehoboth-Ir, is the modern Nimroud, and Resen lay between that site and N. The name Rehoboth-Ir has not yet been found in the inscriptions, but Fried. Deltzsch has suggested that it may be the rébab Nínus of the inscriptions, N.E. of N. If this be the case, the N. of Jonah contained within it all the places in Gen 10:11-12, and Khorsabad besides.

Taking the outlying ruins from N. to S., we begin with Khorsabad (Dur-Sarru-İňa or Dur-Sargina), 12 miles N.E. of Kouyunjik, the great palace mound of N. proper. Khorsabad is a great inclosure about 2,000 yards square, with the remains of towers and gateways. The palace mound lies on its northwest side, and consists of a large inclosure, uniform with the remains of Sargon's palace and its temple, with a ziggurat or temple-tower similar to those at Babylon, Borsippa, Calah and elsewhere. This last still shows traces of the tints symbolic of the 7 planets of which its stonework is, to some, emblematic. The palace ruins show numerous halls, rooms and passages, many of which were faced with slabs of coarse alabaster, sculptured in relief with military operations, hunting-scenes, mythological figures, etc., while the principal en-

trances were flanked with the finest winged human-headed bulls which Assyrian art has so far revealed. The palace was built about 712 BC, and was probably destroyed by fire when N. fell in 606 BC, sharing the same fate. Some of the slabs and winged bulls are in the Louvre and the British Museum, but most of the antiquarian spoils were lost in the Tigris by the sinking of the rafts upon which they were loaded after being discovered.

Another outlying suburb was probably Tarbiš, now represented by the ruins at Khedâvîn, about 3 miles N. of Kouyunjik. In this latter case palace, Sennacheri calls it—dedicated to Nergal. Anciently it must have been a place of some importance, as Esar- haq claims to have built a palace there, as well as the "seat of the gods of Assur, Assur-bani-apli. The site of Resen, "between N. and Calah," is the northern road of the Tigris, 8 mi. S. of N., and 3 miles N. of Nimroud (Calah). It is in the form of an irregular inclosure on a high mound over- looking the Tigris, with a surface of about 400 acres.
No remains of buildings, sculptures or inscriptions have, however, been found there.

After N. itself (Kouyunjik), the ruins known as Ninrrood, 14 or 15 miles S.E., are the most important. They mark the site of the ancient Calah, and have already been described under that heading (see p. 539). As there stated, the stone-faced temple-tower seems to be referred to by Ovid, and is apparently also mentioned by Xenophon (see Resen). The general tendency of the accumulated references to these sites supports the theory that they were regarded as belonging to N., if not by the Assyrians themselves (who knew well the various municipal districts), at least by the foreigners who had either visited the city or had heard or read descriptions of it.

III. The Palaces at Nineveh Proper.—The palaces at N. were built upon extensive artificial platforms between 30 and 50 ft. high, either of sun-dried brick, as at Ninrrood, or of earth and rubbish, as at Kouyunjik. It is thought that they were faced with masonry, and that access was gained to them by means of flights of deep steps, or sloping pathways. Naturally it is the plan of the basement floor alone that can at present be traced, any upper stories that may have existed having disappeared. The halls and rooms discovered were faced with slabs of alabaster or other stone, often sculptured with bas-reliefs depicting warlike expeditions, the chase, religious ceremonies and divine figures. The depth of the accumulations over these varies from a few inches to about 30 ft., and if the amount in some cases would seem to be excessive, it is thought that this may have been due either to the existence of upper chambers, or to the extra height of the room. The chambers, which are grouped around courtyards, are long and narrow, with small square rooms at the ends. The partition walls vary from 6 to 15 ft. in thickness, and are of sun-dried brick, against which the stone paneling was fixed. As in the case of the Bab temples and palaces, the rooms and halls open into each other, so that, to gain access to those farthest from the courtyard entrance, one or more halls or chambers had to be traversed. No traces of windows have been discovered, and little can therefore be said as to the method of lighting, but the windows were either high up, or light was admitted through openings in the roof.

The palace of Sennacherib lay in the southeast corner of the platform, and consisted of a courtyard surrounded on all four sides by numerous long halls, and rooms, of which the innermost were capable of being rendered private. It was in this palace that were found the reliefs depicting the siege of Lachish, with the representation of Sennacherib seated on his “standing” throne, while the captives and the spoil of the city passed before him. The grand entrance was flanked by winged bulls facing toward the spectator as he entered. They were in couples, back to back, on each side of the doorway, and between each pair the ancient Bab hero-giant, carrying in one hand the “boomerang,” and holding tightly with his left arm a struggling lion (Layard, Nineveh and Babylon, 157) was represented, just as at his father Sargon’s palace at Khorsabad. The upper part of these imposing figures had been destroyed, but they were so massive, that the distinguished explorer attributed their overthrow not to the act of man, but to some convulsion of Nature.

In the north of the mound are the ruins of the palace of Assur-bani-apli or Assur-bani-pal, discovered by Hormuzd Rassam. His latest plan (Assur and the Land of Nineveh, 1897, plate facing p. 30) does not give apli the whole of the structure, much of the building having been destroyed; but the general arrangement of the rooms was upon the traditional lines. The slabs with which they were paneled showed bas-reliefs illustrating the Assyrian campaigns against Babylonia, certain Arab tribes, and Elam. As far as they are preserved, the sculptures are wonderfully good, and the whole decorative scheme of the paneled walls, of which, probably, the greater part is forever lost, may be characterized, notwithstanding their defects of perspective and their mannerisms, as nothing less than magnificent. The lion-hunts of the great king, despite the curious treatment of the animals’ manes (due to the sculptors’ ignorance of the right way to represent hair) are admirable. It would be difficult to improve upon the expressions of fear, rage and suffering on the part of the animals there delineated. The small sculptures showing Assur-bani-apli hunting the goat and the wild ass are not less noteworthy, and are executed with great delicacy.

IV. Sennacherib’s Description of Nineveh.—In all probability the best description of the city is that given by Sennacherib on the cylinder recording his expedition to Tarsus in Cilicia. From ancient times, he says, the circuit of the city had measured 9,300 cubits, and he makes the rather surprising statement that his predecessors had not built either the inner or the outer wall, which, if true, shows how confident they were of their security from attack. He claims to have enlarged the city by 12,515 cubits. The great defensive wall which he built was called by the Sumerian name of Bad-kimgallitu-la-bala, which he translates as “the wall whose glory overthrows the enemy.” He made the brickwork 40 cubits thick, which would probably not greatly exceed the estimate of G. Smith, who reckoned it to have measured about 50 ft. The height
of the wall he raised to 180 tipki, which, admitting
the estimate of Diodorus, should amount to about
100 ft.

In this inclosing wall were 15 gates, which he
enumerates in full. Three of these were situated in the short
northern wall—the gate of Hadad; the
gate of Urg or Hadad of Tarbihun (Sherif-
Khan), and the gate of the moon-god
Nannar, Sennacherib's own deity. The
plans show five openings on the side, any of which may have been the gate
used when going to Tarbihun, but they adorned with
winged bulls probably furnished the shortest route.

The gates looking toward the S. and the E. were the
Asur-gate (leading to the old capital); Sennacherib's
Halai-gate, the gate of Sunin at Carchal, the
gate of the god Enil of Kar-Ninili, and the "covered gate," which seems to
have had the reputation of letting forth
the fever-demon. After this are men-
tioned the Shemita-gate, and the gate of
Halaih in Mesopotamia. This last must
have been the extreme northeastern opening, now
communicating with the road to Khorsabad, implying that
Halaih lay in that direction.

The gates on the w. or river-side of the city
were "the gate of Ea, director of my water-
springs"; the quay-gate, "bringer
of the tribute of my peoples"; the
gate of the land of Bari, within
which the presents of the
Sumerians entered (brought down
by the Tigris from Babylonia, in
all probability), the gate of the tribute-people
armony; and the gate of the god Sar-ur—
"altogether 5 gates in the direction of the W."
There are about 9 wide openings in the wall on
this side, 2 being on each side of the Kourynik
mound, and 3 on each side of that called Nebi-
Yunus. As openings at these points would
have endangered the city's safety, these 3 have
probably to be eliminated, leaving 2 in N. of
Nebi-Yunus, 2 between that and Kourynik,
and one in Kourynik. Minor means of exit
probably existed at all points where they were
regarded as needful.

To the outer wall of the city Sennacherib gave a
Sumerian name meaning, "the wall which terrifies
the enemy." At a depth of 54 gar,
the underground water-level, its
foundations were laid upon blocks of
stone, the object of this great depth
being to frustrate undermining.
The wall was made "high like a mountain."

Above and beyond the city he laid out plantations,
wherein all the sweet-smelling herbs of Heth (Pal
and Phoenicia) grew, fruitful beyond those of their
homeland. Among them were to be found every
kind of mountain-vine, and the plants of all the
nations around.

In connection with this, in all probability, he
arranged the water-supply, conducting a distant
water-course to N. by means of con-
ducts. Being a successful venture, he
seems to have watered therewith all
the people's orchards, and in winter
1,000 corn fields above and below the
city. The force of the increased current in the
river Khosar was retarded by the creation of a
swamp, and among the reeds which grew there
were placed wild fowl, wild swine, and deer(?). Here he repeated his exotic plantations, including
trees for wood, cotton (apparently) and seemingly
the olive.

Sennacherib's bas-reliefs show some of the phases
of the work which his cylinder inscriptions describe.

We see the winged bulls, which are of
colossal dimensions, sometimes lying
bas-reliefs on their sledge (shaped like boats or
Illustrate Assyrian ships), and sometimes standing
the King's and supported by scaffolding.

Description

bridges rest upon rollers, and are
dragged by armies of captives urged
action by taskmasters with whips. Others force
the sledges forward from behind by means of enor-
mous levers whose upper ends are held in position
by guy-ropes. Each side has to pull with great
force, for if the higher end of the great lever fell, the
side which had pulled too hard suffered in killed
and crushed, or at least in bruised, workmen of the
number. In the background are the soldiers of the
guard, and behind them extensive wooded hills.
In other bas-reliefs it is apparently the pleasure-
grounds of the palace which are seen. In these
the background is an avenue of trees, alternately tall
and short, and on the banks of a river, whereon are boats,
and men riding astride inflated skins, which are
much used in these days, as now. On another slab,
the great king himself, in his hand-chariot drawn by
eunuchs, superintends the work.

How long N. had been the capital of Assyria is
unknown. The original capital was Assur, about 50
miles to the S., and probably this continued to be
regarded as the religious and official capital of the
country. Assur-naṣir-apli seems to have had a
greater liking for Calah (Nimroud), and Sargon
for Khorsabad, where he had founded a splendid
palace. These latter, however, probably
never had the importance of N.,
and attained their position merely on
account of the reigning king building a
palace and residing there. The period
of N.'s supremacy seems to have been from the
beginning of the reign of Sennacherib to the end of
that of Assur-naṣir-apli, including, probably, the
reigns of his successors likewise—a period of about
95 years (704-606 BC).

V. Last Days and Fall of Nineveh.—N., during
the centuries of her existence, must have seen many
stirring historical events; but the most noteworthy were probably Sennacherib's triumphal entries, including that following the capture of Lachish, the murder of that city's constable by his son (recent theory that he was killed at Babylon needs confirmation), and the coronial triumphs of Assur-bani-apli—the great and noble Osmappid (Ezr 4 10). After the reign of Assur-bani-apli came his son Assur-erbil-lani, who was succeeded by Sin-sarr-isikun (Saracoe), but the history of the country, and also of the city, is practically non-existent during these last two reigns. The Assyrian and Bab records are silent with regard to the fall of the city, but Alexander Polykar, Abylenus and Synecellus all speak of it. The best account, however, is that of Diodorus Siculus, who refers to a legend that the city could not be taken until the river became its enemy. Arbaces, the Scythian, besieged it, but could not make any impression on it for 2 years. In the 3rd year, however, the river (according to Commander Jones, not the Tigris, but the Khoes), being swollen by rains, and very rapid in its current, carried away a portion of the wall, and by this opening the besiegers gained an entrance. The king, recognizing in this the fulfilment of the oracle, gathered together his concubines and eunuchs, and, mounting a funeral pyre which he had caused to be constructed, perished in the flames. This catastrophe is supposed to be referred to in Nah 1 8: "With an over-running flood he [the Lord] will make a full end of her place [i.e. of N.]," and 2 6: "The gates of the rivers are opened, and the palace is dissolved." The destruction of the city by fire is probably referred to in 3 13:15. The picture of the scenes in her streets—the noise of the whip, the rattling wheels, the prancing horses, the bounding chariots (3 2 ff), followed by a vivid description of the carnage of the battlefield—is exceedingly striking, and true to their records and their sculptures.

Literature.—The standard books on the discovery and exploration of N. are Layard, Nineveh and Its Remains (two vols, 1849); Nineveh and Babylon (1853); Monuments of Nineveh, 1st and 2d series (plates) (1849 and 1853); and Hormuzd Rassam, Assyri and the Land of Nimrod (Cincinnati and New York, 1857).

T. G. Pinches


I. The Discovery.—In the spring of 1850, the workmen of Sir A. H. Layard at Nineveh made an important discovery. In the ruins of the palace of Assur-bani-pal they found a passage which opened into two small chambers leading one into the other. The doorway was guarded on either side by figures of Ea, the god of culture and the inventor of letters, in his robe of fishskin. The walls of the chambers had once been paneled with bas-reliefs, one of which represented a city standing on the shore of a sea that was covered with galleys. Up to the height of a foot or more the floor was paved with clay tablets that had fallen from the shelves on which they had been arranged in order, and the larger number of them was consequently broken. Similar tablets, but in lesser number, were found in the adjoining chambers. After Layard's departure, other tablets were discovered by Mr. Hormuzd Rassam, and then the excavations ceased for many years. The discovery of the Bab version of the account of the Deluge, however, by Mr. George Smith in 1873 led the proprietors of the Daily Telegraph to send him to Nineveh in the hope that the missing portions of the story might be found. He had not been excavating there long before he came across a fragment of another version of the story, and then once more the excavations came to an end. Since then expeditions have been sent by the British Museum which have resulted in the recovery of further remains of the ancient library of Nineveh.

II. The Library.—The tablets formed a library in the true sense of the word. Libraries had existed in the cities of Babylonia from a remote date, and the Assyrian kings, whose civilization was derived from Babylonia, imitated the example of Babylonia in this as in other respects. The only true booklover among them, however, was Assur-bani-pal. He was one of the most munificent royal patrons of learning the world has ever seen, and it was to him that the great library of Nineveh owed its existence. New editions were made of older works, and the public and private libraries of Babylonia were rammed in search of literary treasures.

III. Writing-Materials.—Fortunately for us the ordinary writing-material of the Babylonians and Assyrians was clay. It was more easily procurable than papyrus or parchment, and was specially adapted for the reception of the cuneiform characters. Hence, while the greater part of the old Egypt lit., which was upon papyrus, has perished that of Babylonia and Assyria has been preserved. In Babylonia the tablets after being inscribed were often merely dried in the sun; in the damper climate of Assyria they were baked in a kiln. As a large amount of text had frequently to be compressed into a small space, the writing is sometimes so minute as to need the assistance of a magnifying glass before it can be read. It is not surprising, therefore, that in the library-chambers of Nineveh Layard found a magnifying lens of crystal, which had been turned on the lathe.
IV. Contents.—The subject-matter of the tablets included all the known branches of knowledge.

1. Philology logical works. The inventors of the cuneiform system of writing had spoken an agglutinative language, called Sumerian, similar to that of the Turks or Finns today, and a considerable part of the early lit. had been written in this language, which to the later Sem Babylonians and Assyrians was akin to the European nations in the Middle Ages. The student was therefore provided with grammars and dictionaries of the two languages, as well as with reading-books and interlinear tr into Assyry of the chief Sumerian texts. Besides this long list of the cuneiform characters were drawn up with their phonetic and ideographic values, together with lists of Assyrian verbs, by which, for example, all the equivalents are given of the word "to go." The Assyry lexicographers at times attempted etymologies which are as wide of the mark as similar etymologies given by English lexicographers of a past generation. Sabattu, "Sabath," for instance, is derived from the two Sumerian words, sa, "heart," and bot, "to end," and so is explained to mean "day of rest for the heart." It is obvious that all this implies an advanced literary culture. People do not begin to compile grammars and dictionaries or to speculate on the origin of words until books and libraries abound and education is widespread.

Astronomy occupied a prominent place in Assyry lit., but it was largely mingled with astrology. The Babylonians were the founders of scientific astronomy; they were the first to calculate the dates of lunar and solar eclipses, and to give names to the signs of the Zodiac. Among these contents of the library of Nineveh are reports from the Royal Observatory, relating to the observation of eclipses and the like.

A knowledge of astronomy was needed for the regulation of the calendar, and the calendar was the special care of the priests, as the priest was, first of all, a mathematician.

3. Religious festivals of the gods and the payment of tithes were dependent upon it. Most of the religious texts went back to the Sumer period and were accordingly provided with Assyry tr. Some of these were hymns to the gods, others were the rituals used in different temples. There was, moreover, a collection of psalms, as well as numerous mythological texts.

The legal law books were in Sumerian, but the great code compiled by Khammurabi, the contemporaneous of Abraham, was in Sem Babylonian (see Hammurabi). Like English laws, the Assyro-Babylonian law was case-made, and records of the cases decided from time to time by the judges are numerous.

Among scientific works we may class the long lists of animals, birds, fishes, plants and stones, together with geographical treatises, and the determination of the Babylonian stars. Starting from the belief that where two events followed one another, the first was the cause of the second, an elaborate pseudo-science of augury had been built up, and an enormous lit. arose on the interpretation of dreams, the observation of the liver of animals, etc. Unfortunately Assur-bani-pal had a special predilection for the subject, and the consequence is that his library was filled with works which the Assyriologist would gladly exchange for documents of a more valuable character. Among the scientific works we may also include those on medicine, as well as numerous mathematical tables.

Literature was largely represented, mainly in the form of poems on mythological, religious, or historical subjects. Among these the most famous is the epic of the hero Gilgamesh in twelve books, the Bab account of the Deluge being introduced as an episode in the eleventh book. Another epic was the story of the great battle between the god Merodach and Tiamat, the dragon of chaos and evil, which includes the story of the creation.

Historical records are very numerous, the Assyrians being distinguished among the nations of antiquity by their historical sense. A Chronicle and place of the Bab or Egypt temple; and where the Babylonian or the Assyrian would be told from a religious record, the Assyrian adorned his halls with accounts of campaigns and the victories of their royal builders. The dates which are attached to each portion of the narrative, and the care with which the names of petty princes and states are transcribed, give a high idea of the historical precision at which the Assyrians aimed. The Assyrian monuments are alone sufficient to show that the historical sense was by no means unknown to the ancient peoples of the East, and when we remember how closely related the Assyrians were to the Hebrews in both race and language, the fact becomes important to the Bib. student. Besides historical texts the library contained also chronological tables and long lists of kings and dynasties with the number of years they reigned. In Babylonia time was marked by officially naming each year after some event that had occurred in the course of it; the more historically-minded Assyrian named the year after a particular battle, and a day was appointed on each New Year's Day. In Babylonia the chronological system went back to a very remote date. The Babylonians were a commercial people, and for commercial purposes it was necessary to have an exact register of the time.

The library contained trading documents of various sorts, more esp. contracts, deeds of sale of property and the like. Now and then we meet with the plan of a building. Commerce There were also legal documents relating to the taxes paid by the cities and provinces of the empire to the imperial treasury.

One department of the library consisted of letters, some of them private, others addressed to the king or to the high officials. Nearly a thousand of these have already been published by Professor Harper.

The clay books, if need hardly be added, were all carefully numbered and catalogued, the Assyry system of docketing and arranging the tablets being at once ingenious and simple. The librarians, consequently, had no difficulty in finding any tablet or series of tablets that might be asked for. We may gather from the inscription attached to the larger works, as well as to other collections of tablets that the library was open to all "readers."
NINEVITES, nīn'ē-vītēs (Nu. 24 2; 42 7, 8; 2 Ki 14 25, 26; 17 36): Only in Lk 11 30. The passage (Mt 12 41, with Lk 11 32, has the fuller form, "men of Nineveh," which gives the meaning.

NIPHIS, nī'fēs (Ne. 5 10, 11; Ph. 4 3; Ap. Nephis; AV Nephis; Gen 11 27): Given in 1 Esd 6 21 m as = "Magbish" of Ezr 2 30, whose sons are the same in number (106) as those of Niphis, but it would seem rather to be the equivalent of Nebor in ver 20.

NISAN, nī'sān (נִסַּן, nīṣān): The first month of the Jewish year in which occurred the Passover and which corresponds to April. The month is the same also called, which occurs in the Pent. Nisan occurs in Neh 2 1 and Est 3 7. It denotes "the month of flowers." See Calendar.

NISROCH, nī'srōkh (עֵשֶׂר, nēṣrōk): The Assyr god in whose temple Semmacherib was worshipping when put to death by his sons (2 K 19 37; Isa 37 38). The name is not found elsewhere. Some identify him with Asshur, the national deity. See BABYLONIA and ASSYRIA, Religion of.

NITRE, nī'tēr (ניטר, nēṭēr; firvōn, nīṭōn): Nitre as used in AV does not correspond to the present use of that term. Nitre or niter is now applied to sodium or potassium nitrate. The writer has in his collection a specimen of sodium carbonate, called in Arab. natrān, which was taken from the extensive deposits in Lower Egypt where it is found as a deposit underneath a layer of common salt. Similar deposits are found in Syria and Asia Minor. This is probably the "nitre" of the Bible. AV has rendered nitre "lye" in Jer 2 22, and "soda" in Prov 25 20. Soda or lye has been used as a cleansing agent from earliest times. It renders energetically, when treated with an acid; hence the comparison in Prov 25 20 of the heavy-hearted man ruled by the sound of singing to the sizzling of soda on which vinegar has been poured. See Vinegar.

JAMES A. PATCH

NO, nō. See NO-AMON.

NOADIAH, nō-ad'ē-ā (נואדיה, nō'ādēyāh): "trust of Jeh"; Noadiah, Noadis). 1. (Son of Binnui, one of the Levites to whom Ezra intrusted the gold and silver and sacred vessels which he brought up from Babylon (Ezr 8 28); also called Mozri (q.v.), son of Sabanus (1 Esd 8 63).

2. (A prophetess associated with Tobiah and Sanballat in opposition to Nehemiah (Neh 6 14).

NOAH, nō', nō'a (נֹהַם, nō'ām): "rest"; LXX Nōς, Nōs; Jos, Nōxēs, Nōchos). The 10th in descent from Adam in the line of Seth (Gen 5 25). Lamech here seems to derive the word from the root נוח, "to comfort," but this is probably a mere play upon the name by Noah's father. The times in which Noah was born were degenerate, and this finds pathetic expression in Lamech's saying at the birth of Noah, "This same shall comfort us in our work and in the toil of our hands, which cometh because of the ground which Jeh hath cursed." Concerning the theory that Noah is the name of a dynasty, like Pharaoh or Caesar, rather than of a single individual, see Antediluvians. In his 600th year the degenerate races of mankind were cut off by the Deluge. But 120 years previously (Gen 6 3) he had been warned of the catastrophe, and according to 1 Pet 3 20 had been preparing for the event by building the ark (see Ark; Deluge). In the cuneiform inscriptions Noah corresponds to "Hasisadru" (Xisuthrus). After the flood Noah celebrated his deliverance by building an altar and offering sacrifices to Jeh (Gen 8 20), and was sent forth with God's blessing to be "fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth" (Gen 9 1), as Adam had been sent forth at the beginning (Gen 1 28). In token of the certainty of God's covenant not to destroy the race again by flood, a rainbow spanned the sky whose reappearance was ever after to be a token of peace. But Noah was not above temptation. In the prosperity which followed, he became drunken from the fruit of the vineyard he had planted. His son Ham irreverently exposed the nakedness of his father, while Shem and Japheth covered it from view (Gen 9 22-23). The curse upon Canaan the son of Ham was literally fulfilled in subsequent history when Israel took possession of Pal, when the Pyre fell burnt and the walls of Jerusalem, Rome, and Carthage surrendered to Rome.

GEORGE FREDERICK WRIGHT

NOAH, BOOK (APOCALYPSE) OF. See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

NO-AMON, nō-ā-mon (נוא-amon, Nō-ā'mōn, Egypt nut, "a city," with the feminine ending ; and Amon, proper name of a god, City Amon, i.e. the "City, i.e. par excellence, of the god Amon; th m AV "populous No," following the Vulg in a misunderstanding of the word 'amon'; RV "No-amon"): Occurs in this form only in Neh 3 8, and nō-ā'nom, "Amon of No"); occurs in Jer 48 25. Or also Ezk 30 14–16, where nō', nā', is undoubtedly the same city.

The description of No-amon in Neh 3 8 seems to be that of a delta city, but Ṗ, yām, "sea," in that passage is used poetically for the Nile, as in Job 41 31 and in Isa 18 2. With this difficulty removed, the Egypt etymology of the name leaves no doubt as to the correct identification of the place. The "City Amon" in the days of Nahum, Jeremiah and Ezekiel was Thebes (cf. art. "Thebes" in any general encyclopaedia).

M. G. KYLE

NOB, nob (נוב, nōb; B, Nōḇā, Nōmīṯ, A, Nōḇā, Nōḇād, and other forms): An ancient priestly town to which David came on his way 8, when he fled from Saul at Gibeah (1 S 21 1). Here he found refuge and succor with Ahimelech. This was observed by Doeg the Edomite, who informed the king, and afterward became the instrument of Saul's savage vengeance on the priests, and on all the inhabitants of the city (ch 22). The name occurs in Neh 11 32 in a list of cities, immediately after Anathoth. In Isaiah's ideal account of the Assyrians' march against Jerus, Nob is clearly placed S. of Anathoth. Here, says the prophet, the Assyrian shall shake his hand at the mount of the daughter of Zion, the hill of Jerus. It was a place, therefore, from which the Holy City and the temple were clearly visible.

The district in which the site must be sought is thus very definitely indicated; but within this district no name at all resembling Nob has been discovered, and so no sure identification is yet possible. 'Anāḵa (Anathoth) is 2 miles N.E. of Jerus. Nob therefore lay between that and the city, at a point where the city could be seen, apparently on the ancient road from the ancient N. Rather more than a mile N. of Jerus rises the ridge Rās el-Meshārīf (2,065 ft.), over which the road from the N. passes; and
here the traveler approaching from that direction of Gaza, his home of the city. It is fittingly named "the look-out." Col. cite with the case for identifying this height with Mt. Scopus where Titus established his camp at the siege of Jerusalem (PEFS, 1874, 111 ff). Immediately S. of the ridge, to the E. of the road, there is a small plateau, S. of which there is a lower ridge, whence the slopes dip into Wady el-Faz. This plateau, on which Titus may have sat, is a very probable site for Nob. It quite suits the requirements of Isaiah's narrative, and not those of David's flight. Junius suggests the N., and this lay in the most likely path to the S.

W. Ewing

NOBACH, nō'ba (נובא, nōḇāh; B, נבשא, Naḇašā, Naḇoš, Naḇaš, Naḇās, Naḇoš, Naḇāš, Naḇoš).

1) Nobah the Manassite, we are told, "went and took Kenath, and the villages thereof, and called it Nobah, after his own name" (Nu 32 42). There can be little doubt that the ancient Kenath is represented by the modern Qana'awat, on the western slope of Jebel Druze, the ancient name having survived that of Nobah.

2) A city which marked the course of Gideon's pursuit of the Midianites (Jgs 8 11). It is possible that this may be identical with (1). Cheyne argues in favor of this (BD, s.v., "Gideon"). But its mention along with Jophbah points to a more southerly location. This may have been the original home of the clan Nobah. Some would read, following the Syr in Nu 31 30, "Nobah which is on the desert," instead of "Nophah which reacheth unto Medeba." No site with a name resembling this has yet been recovered. If it is to be distinguished from Kenath, then probably it will have to be sought somewhere to the N.E. of Rabbath-Amon (Anmcdn). W. Ewing

NOBAI, nō'ba (נובה, nōḇāh, or nōḇ‘ah, nōḇ‘āh): One of those who took part in sealing the covenant (Neh 10 19).

NOBLE, nōbl', NOBLES, nōb'ls, NOBLEMAN, nōbl'mn (נובל, 'nōḇîl, kōrîm, 'nōḇîn, addâr; τέγνης, κόριμος, κρεττίς, Bassetos, basileia): "Noble" is the tr of the Heb kōrîm (occuring only in the pl.), "free-born," "noble" (1 K 21 811; Neh 2 16; 6 17, etc); of addâr, "begirded," "mighty," "illustrious" or "noble" (Jgs 6 13; 2 Ch 25 20, etc); of kōrîm, "liberal," "a noble" (Nu 21 18, Prov 16 16, etc).

Other words are gâdîl, "great" (Jon 3 7); yâkîr, Aram, "precious" (Ezr 4 10); nāhîd, a "lender" (Job 29 10); parâmîl, "foremost ones" (Est 1 3; 6 6); ṣûḵâr, "those near," "nobles" (Ex 24 11); bârî, "fugitives" (Isa 43 14); ṭâkkêb, "weighty," "honored" (Ps 149 8); egesâh, "well-born" (Acts 17 11; 1 Cor 2 26); krodâne, "strongest," "most powerful" (Acts 24 23, 26 25).

The Apoc. AV and RV, still further enlarges the list. In Ps 8 5 we have nāqebn, "great ones" (1 Est 1 38; § 26, with ṣûkîma, "in honor"; Wisd 18 12). Otherwise RV's use of noble and 'noblesse' are for words containing the n-gn, and referring to birth (cf Wisd 3 3; 2 Macc 5 273; 12 42; 14 42 bis). AV's uses are wider (Job 20 7, etc).

Noblemen is, in Lk 19 12, the tr of egeâsâh antîrûsas, "a man well born," and in Jn 4 46 49 of basileios, "kingly," "belonging to a king," a designation extended to the officers, courtiers, etc, of a king, RvM "king's officer"; he was probably an official, military or legal, of the Herod Antipas, who was styled "king" (basileioi).

For "nobles" (Isa 43 14), AV "have brought down all their nobles." RV has "I will bring down all them as fugitives," etc, or, as otherwise read, "their nobles even;" etc, for "nobles" (Jer 30 21). "Prince": ERV has "worthies" for "nobles" (Nah 3 18); RV has "the noble" for "princes" (Prov 17 26); "noble" for "princes" (Job 54 18; Dan 1 3); for "Nazarites" (Lam 4 7; m, Nazrītēs); "her nobles" for "his fugitives," RV, as other wise read, "fugitives" (Isa 15 5); AV has "noble" for "liberal" (Isa 35 2); "the nobles that held their peace," RV; "The voice of the nobles was hushed," m, Heb hid;" for "most noble" (Acts 24 3; 25 23), "most excellent." W. L. Walker

NOD, nōd (נוד, nōḏ): The land of Eden, to which Cain migrated after the murder of his brother and his banishment by Jehovah (Gen 4 16). Conjecture as to the region in which it was is uncertain. The ideas of China, India, etc, which some have entertained, are groundless. The territory was evidently at some distance, but where is now undiscoverable.

NODAB, nōḍāb (נֹדָב, nōḏāḇ; Nōdâbaω, Nōdâbaω): A Hagrite clan which, along with Jetur and Naphtash, suffered complete defeat at the hands of the trans-Jordanic Israelites (1 Ch 5 19). It has been suggested that Nodab is a corruption of Kedemah, another Hebrew name which is associated with Jetur and Naphtash in the lists of Isha'el's sons (Gen 25 15; 1 Ch 1 31), but it is difficult to see how even the most careless copyist could so blunder. There is a possible reminiscence of the name in Ndêbê, a village in the Hauran.

NOE, nō’ē (Nô, Nôb): AV of Mt 24 37 38; Lk 3 36; 17 26 27; Tob 4 12. Gr form of Noah (q.v.) (thus RV).

NOEBA, nō’ē-ba (Nôbâ, Nōeboh): Head of one of the families of temple-servants (1 Est 6 31) = "Nekoda of Ezra 2 48.

NOGAH, nō'ga (נגא, nôghāh, "splender"): Son of David born at Jerus (1 Ch 3 7; 14 6). In the list (2 S 5 14 16) this name is wanting. In its Gr form (Naγας, Naγας) it occurs in the genealogy of Jesus (Lk 3 25).

NOHABA, nō’ba (נובה, nōḇah, "rest"): The fourth son of Benjamin (1 Ch 8 2). It is probable that in Jgs 20 43, instead of "a resting-place" we should read "Nobah," which may have been the settlement of the family.

NOISE, noiz (ניאה, nô‘în, nô‘în, hâmôn, nîn, šâlān, ﷲإمكانية, khoân): "Noise" is most frequently the tr of kol, "voice," "sound," in AV (Ex 20 18, "the noise of the trumpet," RV "voice"; 32 17 18; Jgs 5 11, "[they that are delivered] from the noise of the archers," RV "far from the noise," etc, m "because of the voice of": 1 S 4 6, etc); hâmôn, "noise," "sound" (1 S 14 19); rōghez, "anger," "rage" (Job 37 2); rēs, "outcry" (Job 36 33); shôn, "desolation," "noise" (Isa 24 8; 26 9); rōṣ, "cry," "cry," "crying" (Job 36 29); rōṣ, "to break forth" (Ps 89 4); šômē, "to hear," etc (Josh 6 10; 1 Ch 15 28); khoân, "sound," "voice," is tr "noise" (Rev 6 1, "I heard as it were the noise of thunder," RV "saying as with a voice of thunder"); rōṣēlēm, "with a hissing or rushing sound" (2 Pet 3 10, "with a great noise"); tinētāt khoân (Acts 6 2, AV "when this was noise abroad," m "when this voice was made," RV "when this sound was heard"); akōû, "to hear," "to talk or speak" throughout, are also tr "noise" (Mk 2 1; Lk 1 65). So RV of Jch 10 16, "noised among the tents," "to talk," "to break forth" (Ps 89 4), "to be heard," etc (Josh 10 16, 18; Apoc, thrôs, "confused noise" (Wisd 1 10); boē, "outcry" (Jch 14 19); echōs, "sound" (Wisd 17 18; Sir 40 13); Lat nox, "voice" (2 Est 5 7).
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For "noise" (Ps 65 7 bvs), RV has "roaring"; for "make a noise like the noise of the sea" (Isa 17 12), "the uproar [in "multitude"] of many peoples, that roar like the roaring of the sea": for "a voice of noise from the city" (Isa 66 6), "a voice of tumult from the city"; for "a noise" (Jer 10 22), "voice"; for "a noise" (1 Ch 15 28), "voice"; (Ezek 3 9), "voices"; for "every battle of the warrior is with confused noise" (Hab 3 6), "the voice of the warrior in the tumult," "every boot of the booted warrior": for "make a noise," "noan" (Ps 3 2), "roar" (Isa 17 12); for "make a loud noise" (Ps 85 4), "break forth"; for "maketh a noise" (Jer 4 19), "is disregulated"; for "the noise of his tabernacle" (Job 38 29), "the thunderings of his pavilion," for "make any noise with your voice" (Josh 6 10), "let your voice be heard": "joyful noise in the courts of the LORD." (Isa 16 8). "The noise on high is mightier than the noise of many waters, yea, than all the mighty waves of the sea" (Ps 93 4; 46 6). Above the voices of many waters, the mighty-breakers of the sea, Jehovah is mighty.

W. L. WALKER

NOISE, noise, nōn, nōn: 1 Ch 7 27 AV and RVm. See NUN.

NOOMA, nō'ō-ma (Nōomā, Noomā, B, 'Oouā, Oomt; AV Ethma); 1 Esd 9 35 = "Nebo" of Ezra 10 43, of which it is a corruption.

NOON, nōn, NOONDAY, nōn'dā (גּוֹרָתָי, gōratay, μεμυρμεία, memimēria): The word means light, splendor, brightness, and hence the brightest part of the day (Gen 43 16 25; Acts 22 6). See also MIDDAY; DAY AND NIGHT; TIME.

NOPH, nōf (נוף, nōph; in Hos 9 6 môph): A name for the Egyptian city Memphis (so LXX), hence rendered in RV (Isa 19 13; Jer 2 16; 44 1; Ezek 30 13 16). See MEMPHIS.

NOPHAI, nōfā (נופָהִי, nōphāhī; LXX does not transliterate): A city mentioned only in Nu 21 30 (see NOAH). LXX reads kai hai gunaikes ei pros ezekiasan pin epi Modo, "and the women besides [yet] kindled a fire at [against] Moab." The text has evidently suffered corruption.

NORTH, north, NORTH COUNTRY (נְפִּיא, nophē, כָּנָה, from נָפֶשׁ, ἐνίο, "to hide," i.e. "the hidden," "the dark" [Ges.]; ἐνφασ, ἄνφας, ἐνφασ, ἄνφας, ἄνφας, ἄνφας [Ith 16 4]; septuagint [2 Esd 15 45]): In addition to the many places where "north" occurs merely as a point of the compass, there are several passages in Jer, Ezek and Zeph, where it refers to a particular country, usually Assyria or Babylonia: Jer 3 18, "They shall come together out of the land of the north to the land that I gave for an inheritance unto your fathers"; Jer 46 6, "In the north by the river Euphrates they have stumbled and fallen"; Ezek 26 7, "I will bring upon Tyre Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon, king of kings, from the north"; Zeph 2 13, "He will stretch out his hand against the north, and destroy Assyria, and will make Nineveh a desolation."

While the site of Nineveh was N.E. of Jerus, and that of Babylon almost due E., it was not unnatural for them to be referred to as "the north," because the direct desert routes were impracticable, and the roads led first into Northern Syria and then eastward (cf however Gen 29 1, "Then Jacob went on his journey, and came to the land of the children of the east").

In Ezek 38 6, we have, "General and all his host, the house of Togarmah in the uttermost parts of the north." It is uncertain what country is here referred to. Some have supposed Armenia (cf Gen 10 3; 1 Ch 1 6; Ezek 27 14).

The north border of the promised land, as outlined in Nu 34 7-9 and Ezek 47 15-17, cannot be determined with certainty, even in the light of the evidence that is named cannot be identified, but it was approximately the latitude of Mt. Hermon, not including Lebanon or Damascus. For north (מְשֹׁר, see Astronomy.

ALFRED ELY DAY

NORTHEAST, SOUTHEAST: These words occur in Acts 27 12, "if by any means they could reach Phoenix, and winter there; which is a haven of Crete, looking north-east and south-east." RV has: "Gr, direct from the south-west and down the north-west wind," which is a lit. tr. of the Gr: eis Phthivika . . . E. (Acts 27 12)." "The northeast wind is stronger than the northwest wind." Chôraos does not appear to occur except here, and is therefore the corresponding Lat. "choras" is found in Caesar, Vergil, and other classical authors. AV has "lieth toward the south west and north west." kórd, kóta, with a wind or stream, means, "down the wind or stream," i.e. in the direction that is blowing or flowing, and this interpretation would indicate a harbor open to the E. If νῦν, lips, and χρόνος, chôraos, are used here as names of directions rather than of winds, we should expect a harbor open to the W. There is good reason for identifying Phoenix (AV "Phenice") with Loutro on the south shore of Crete (EB, s.v. "Phenice"), whose harbor is open to the E. See PHOENIX.

ALFRED ELY DAY

NOSE, nose, NOSTRILS, nos'trils, nos'trils (נָזָה, eph; "nose," נָזָה, "nose," נָזָה, dual of נָזָה, נָזָה, "nose"): The former expression (eph from "amph, like Arab. أنف, 'onf) is often tr. "face" (which see s.v.) in EV. It is frequently referred to as the organ of breathing, in other words, as the receptacle of the breath or spirit of God: "Jeh . . . breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul" (Gen 2 7). "My life is yet whole in me, and the spirit of God is in my nostrils" (Job 27 3). Therefore a life which depends on so slight a thing as a breath is considered as utterly frail and of no great consequence: "Cease ye from man, whose breath is in his nostrils; for wherein is he to be accounted of?" (Isa 2 22; cf Wisd 2 2).

In poetical language such a breath of life is ascribed even to God, esp. with regard to the mighty storm which is thought to proceed from His nostrils (Ex 16 8; Ps 30 14; Ezek 37 9; Ps 48 8):

The phrase, "a smoke in my nose, a fire that burneth all the day" (Isa 65 5), is equivalent to a perpetual annoyance and cause of irritation. A cruel custom of war, in which the vanquished had their noses and ears cut off by their remorseless conquerors, is described to in Ezek 23 25. As a wild animal is held in check by having his nose pierced and a hook or ring inserted in it (Job 40 24; 41 2 [Heb 40 26]), so this expression is used to indicate the humbling and taming of an obstinate person (2 K 19 20; Isa 37 29; cf Ezek 23 25). But men, and esp. women, had their noses pierced for the wearing of jewelry (Gen 24 47; Isa 3 21; Ezek 16 12). In one passage the meaning is not
Nose-Jewels
Number
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quite clear, viz. in the enumeration of blemishes which disable a "son of Aaron" from the execution of the priest's office (Lev 21:18), where EV translates "flat (in 'slit') nose." The Heb word is הבמה, baram, which is a hapax legomenon. It corresponds, however, to the Arab. √ حَرَمَة, حَرَم, حَرَمُ (kharām, khararnā), which means "to open," "to pierce the nose," cap. the bridge of the nose. We may accept this meaning as the one intended in the passage.

The text is dark and much discussed passage must still be referred to: "And, lo, they put the branch to their nose" (Ezek 17:2). The usual explanation (whereof the context gives some valuable hints) is that a rite connected with the worship of Baal (the sun) is here alluded to (see Smend and A. B. Davidson's comm. on the passage). A similar custom is known from Pers sun-worship, where a bunch (barebeh) of dates, pomegranates or tamarisks was held to the nose by the worshipper, probably as an attempt to keep the Holy One (sun) from being contaminated by sinful breath (Spiegel, Eranische Altertümer, I, 571). Among modern Jews posies of myrtle and other fragrant herbs are held to the nose by the persons attending on the ceremony of circumcision, for the alleged reason of purifying the nose. Another interpretation of the above passage would understand נ.which, in the sense of "male sexual member" (see Gesenius-Buhl, s.v.; Levy, 116, 1, 544), and the whole passage as a reference to a sensuous Canaanite rite, such as is perhaps alluded to in Isa 57:8. In that case the פס, app'dam, "their nose," of the MT would have to be considered as tškōn 100 (a correction of the scribes) for EN, (appt, "my face." Or read "They cause their stench (z'mordhthim) to come up to my face." (Kraetschmar, ad loc.) See Branch.

H. L. E. Lueking

NOSE-JEWELS, nōz-jūdz, -jōdz (נַשׁ-יֵילָ֑ד, nēzā'ēdz [probably from נַשָּׁה, nēzā, "muzzle"], a "nose-ring," or "nose-jewel," so rendered in Isa 3:21; "jewel in a swine's snout," Prov 11:22, AVm "ring," "jewel on thy forehead," Ezek 16:12, "ring upon thy nose"); in Gen 34:22, AV rendered incorrectly "earring" of ver 47. Indeed, the word had also a more generic meaning of "ring" or "jewelry," whether worn in the nose or not. See Gen 35:4; Ex 32:2, where the ornament was worn in the ear. There are several cases without specification, uniformly rendered, without good reason, however, "earing" in AV (Ex 35:25; Jgs 8:24, 25; Job 42:11 ["ring"]); Prov 26:12; Hos 2:13 [15].

The nose-jewel was made of gold or of silver, usually and worn by many women of the East. It was a ring of from an inch to about three inches (in extreme cases) in diameter, and was passed through the right nostril. Usually there were pendant from the metal ring jewels, beads or coral. Such ornaments are still worn in some parts of the East. See also Amulet; Jewel.

Edward Bagby Pollard

NOTABLE, nōtā'bāl (נְתַנְתָּל, nōtā'tāl; γνωστός, gnōtos); "Notable" is the tr of ḥēzāth, "conspicuous" (חֹזָאת, "to see," e.g. Dnl 8:5, "a notable horn," i.e. "conspicuous," AVm "a horn of sight," ver 45, "notable" [horn]; "knowledge," "knowledge" (Acts 4:16); of epimēnos, "noted," "marked" (Mt 27:16; Rom 16:17, "of note"); of epiphanēs, "very manifest," "illustrious" (cf. "Antiochus Epiphanes"); Acts 2:20, "that great and notable day," quoted from Joel 2:31; LXX, for γάρ, "to be feared," AV and RV "terrific,"

(of Mal 4:5); "notable" occurs also in 2 Mac 3:26 (expres,); 14:33, RV "for all to see"; 6:28 (genoivos), "a notable example," RV "noble;" notably, only in 2 Mac 14:31 (genoivos), "notably prevented," RV "bravely," m "notable").

W. L. Walker

NOTO, nōtō (נָתוֹ, nōto, nōth, nōth, nōthmān, etc.; μνηστική, μνηστικος, μνηστήμας, μνηστώματα); "Note" (vb.) is the tr of ḥēzāth, "to grave," "to inscribe," etc (Isa 30:8, note it in a book, RV "inscribe"); of ḥēzēma, "to note down, etc (Dnl 10:21, RV "inscribed"); of sēmētō, "to put a sign on" (2 Thess 3:14, "note that man"). "Note" (noun) is the tr of epimēnos, "marked upon," "distinguished" (Rom 16:7, "who are of note among the apostles").

"Notes" (musical) occurs in Wisd 19:18, "notes of a portly" (πιθήκης).

W. L. Walker

NOTHING, nōth'ing (nōt'ing, lō', lē'ning, lē'ning, lē'mān, etc.; πνεύμα, μνημέδες, νοόδες, νοοδες); "Nothing" is represented by various words and phrases, often with lō', which is properly a subject, with the meaning of "nothing." Most frequently we have lō' "marked," "not anything" (Gen 40:15; Jgs 14:6).

Other forms are lō' ḥēzē"khā, "not anything" (Gen 19:18); lē' "known," "not known" (Dnl 12:7, 8); lē'mān, "nothing" (Dnl 14:35, RSV, "nothing"); ḥēzēm, "nothing" (Isa 34:12); lē'mān, "nothing" (Isa 41:22); lē'mān, "nothing" (Am 3:1); ḥēzēm, "nothing" (Dnl 3:4); ḥēzēm, "nothing" (Dnl 21:4); once lō'ā; "emptiness" (Job 6:18); ḥēzēm, "nothing" (Prov 9:13); lē'mān, "empty"); "nothing" (2 S 24:24); nē' "not," "to make small," "bring to nothing" (Jer 10:24); ḥēzēm, "nothing" (Job 24:25).

In 2 Mac 7:12, we have "nothing," adverbially (en oudeis), "he nothing regarded the pains" (cf. K K 16:21); 9:7 (oudomēs), RV "in no wise"; Wisd 11:11, "noteworthy" (ἀξιόροο), RV "of no service"; Bar 16:7,26.

For "nothing" RV has "none" (Ex 23:26; Joel 2:3, "never" (Neh 5:8), "not wherewith" (Prov 22:27), "vanity and nought" (Isa 41:29); for "answerless anything" (Mk 16:1), "no more answered anything."); "answered nothing" (ver 3 omitted); "anything" for "nothing" (1 Tim 6:7), "not anything" (Acts 20:20), "not" (1 Cor 8:2), "no word" (Lk 1:37), "not wherewith" (7:42); for "nothing" (Job 4:4), "not" (1 Cor 12:27); for "it is nothing" (2 Ch 14:11), "there is none besides" a "like"); for "lacked nothing," for "nothing lacking" (Acts 11:22), "nothing doubting" (Acts 12:12), "making no distinction"; for "hoping for nothing again" (Lk 6:35), "never despairing"; for "are nothing" (Acts 21:24), "no truth in"; for "nothing shall offend them" (Ps 119:165), "no occasion of stumbling"; for "bring to nothing" (1 Cor 1:19), "ERV reject," ARV "bring to nought;" "nothing better for "no good" (Eccel 3:12), for "not" (Mt 13:34, different text); "for nothing" (Acts 9:8), "for nothing," "for" (Ex 21:11), "nothing for "for sin" (Job 6:24), m "shalt not err"; and "shall have nothing" for "and not for himself" (Dnl 9:26, m "there shall be none belonging to him").

W. L. Walker

NOUGHT, nōt (nōt, bīnān; πρόποπα, katarpe; katarpe; "Naught" is to be distinguished from "naught" implying "badness" (see Naught).

"Naught" in the sense of "nothing," etc. is the tr of bīnān, "forbidden" (Gen 39:15), and of various other words occurring once only, e.g. "good," "vanity" (Am 5:5); tōhā, "vacancy," "ruin" (Isa 49:4); "cpha," "nothing" (Isa 14:21); nōbēl, "to fade" (Job 14:18, m "faded away"); pārē, "to make void" (Ps 33:10); katarpe, "to make without effect" (1 Cor 1:28; 2:6); oudeis,
not even one" (Acts 5:30); apeleugemōn, "refutation" (Acts 19:27, RV "come into disrepute"); dōrōn, "without payment" (2 Thess. 3:8, RV "for nought"); erēmō, "to desolate" (Rev. 18:17, RV "made desolate"); katalō, "to loose down" (Acts 5:38, RV "be overthrown"). In Apoc we have "set at nought" and "come to nought," etc. (1 Pet. 3:15; 2 Pet. 3:5; 2:5).

For "nought" RV has "perish" (Dt. 28:63); for "come to nought" (Job 8:22), "he no more"; "nought" for "not (ex)" (Ex. 5:11), for "no (28:32); for "nought" Isa. (Isa. 19:1), "brought to nought": ARV "bring to nought" (1 Cor. 19:19) for "nought" (KJV) (ARV "ex Profecto"); "nought but terror" (Isa. 28:19) for "a vexation only": "brought to nought" (Isa. 16:4) for "is at an end": "come to nought for" (Rom 9:5; non: effect) "set at nought for" (despise) (Rom 14:3).

NOURISH, nourish ( γαστερίζειν, giddēl, γείνω, hēgyē, ἔµιπερ, καλέλ, ἑπαβάν, ἀναπόφιλον, ἀπόθίμω, ἐκπληθοῦν, ἐντρηπόθην): While the word "nourish" was ordinarily an appropriate rendering in the time of the AV, the word has since become much less frequent, and some senses have largely passed out of ordinary use, so that the meaning in most cases he better expressed by some other word. Giddēl means "to bring up," "rear [children]" (Isa. 1:2, m "made great"); ἑπαβάν; "keep alive" (with a sense of care) (2 S. 12:3; Isa. 7:21, ARV "keep alive"). Kallēl means "to support," "maintain," "provide for" (esp. with food) (Gen. 45:11; 47:12; 50:21). Ribbān means "to bring up," "rear [whelps]" in a figurative use (Exk 19:2). Trepō "to feed" (transitive, Acts 12:20, RV "feed"); Rev. 15:14; "to fatten" (Jas. 5:5, the context indicating an unfavorable meaning). Ananthropē in "to bring up," "rear," like giddēl (Acts 7:20.21); ekthrephō is "to take care of" (Eph. 5:29); ἐντρηπόθην means "to bring in up," "train in" (1 Tim. 4:6).

GEORGE RICKER BERRY

NOVICE, nov'is (νεοφτός, νεοφρός, "newly planted"): In this sense it is found in LXX of Job 14:9 and Isa. 5:7. In the NT it occurs only once (1 Tim. 3:6), where it means a person newly planted in the Christian faith, a neophyte, a new convert, one who has recently become a Christian. This term occurs in the list which Paul gives of the qualifications of one a Christian bishop must possess. The apostle instructs Timothy, that if any man desires the office of a bishop, he must not be a "novice," must not be newly converted, or recently brought to the faith of Christ "lest he be lifted up with pride, and fall into the condemnation of the devil.

This means that a recent convert runs the very serious risk of being wise in his own eyes, of despising those who are still on the level from which by his conversion, he has been lifted; and so he becomes puffed up with high ideas of his own importance. He has not yet had time to discover his limitations, he is newly planted, he does not fully understand his true position in the Christian community, he overestimates himself, and for these reasons he is peculiarly liable to instability, and to the other weaknesses and sins connected with an inflamed opinion of himself. His pride is a kind of indication of a coming fall. A novice, therefore, must on no account be appointed to the office in question, for he would be sure to bring disgrace upon it.

JOHN RUTHERFORD
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1. Number and Arithmetic.—The system of counting followed by the Hebrews and the Semites generally was the decimal system, which seems to have been suggested by the use of the ten fingers. Hebrews had several words of different forms for the first nine numbers and for ten and its multiples. Of the sexagesimal system, which seems to have been introduced into Babylonia by the Sumerians and which, through its development there, has influenced the measurement of time and space in the western civilized world even to the present day, there is no direct trace in the Bible, although, as will be shown later, there are some possible echoes. The highest number in the Bible described by a single word is 10,000 (ribbā or ribbō or mārūdā). The Egyptians, on the other hand, had separate words for 100,000, 1,000, 100,000, 10,000,000. The highest numbers referred to in any way in the Bible are: "a thousand thousand" (1 Ch. 22:14; 2 Ch. 14:9) "thousands of thousands" (Dan. 12:3; Rev. 5:11); "thousands of ten thousand" (Gen. 24:60); "ten thousands ten thousand" (Dnl. 7:10; Rev. 5:11); and twice that figure (Rev. 9:16). The excessively high numbers met with in some oriental systems (cf. Lhabeb System of the Decalogue, v. 37), have no parallels in Heb. Fractions were not unknown. We find 1/2 (2 S. 18:2, etc.); 1/3 (Ex. 25:10.17.etc.); 1/4 (Gen. 37:9.8.1/2); 1/10 (Dnl. 9.46); 1/36 (Ex. 18:36); 1/13 (Lev. 23:13); 1/14 (Lev. 14:10), and 1/11 (Lev. 19:29). These numbers are less definitely expressed: 1/3 by "a double portion," lit. "a double mouthful" (Dt. 21:17; 2 K. 2:9; Zee. 13:8); 1/4 by "four parts" (Gen. 24:7); and 1/10 by "nine parts" (Neh. 11:1). Only the simplest rules of arithmetic can be illustrated from the OT. There are examples of addition (Gen. 5:3-31; Nu. 1:20-46); subtraction (Gen. 18:28 ff.); multiplication (Lev. 25:8; Nu. 36:46), and division (Nu. 31:27 ff.). In Lev. 25:50 ff. is what has been said to imply a kind of rule-of-three sum. The old Babylonians had tables of squares and cubes intended no doubt to facilitate the measurement of land (Sayce, Assyria, Is. 26, Priests and People, 118; Besold, Ninive and Babylon, 90, 92), and it can only be doubted that the same need led to similar results among the Israelites, but at present there is no evidence. Old Heb arithmetic and mathematics as known to us are of the most elementary kind (Nowack, HA. 1, 285).

II. Notation of Numbers.—No special signs for the expression of numbers in writing can be proved to have been in use among the Hebrews before the exile. The Sibam Words Inscription, which is probably the oldest Monument of Heb writing extant (with the exception of the ostraca of Samaria, and perhaps a seal or two and the obscure Gezer tablet), has the numbers written in full. The words used there for 3,200, 1,000 are written as words without any abbreviation. The earlier text of the M S which practically illustrates Heb usage has the numbers 30, 40, 50, 100, 200, 7,000 written out in the same way.

After the exile some of the Jews at any rate employed signs such as were current among the Egyptians, the Phoenicians—an upright line for 1, two such lines for 2, three for 3, and so on, and special signs for 10, 20, 100. It had
been conjectured that these or similar signs were known to the Jews, but actual proof was not forthcoming until the discovery of Jewish papyri at Assuan and Elephantine in 1904 and 1907. In these texts, ranging from 494 to c. 400 BC, the dates and names, e.g., Solomon, and so forth, are described. We have therefore clear evidence that numerical signs were used by members of a Jewish colony in Upper Egypt in the 5th cent. BC. Now, as the existence of this colony can be traced before 525 BC, it is probable that they used this method of notation also in the preceding century. Conjecture indeed may go as far as its beginning, for it is known that there were Jews in Pathros, that is Upper Egypt, in the last days of Jeremiah (Jer 44:15). Some of the first Jewish settlers in Elephantine may have known the prophet and some of them may have come from Jesus, bringing these signs with them. At present, however, that is pure hypothesis.

In the notation of the chapters and verses of the Heb Bible and in the expression of dates in Heb books the consonants of the Heb alphabet are employed for figures, i.e., the first ten letters for 1–10, combinations of these for 11–99, the following eight for 20–99, and the remainder of the alphabet, at any rate. The letters of the Gr alphabet were used in the same way.

The antiquity of this kind of numerical notation cannot at present be ascertained. It is found on Jewish coins which have been dated in the reign of the Macabean Simon (143–135 BC), but some scholars refer them to a much later period. All students of the Talm are familiar with this way of numbering the pages, or rather the leaves, but its use there is no proof of early date. The numerical use of the Gr alphabet is abundantly illustrated. It is met with in many Gr papyris, some of them from the 3rd cent. BC (Hibeh Papyri, nos. 40–43, etc.): on several coins of Herod the Great, and in some MSS of the NT, for instance, a papyrus fragment of Mt (Oxyrhynchus Pap., 2) where 14 is three times represented by iota delta with a line above the letters, and some codices of Rev at 13:18 where 666 is given by the three letters chi xi sau (or digamma). It is possible that two of these methods may have been employed by scholars in the Punic Sacrificial Tablet of Marseilles, where (l. 6) is expressed first in words, and then by figures.

III. Numbers in OT History.—Students of the historical books of the OT have long been perplexed by the high numbers which are made with in memory and which are set down as a number ascribed to the Israelites at the exodus (Ex 12:37; Nu 11:21), and on two occasions during the sojourn in the wilderness (Nu 1:26)—more than 600,000 adult males, which means a total of two or three millions; the result of David's census 1,300,000 men (2 S 24:9) or 1,570,000 (1 Ch 21:5), and the slaughter of half a million in a battle between Judah and Israel (2 Ch 13:17). There are many other illustrations in the Books of Ch and elsewhere. That ancient figures were used and that they are not beyond reason can, beyond any reasonable doubt, and is not in the least surprising, for there is ample evidence that the numbers in ancient documents were exceptionally liable to corruption. One of the best known instances is the variation of 4,646 years between the Heb text and the LXX (text of B) as to the interval from the creation of Adam to the birth of Abram. Other striking cases are 1 S 6:19, where 50,070 ought probably to be 70 (Jos, Ant. VI, i, 4); 2 S 15:7, where 400,300 is probably 400,300; 117 of 76 and 276 in the MSS of Acts 27:37, and of 616 and 666 in those of Rev 13:18. Heb MSS furnish some instructive variations. One of them, no. 109 of Kennicott, reads (Nu 1:23) 1,050 for 50,000; 50 for 50,000 (2:6), and 100 for 100,000, (ver 16).

It is easy to see how mistakes may have originated in many cases. The Heb numerals for 30, etc., are the plurals of the units, so that the former, as written, differ from the latter only by the addition of the two last letters, and much more so of the vowel doublé -im. Now as the means was often omitted, 3 and 30, 4 and 40, etc., could readily be confused. If signs or letters of the alphabet were made use of, instead of abbreviated words, there would be quite as much room for misconception on the part of copyists. The high numbers above referred to as found in Ex and Nu have been ingeniously accounted for by Professor Findlers Petrie (Researches in Sinai) in a wholly different way. By understanding 'thousands' not as "thousand," but as "family" or "tent," he reduces the number to 5,550 for the first census, and 5,730 for the second. This figure, however, seems too low, and the method of interpretation, though not impossible, is open to criticism. It is generally admitted that the number as usually read is too high, but the original number has not yet been certainly discovered. When, however, full allowance has been made for the intrusion of numerical errors into the Heb text, it is difficult to resist the belief that, in the Books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, etc., there is a marked tendency to exaggeration in this respect. The huge armies again and again ascribed to the little kingdoms of Judah and Israel cannot be reconciled with some of the facts revealed by recent research; with the following, for instance: The army which met the Assyrians at Karkar in 854 BC and which represented 11 states and tribes inclusive of Israel and the kingdom of Damascus, cannot have numbered at the most more than about 75,000 or 80,000 men (HDB, p. 4900, 630), and is represented. By the latter reckons the whole levy of his country at only 102,000 (Dem. Allo orient. XI, l, 14, note). In view of these figures it is not conceivable that the armies of Israel or Judah could number a million, or even half a million. The contingent from the larger kingdom contributed on the occasion mentioned above consisted of only 10,000 men and 2,000 chariots (HDB, Ib). The safest conclusion, therefore, seems to be that, while many of the questionable numbers in the present text may be the result of corruption, there is a residuum which cannot be so accounted for.

IV. Round Numbers.—The use of definite numerical expressions in an indefinite sense, that is, as round numbers, which is met with in many languages, seems to have been very prevalent in Western Asia from early times to the present day. W. Ramsay (Thousand and One Churches, 6) remarks that the modern Turks have 4 typical numbers which are often used in proper names with little or no reference to their exact numerical force—3, 7, 40, 1,001. The Lycaonian district which gives the book its name is called Bin Bir Kilise, "The Thousand and One Churches," although the actual number in the valley is only 25. The modern Persians use 40 in just the same way. "Forty years" with them often means a long time (Brugsh, cited by König, Städtistik, 55). This lax use of numbers, as we think, was probably very frequent among the Israelites and their neighbors. The inscription on the M S supplies a very instructive example. The Israelites occupied Mount Medeba by Omri and his son for half the reign of the latter is there reckoned (II. 7 f) at 40 years. As, according to 1 K 18:23-29, the period extended to only 23 years at the most, the number 40 must have been used with the idea of a prophet's scribe as a round number. It is probably often used in that way in the Bible where it is remarkably frequent, esp. in reference to periods of days or years. The 40 days of the Flood (Gen 7:4,17), the arrangement
of the life of Moses in three periods of 40 years each (Acts 7:23; Ex 7:7; Dt 34:7), the 40 years' rule or ministry of Moses (Ex 3:1, 21, 23; Jos, Ant. VI, xiv, 9), of David (1 K 2:11), of Solomon (1 K 11:42) and of Jeboam (2 K 13:1), the 40 or 80 years of rest (Jgs 3:11.30; 5:31; 8:28), the 40 years of Phili oppression (Jgs 13:1), the 40 days' challenge of Goliath (1 S 17:16), the 40 days' fast of Moses (Ex 34:28), Elijah (1 K 19:8), and Jesus (Mt 4:2 and 1), the 40 days before the destruction of Nineveh (Jon 3:4), and the 40 days before the Ascension (Acts 1:3), all suggest conventional use, or the influence of that use, for it can hardly be denied that in each of the cases, and in others which might be mentioned, was exactly 40. How it came to be so used is not quite certain, but it may have originated, partly at any rate, in the idea that 40 years constituted a generation or the period at the end of which a man attains maturity, an idea common, it would seem, to the Greeks, the Israelites, and the Arabs. The period of 40 years in the wilderness in the course of which the old Israel died out and a new Israel took its place was a generation (Nu 32:18, ete.). The rabbis long afterward regarded 40 years as the age of understanding, the age when a man reaches his intellectual prime (Ab, v, addendum). In the Koran (Sura 49) a man is said to attain his strength when 40 years old, and at that age, according to tradition, that Muhammad came forward as a prophet. In this way perhaps 40 came to be used as a round number for an indefinite period with a suggestion of completeness, and then was extended in course of time to things as well as seasons.

Other round numbers are: (1) some of the higher numbers; (2) several numerical phrases. Under (1) come the following numbers. One hundred, often of course to be understood literally, but evidently a round number in Gen 26:12; Lev 26:8; 2 S 24:3; Ecl 8:12; Mt 19:29 and ||. A thousand (thousands), very often a literal number, but in not few cases indefinite, e.g., Ex 20:6 ||; Dt 5:10; 7:9; 1 S 15:7; Ps 50:10; 90:4; 106:8; Isa 60:22, etc. Ten thousand (Heb ribbó, ribbóth, "ribbóh"); Gr μῦρος, μῦριοι) is also used as a round number as in Lev 26:8; Dt 32:30; Cant 5:10; Mic 6:7. The yet higher figures, thousands of thousands, etc., are, in almost all cases, distinct from the purely alphabetical numbers, there being remarkable examples occurring in the apocryphal books (Dn 7:10; Rev 6:11; 9:16; Ethiopic En 40:1). (2) The second group, numerical phrases, consists of a number of expressions in which numbers are used roundly, in some cases to express the idea of a fewness. One or two, etc.: "a day or two" (Ex 21:21), "an heap, two heaps" (Jgs 15:16 RVm), "one of a city, and two of a family" (Jer 3:14), "not one, nor twice," that is, several times" (2 K 16:10). Two or three: "Two or three hberries in the [topmost] hough" (Isa 17:6; cf Hos 6:2), "Where two or three are gathered together in my name," etc (Mt 18:20). König refers to Assyrian, Spts, and Arab. parallels. Three or four: the most noteworthy example is the formula which occurs 8 in Am (1:3f.6:11.16, 2:1,4.6), "for three transgressions . . . yeas for four". That the numbers here are round numbers is evident from the fact that the sins enumerated are in most cases neither 3 nor 4. In Prov 30:15. 18:29, on the other hand, the speaker, using the same rhetorical device, clmex ad majus, 4 is followed by four statements and is therefore to be taken literally. Again, König (ib) points to classical and Arab. parallels. Four or five: "Four or five in the outmost branches of a fruitful tree" (Job 32:18), and they should have smitten [Syria] five or six times" (2 K 13:19), an idiom met with also in Am 7 (König, ib). Six and seven: "He will deliver thee in six troubles; yea, in seven there shall he give thee health" (Am 3:9). "Seven shepherds, and eight principal men" (Mie 5:5), that is, "enough and more than enough" (Cheyne); "Give a portion to seven, yea, even unto eight" (Ecc 11:2). In one remarkable phrase which occurs (with slight variations of form) 24 t in the OT, two Hebrew words, meaning respectively "yesterday" and "third," are mostly used so as together to express the idea of vague reference to the past. RV renders in a variety of ways: "beforetime" (Gen 31:2, etc), "aftertime" (Josh 4:18), "henceforth" (Ex 25:1), etc in each of these cases, and in others which might be mentioned, was exactly 40. How it came to be so used is not quite certain, but it may have originated, partly at any rate, in the idea that 40 years constituted a generation or the period at the end of which a man attains maturity, an idea common, it would seem, to the Greeks, the Israelites, and the Arabs. The period of 40 years in the wilderness in the course of which the old Israel died out and a new Israel took its place was a generation (Nu 32:18, ete.). The rabbis long afterward regarded 40 years as the age of understanding, the age when a man reaches his intellectual prime (Ab, v, addendum). In the Koran (Sura 49) a man is said to attain his strength when 40 years old, and at that age, according to tradition, that Muhammad came forward as a prophet. In this way perhaps 40 came to be used as a round number for an indefinite period with a suggestion of completeness, and then was extended in course of time to things as well as seasons. By far the most prominent of these is the number 7, which is referred to in one way or another in nearly 600 passages in the Bible, as well as in many passages in the Apec and its and the Pseudepigrapha, and later Multiples Jewish literature. Of course the number has its usual numerical force in many of these places, but even there not seldom with a glance at its symbolic significance. For the determination of the latter we are not assigned to conjecture. There is clear evidence in the cuneiform texts, which are our earliest authorities, that the Babylonians regarded 7 as the number of totality, of completeness. The Sumerians, from whom the Spts have descended, are sometimes said to have been "seven-yea, the idea, equated 7 and "all." The 7-storied towers of Babylonia represented the universe. Seven was the expression of the highest power, the greatest conceivable fulness of force, and therefore was early pressed into the service of religion. It is found in reference to ritual in the age of Gudea, that is perhaps about the middle of the 3d millennium BC. "Seven gods" at the end of an enumeration meant "all the gods" (for these facts and the cuneiform evidence of Hehn, Siebenzahl und Sabbath bei den Babyloniers und im AT', 4 ff.) How 7 came to be used in this way can only be glanced at here. The view connecting it with the gods of the 7 planets, which used to be in great favor and still has its advocates, seems to lack ancient proof. Hehn (op. cit., 44 ff) has shown that the number acquired its symbolic meaning long before the earliest time for which that reference can be demonstrated. As this sacred or symbolic use of 7 was not peculiar to the Babylonians and their teachers and neighbors, but was by this time a large institution in Egypt and China, in classical lands, and among the Celts and the Germans, it probably originated in some fact of common observation, perhaps in the four lunar phases each of which comprises 7 days and a fraction. Consider Con 17:6: "the moon has not yet ceased to deepen the impression, and the fact that 7 is made up of two significant numbers, each, as will
be shown, also suggestive of completeness—3 and 4—may have been early noticed and taken into account. The Bib. use of 7 may be conveniently considered under 4 heads: (1) ritual use; (2) historical use; (3) didactic or literary use; (4) apocalyptic use.

(1) Ritual use of seven.—The number 7 plays a conspicuous part in a multitude of passages giving rules for worship or purification, or recording ritual actions. The 7th day of the Biblical week (Gen 1:7; Gen 2:3; Ex 31:17) was holy to the Lord (Ex 31:13). There were 7 days of unleavened bread (Ex 34:31, etc), and 7 days of the Feast of Tabernacles (Num 29:12-41). The 7th year was the sabbatical year (Ex 21:2, etc). The Moabite Balak built Balaam on three occasions 7 altars and offered 7 oxen and 7 rams (2 Sam 24:13-25) and 7 lambs (Num 16:24). The 7th sprinkling of blood is entered in the ritual of Atoneon (Lev 16:19, etc.) and elsewhere. "Seven" sprinkling is also repeatedly mentioned in the rules for the purification of the leper and the leprous house (Lev 14:49). The leper had to order his house, "all that comes to the house of the leprous" (7 times) in the Jordan (2 K 5:10). In Jos. of report or suspected uncleanness through leprosy, or the presence of a corpse, or for other reasons, 7 days' seclusion was necessary (Lev 12:2, etc.). Circumcision took place after 7 days (Gen 17:11). The 7th day (Ex 31:17) was the "day before" it could be offered in sacrifice (Ex 22:30). Three periods of 7 days each are mentioned in the rules for the consecration and purification of the Levites (Lev 16:30). Seven words have been in the first instance by 7 holy things (Gen 21:29 ff and Gen 37:18). The 7th day was not only considered entered into the structure of sacred objects, for instance the candlestick or lamp-stand in the tabernacle and the sanctuary (Lev 24:3, etc.). The 7th day was contained in the heptateuch (Gen 1:1-2:8; cf Gen 2:12, etc). Many other instances of the ritual use of 7 in the O.T. and many instructive parallels from Bab texts can be cited.

(2) Historical use of seven.—The number 7 also figures prominently in a large number of passages which occur in historical narrative, in a way which reminds us of its symbolic significance. The following are some of the most remarkable: (a) 7; the head of the 7 horns of the Babylonian beast was one of the visions of Daniel (Dan 7:7). A similar idea is found in Revelation (Rev 12:3). The bowing down 7 times to Esau (Gen 33:3) and to Laban (Gen 31:22, etc.) is another. (b) The 7 chosen men from among the 70 sons of Israel, mentioned in Gen 41:53, was the subject of a prophetic saying (ивр. כֶּהִי נַעֲלָם כַּעַל אֵין לַעֲלָם יֹנַדְנוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל), and there were 7 princes of Israel, with 7 sons of Saul (2 S 1:1, etc.) and 7 sons of Job (Job 12:2). There are 7 orders of angels (cf Rev 5:11), 7 seals (Rev 6:1), and 7 eyes (Rev 1:17), and 7 angels with 7 trumpets (Rev 8:2), 7 thunders (Rev 10:3), 7 golden candlesticks (Rev 1:20, etc.), 7 golden bowls of incense (4:9), 7 spirits of God (4:1, 3:14, 5:6), and 7 seals (Rev 5:1). For the full number, see also the 7 days of creation (Gen 1:1-28); the 7 days' rain (Gen 8:2), the 7 days' march of the priests blowing 7 trumpets round the walls of Jericho, and the 7-fold march on the 7th day (Num 10:10); the 7 sons of Eli, the sons of Elihu, the sons of Caleb (Num 10:29); the 7 horns of the Nebuchadnezzar's furnace 7 times more than it was heated (Dan 3:19), and the king is dressed in fine linen and wears golden crowns (Anna's 7 years of weilded life (Lk 2:36); the leaves of the tree of life in the new Jerusalem (Rev 22:19); the 7 harshest of the seven hills (Mt 5:29); the 7 last plagues (Rev 15:1), and 7 golden bowls of wrath (of God 15:7) and scattered by the 7 heads (15:8) which are 7 mountains (ver 9) and 7 kings (ver 10). The writer, whoever he was, must have had his imagination fired by the numerical symbolism which had been cultivated in Western Asia for millenniums. There cannot be a shadow of doubt that 7 is a symbol of completeness, as is the infinitive number 1. But the selection of the number, esp. in view of the fact that 7 and 7 occur repeatedly in cuneiform literature—in magical and liturgical texts, and in the formula so often used in the Am Tab: "7 and 7 times at the foot of the king my lord, I prostrate myself." The arrangement of the generations from Abraham to Christ in three groups of 14 each (Mt 17:1) is probably intentional, so far as the number in each group is concerned. It is doubtful whether the number has any symbolical sense. The doctrine of the 7 days of creation (Gen 1:1-2:3) is pure fiction, for there has been no influence of the application of its double, at least in some cases.

Forte-nine, or 7X7, occurs in two regulations of the Law. The second of the three great festivals took place on the 50th day after one of the days of unleavened bread (Lev 23:15 ff), that is, after an interval of 7X7 days. This custom may not have been separated by 7X7 years (Lev 25:8 ff). The combination is met with also in one of the so-called Pentitential Psalms of Babylon: "Although my sins are 7 times 7, forgive me my sins." 

Seven multiplied by ten, or 70, was a very strong...
expression of multitude which is met with in a large number of passages in the OT. It occurs of persons: the 70 descendants of Jacob (Ex 1:5; Dt 10:22); the 70 of Samuel (1Sm 29:23); the 70 kings ill treated by Adonibezek (Jgs 1:7); the 70 sons of Gideon (Jgs 8:30; 9:2); the 70 descendants of Abdon who rode on 70 ass-cots (Jgs 12:14); the 70 sons of Abah (2 K 10:1; 6:1); and the 70 idolatrous elders seen by Ezekiel (Ezk 8:11). It is also used of periods: 70 days of Egypt mourning for Jacob (Gen 50:3); 70 years of trial (Isa 23:15;17; Jer 26:11; Dnl 9:2; Zec 11:1;75); the 70 weeks of Daniel (Dnl 9:24); and the 70 years of human life (Ps 90:10). Other noticeable uses of 70 are in Jer 2:10 and in the prophets (Ex 15:11; Nu 33:9); the offering of 70 bullocks in the time of Hezekiah (2Ch 29:32), and the offering by the heads of the tribes of 12 silver bowls each of 70 shekels (Nu 7:13ff). In the NT we have the 70 apostles (Lk 10:1;17), but the number is uncertain B, D and some VSS reading 72, which is the product, not of 7 and 10, but of 6 and 12. Significant seventies are also met with outside of the Bible. The most noteworthy are the Jewish belief that there are 70 nations or tongues 70 languages, under the care of 70 angels, based perhaps on the list in Gen 10; the Sanhedrin of about 70 members; the tr of the Pent to Gr by LXX (more exactly 72), and the 70 members of a family in one of the writings of Josephus (Jos 8:18). The abundant use of 70 must have been largely due to the fact that it was regarded as an intensified 7.

Seventy and seven, or 77, a combination found in the words of Lamech (Gen 4:24); the number of the first and elders of the 3rd of Sanhedrin (2Sm 24:8); and the number of lambs in a memorable sacrifice (Eer 8:35), would appeal in the same way to the oriental fancy.

The product of seven and seventy (Gr habadamokontidakia hepet) is met with once in the NT (Mt 15:22), and in the LXX of the above-quoted Gen 4:24. Moulton, however (Gram. of Gr NT Protopraema, 98), renders in both passages 70+7; contra, Allen, "Mt," ICC, 199. The number is clearly a forceful equivalent of "always." Seven thousand in 1 K 19 18 is Rom 11 4 may be a round number chosen on account of its embodiment of the number 7. In the M S the number of Israelites slain at the capture of the city of Nebo by Hezekiah is reckoned.

The half of seven seems sometimes to have been regarded as significant. In Dnl 7:25; 9:27; 12:7; Lk 4:25; Jas 5:17; Rev 11:2; 13:5 a period of distress is calculated at 3½ years, that is, half the period of sacred completeness.

The number three seems early to have attracted attention as the number in which beginning, middle and end are most distinctly marked, and to have been therefore regarded as symbolic of a complete and ordered whole. Abundant illustration of its use in this way in Bab theology, ritual and magic is given from the cuneiform texts by Hohn (op. cit., 63 ff), and the hundreds of passages in the Bible in which the number occurs include many where his special significance either lies on the surface or not far beneath it. This is owing in some degree perhaps to Bab influence, but will have been largely due to independent observation of common phenomena—thearithmetical fact more wars, 70 national calamities, 70 years to marriage, etc. as being an exact period of time, 70, the number of the earth, and sea, or "the abyss"; morning, noon and night; right, middle, and left, etc. In other words, 3 readily suggested completeness, and was often used with a glance at that meaning in daily life and daily speech. Only a few of the most memorable examples of Bib. examples can be given here. (1) Three is often found of persons and things sacred or secular, e.g. Noah's 3 sons (Gen 6:10); Job's 3 daughters (Job 1:2; 42:13) and 3 friends (Job 2:11); Abraham's 3 sons (Gen 17:19; 22:18); and the 3 measures of meal (ver 6; cf Mt 13:33); 3 in military tactics (Jgs 7:16,20; 9:43; 1 Sm 11:13, 17; Job 1:17); 3 great feasts (Ex 23:14); the 3 daily prayers (Ps 55:17; Dnl 6:10); the 3 might watches (Jgs 7:19); God's 3-fold call of Samuel (1 Sm 3:8); the 3 keepers of the temple threshold (Jr 52:24); the 3 presidents appointed by Darius (Dnl 6:2); the 3 temptations (Mt 4:3, 5, 8); the 3 prayers in Gethsemane (Mt 26:39, 42, 44); Peter's 3 denials (Mt 26:54,75); the Lord's 3-fold question and 3-fold charge (Jn 21:15 ff); and the 3-fold vision of the sheet (Acts 10:16). (2) In a very large number of passages 3 is used of periods of time: 3 days; 3 weeks; 3 months and 3 years. So in Gen 40:12,13,18; Ex 2:2; 10:22; 2 S 24:13; Isa 30: 3; Jon 1:17; Mt 16:12; Lk 2:46; 13:7; Acts 9:9; 2 Cor 12:8. The frequent reference to the resurrection "on the 3d day" or "after 3 days" (Mt 16:21; 27:63, etc) may at the same time have glanced at the symbolic use of the number 3. We must therefore begin to the Jews and the Zoroastrians that a corpse was not recognizable after 3 days (for Jewish testi mony of Jr 11:39; Yô'hâmâh, xvi, 3; Midr. Gen, ch c; Smôkhôth, viii; for Pers ideas cf Esp 7, XVIII, 589). The number 3 has in the OT & NT a most abundant use of 70 must have been largely due to the fact that it was regarded as an intensified 7.

Seven thousand in 1 K 19 18 is Rom 11 4 may be a round number chosen on account of its embodiment of the number 7. In the M S the number of Israelites slain at the capture of the city of Nebo by Hezekiah is reckoned.

The half of seven seems sometimes to have been regarded as significant. In Dnl 7:25; 9:27; 12:7; Lk 4:25; Jas 5:17; Rev 11:2; 13:5 a period of distress is calculated at 3½ years, that is, half the period of sacred completeness.

The number three seems early to have attracted attention as the number in which beginning, middle and end are most distinctly marked, and to have been therefore regarded as symbolic of a complete and ordered whole. Abundant illustration of its use in this way in Bab theology, ritual and magic is given from the cuneiform texts by Hohn (op. cit., 63 ff), and the hundreds of passages in the Bible in which the number occurs include many where his special significance either lies on the surface or not far beneath it. This is owing in some degree perhaps to Bab influence, but will have been largely due to independent observation of common phenomena—thearithmetical fact more wars, 70 national calamities, 70 years to marriage, etc. as being an exact period of time, 70, the number of the earth, and sea, or "the abyss"; morning, noon and night; right, middle, and left, etc. In other words, 3 readily suggested completeness, and was often used with a glance at that meaning in daily life and daily speech. Only a few of the most memorable examples of Bib. examples can be given here. (1) Three

2. The Number Three

Abundant illustration of its use in this way in Bab theology, ritual and magic is given from the cuneiform texts by Hohn (op. cit., 63 ff), and the hundreds of passages in the Bible in which the number occurs include many where his special significance either lies on the surface or not far beneath it. This is owing in some degree perhaps to Bab influence, but will have been largely due to independent observation of common phenomena—thearithmetical fact more wars, 70 national calamities, 70 years to marriage, etc. as being an exact period of time, 70, the number of the earth, and sea, or "the abyss"; morning, noon and night; right, middle, and left, etc. In other words, 3 readily suggested completeness, and was often used with a glance at that meaning in daily life and daily speech. Only a few of the most memorable examples of Bib. examples can be given here. (1) Three

3. The Number of completeness of range, of Four

comprehensive extent. As early as the beginning of the millennium the 11 Bab rulers (followed long afterward by the Assyrians) assumed the title "king of the 4 quarters," meaning that their rule reached in all directions, and an early conqueror claimed to have subdued the 4 quarters. There are not a few illustrations of the use of 4 in some such way in the Bible. The 4 winds (referred to also in the cuneiform texts and the Book of the Dead) are mentioned again and again (Jer 49:30; Ezk 37:9, and the 4 quarters or corners of Gen 1:12; Ezk 47:12). We read also of the 4 heads of the river of Eden (Gen 2:10 ff), of 4 horns, 4 smiths, 4 chariots, and horses of 4 colors in the visions of Zechariah (1Sm 18, 15; 2Sm 5; 1K 14:9, 11; 2Sm 5:11, 12). As a parallel, the 4 kingdoms in Nebuchadnezzar's
dream as interpreted (Dn 2 37 ff) and Daniel's vision (7 3 ff); the 4 living creatures in Ezek (1 5 ff; cf 10), each with 4 faces and 4 wings, and the 4 modeled after them (Rev 4 6, etc). In most of these cases 4 is clearly symbolic, as in a number of passages in Apoc and Pseudepigrapha. Whether the frequent use of it in the description of the tabernacle, Solomon's temple, and Ezekiel's temple has anything to do with the symbolic meaning is not clear, but the latter can probably be traced in proverbs and prophetic speech (Prov 30 15,18,21. 22; 31 10,12,15,16,25; Am 5 5ff). The latter represent full-summed insignity, and the 4-folding in the former suggested the wide sweep of the classification. Perhaps it is fanciful to find the idea in the 4 sets of ministers in the temple of the Sover (Mt 13 19–23 ). The rabbis almost certainly had it in mind in their 4-folding of characters in six successive paragraphs (Ab, v.16–21) which, however, is of considerably later date.

4. The Number patriarchy (Gen 5; of the 10 Bab kings of Berosus, and 10 in early Iranian texts; Dn 7 10; 12; 11 32; 6 12,14,18; 26; etc). Ten of the 36 citizens of Sodom (Gen 18 22); the 10 plagues of Egypt; the 10 commandments (Ex 20 1–17) Dt 5 1–21; the 10 commandments found by some in Ex 34 14–26 are not clearly made out); the 10 servants of Gideon (Jgs 6 27); the 10 elders who accompanied Boaz (Ruth 4 2); the 10 virgins of the parable (Mt 25 1); the 10 pieces of silver (Lk 15 8); the 10 servants intrusted with 10 pounds (Lk 15 11 ff), the most capable of whom was placed over 10 cities (Lk 12 17); the 10 days' tribulation predicted for the church of Smyrna (Rev 2 10); the use of "10 times" in the sense of "many times" (Gen 51 7; Neh 4 12; Dn 1 20, etc; an idiom met with repeatedly in Am and Tob); and the use of 10 in sacred measurements and in the widely diffused custom of tithe, and many other examples show plainly that 10 was a favorite symbolic number suggestive of a rounded total, large or small, according to circumstances. The decemvirate was a prominent idea in the early Jewish life and thought. Ten times was the Tetragrammaton uttered by the high priest on the Day of Atonement; 10 persons must be present at a nuptial benediction; 10 constituted a congregation in Israel; the number was ascribed to the company at the paschal meal, and of a row of conquerors of the bereaved. The world was created, said the rabbis, by ten words, and Abraham was visited with 10 temptations (Ab, v.1 and 4; several other numbers are found in the contexts).

The 12 months and the 12 signs of the zodiac probably suggested to the old Babylonians the use of 12 as a symbolic or semi-sacred number, but its frequent employment by the Hebrews with special meaning cannot at present be proved to have originated in that way, although the idea was favored by both Jos and Philo. So far as we know, Israellite predilection for 12 was entirely due to the traditional belief that the nation consisted of 12 tribes, a belief, it is true, entertained also by the Arabs or some of them, but with much less intensity and persistence. In Israel the belief was universal and ineradicable. Hence the 12 pillars set up by Moses (Ex 24 4), the 12 jewels of Aaron's breastplate (Ex 28 18ff), the 12 cakes of shewbread (Lev 21 5); the 12 rods (Nu 17 2); the 12 spies (Nu 13); the 12 stones placed by Joshua in the bed of Jordan (Josh 4 9); the 12 officers of Solomon (1 K 4 7); the 12 stones of Eliah's altar (1 K 18 31); the 12 disciples or apostles (26 t), and several details of apocalyptic imagery (Rev 7 5 ff; 12 1, 21, 12.14.16.21; 22 2, cf also Mt 14 20; 19 25; 26 33; Acts 26 7). The number points to a certain completeness which had been sanctioned by Divine election, and it retained this significance when applied to the spiritual Israel. Philo indeed calls it a perfect number. Its double in Rev 4 4, etc, is probably also significant.

Five came into prominence into the mind as the half of 10. Hence perhaps its use in the parable of the Virgins (Mt 25 2). It was often employed in the apocalyptic, especially in Jewish apocalyptic, for the number of the multitude in judgment, and is particularly suggested in Daniel's vision (7 10). It seems to have been occasionally suggestive of relative smallness, as in Lev 26 8, the 5 loaves (Mt 14 17), 1 Cor 14 10, and perhaps in A. a text-marked (Skr; "Gen."

6. Other Significant Numbers the Hagiographa known as the Ethnographic Numbers (Mt 7 28; 11 13; 19 16; 26 1; cf Sir J. Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, 1683). It seems to have been occasionally suggestive of relative smallness, as in Lev 26 8, the 5 loaves (Mt 14 17), 1 Cor 14 10, and perhaps in A. a text-marked (Skr; "Gen."

7; 10; 13 ff). It is used as a base of time (Ex 12 31; 20 10) in the calculations of the ages of the patriarchs, and other figures which may be expected, many are found in the Bible, however, the special use of the number is relatively rare and indirect. One hundred and ten, the phrase is often used by Jeremiah (e.g. 50 22), significant as the Egyptian ideal of longevity (Smith, DB, 1894 4 380, 381; J. A. Skinner, 'Jer."

7. The Number of the Name (Ab, v.1 and 4; several other numbers are found in the contexts).

VI. Gematria (*gematria*)—A parallel application of numbers which was in great use with the later Jews and some of the early Christians and is not absolutely unknown to the Bible, is *gematria*, that is the use of the letters of a word so as by means of their combined numerical value to express a name, or a witty association of ideas. The term is usually explained as an adaptation of the Gr word *geomatia*, that is, "geometry," but Dalman (Wörterbuch, s.v.) connects it in this application of it with *grammatia*. There is only one clear example in Scripture of the use of numbers which is the number of a man, six hundred sixty and six (Rev 13 18). If, as most scholars are inclined to believe, a name is intended, the numerical value of the letters composing which adds up to 666, and if it is assumed that the writer thought in Heb or Aram. Nero Caesar, writers with the number 666, * resh = 200, vav = 6, nun = 50, kaph = 100, gemesh = 60, resh = 200; total = 666, seems to be the best solution. Perhaps the idea suggested by Dr. Milligan that the 6-fold use of 6 which just falls short of 7, the number generally considered complete, and therefore a note of imperfection, may have been also in the writer's mind. Some modern scholars find a second instance in Gen 14 14 and 15 2. As the
numerical value of the consonants which compose Elohim in Heb add up to 318, it has been maintained that the number is not historical, but has been fancifully constructed by means of gematria out of the name. This strange idea is not new, for it is found in the Midrash on Gen (ch 43) in the name of a rabbi who lived c 200 AD, but its antiquity is its greatest merit.

Literature.—In addition to other books referred to in the course of the art.: Rehm, Siebenzahl und Sabbat bei den Juden; Dr. Konig, Die sechs Sippen, Vol IV; Rabinowitsch, Period 41—57, and the same writer's art. "Number" in HDB; Sir J. Hawkins, Horse Sympotomata, 163—11/27; Hoehner on Pentateuchal Criticism, 152—69; "Number" in HDB (1-vol); EB; Jew Enc. Smith, DB; Numbers in DCG; "Zahlen" in the Dict. of Wisen, Richen, Guthe; Zahn's and Schenel in RB.

William Taylor Smith

Number, Golden. See Golden Number.

Numering See David; Quirinitis.

Numbers, number, Book of:

I. Title and Contents

1. Title
2. Contents

II. Literary Structure

1. Alleged grounds of Distribution
2. Objections to Same
   (a) Hypothesis Unproved
   (b) Written Record Not Impossible
   (c) No Book Ever Thus Constructed
3. Inherent Difficulties of Analysis
   (a) The Story of the Spies
   (b) Reunion of Korah
   (c) Story of Balaam

III. Historical Credibility

1. Seeming Chronological Inaccuracies
   (a) The Second Passover
   (b) The Thirty-seven Years' Chasm
   (c) Fortieth Year
2. So-called Statistical Errors
   (a) Number of the Fighting Men
   (b) Size of the Congregation
   (c) Multiplication of People
   (d) Exodus in One Day
   (e) Support in Wilderness
   (f) Room at Mt. Sinai
   (g) Slow Conquest of Canaan
3. Number of the Firstborn
4. Alleged Physical Impossibilities
   (a) Duties of the Priests
   (b) Assembling of the Congregation
   (c) Marching of the Host
   (d) Victory over Midian

IV. Authorship

1. Against the Mosaic Authorship
   (a) Alternating use of Divine names
   (b) Traces of Late Authorship
2. In favor of Mosaic Authorship
   (a) Certain Passages Have the Appearance of Having Been Written by Moses
   (b) Acquaintance with Egyptian Manners and Customs

Literature

I. Title and Contents.—Styled in the Heb Bible מַעְרִיב, "in the wilderness," from the 5th word in 1 1, probably because of recording the fortunes of Israel in the Sinaitic desert. The 4th book of the Pent (or of the Hex, according to criticism) was designated אָדָם, אֱרָתָמָי, in LXX and Numan in the Vulg, and from this last received its name "Numbers" in the AV, in all 3 evidently because of its reporting the 2 censuses which were taken, the one at Sinai at the beginning and the other on the plains of Moab at the close of the wanderings. Of the contents the following arrangement will be sufficiently detailed:

(1) Before leaving Sinai, 1 1—10 10 (a period of 19 days, from 1st to the 30th of the 2d month after the exodus), describing:
   (a) the numbering and ordering of the people, chs 1—4.
   (b) the cleansing and blessing of the congregation,
   (c) the princes' offerings and the dedication of the 63 centers, chs 5—8.
   (d) the observance of a second Passover, 9 1—14.
   (e) the cloud and the trumpets for the march, 9 15—10 10.

(2) From Sinai to Kadesh, 10 11—14 45 (a period of 10 days, from the 20th to the 30th of the 2d month), narrating:
   (a) The departure from Sinai, 10 1—11.
   (b) The events at Taberah and Kibroth-hattavah, ch 11.
   (c) The rebellion of Miriam and Aaron, ch 12.
   (d) The wanderings of the spies, ch 13.

(3) The wanderings in the desert, chs 15—19 (a period of 37 years, from the end of the 2d to the beginning of the 4th year), recording:
   (a) Sundry laws and the punishment of a Sabbath breaker, ch 15.
   (b) The rebellion of Korah, ch 16.
   (c) The budding of Aaron's rod, ch 17.
   (d) The duties and revenues of the priests and Levites, ch 18.
   (e) The water of separation for the unclean, ch 19.

(4) From Kadesh to Moab, chs 20, 21 (a period of 10 months, from the beginning of the 40th year), reciting:
   (a) The story of Balaam, 22 2—24 25.
   (b) The zeal of Pinchas, ch 25.
   (c) The second census, 26 1—51.
   (d) Directions for dividing the land, 26 52—27 11.
   (e) Appointment of Moses' successor, 27 12—29.
   (f) Concerning offerings and vows, chs 28—30.
   (g) War with Midian, ch 31.
   (h) Settlement of Reuben and Gad, ch 32.
   (i) List of camping stations, 33 1—49.
   (j) Canaan to be cleared of its inhabitants and divided, 33 50—34 29.
   (k) Citizens refuge to be appointed, ch 35.
   (l) The marriage of heiresses, ch 36.

II. Literary Structure.—According to modern criticism, the text of Nu, like that of the other books of the Pent (or Hex), instead of being regarded as substantially the work of one writer (whatever zeal they may have been his sources of information and whoever may have been its first or latest editor), should be distributed—not always in solid blocks of composition, but frequently in fragments, in sentences, clauses or words, so mysteriously put together that they cannot now with certainty be separated—among three writers, J, E and P with another D (at least in one part)—these writers, individuals and not schools (Gunkel), belonging, respectively: J to the 9th cent. BC (c 530), E to the 8th cent. BC (c 750), P to the 5th cent. BC (c 644), and D to the 7th cent. BC (c 621).

The grounds upon which this distribution is made are principally these: (1) the supposed preferential use of the Divine names, of

1. Alleged Jeh (Lord) by J, and of Elohim (God) by E and P—a theory of the Hex;

2. Distribution hopelessly breaks down in its application, as Orr (PET, ch viii), Eerdman (St, 33 ff) and Wiener (EPC, 1) have conclusively shown, and as will afterward appear; (2) distinctions in style of composition, which are not always obvious and which, even if they were, would not necessarily imply diversity of authorship unless every author's writing must be uniform and monotonous, whatever his subject may be; and (3) perhaps only a prejudice in religious development in Israel, according to which the people in pre-Mosaic times were animists, totemists and polytheists; in Mosaic times and after, henotheists or worshippers of one God, while recognizing the existence of other gods; and latterly, in exilic and post-exilic times, monothists or worshippers of the one living and true God—which theory, in order to vindicate its plausibility, required the reconstruction of Israel's religious documents in the way above described, but which is now rejected by archaeologists (Delitzsch and A. Jeremias) and by theologians (Orr, Baentisch [though accepting the analysis of other grounds] and König) as not supported by facts.

Without denying that the text-analysis of criticism is on the first blush of it both plausible and
attractive and has brought to light valuable information relative to Scripture, or without overlooking the fact that it has behind it the names of eminent scholars and is supported by not a few considerations of weight, one may fairly urge against it the following objections.

2. Object is unproved.—At the best, the theory is an unproved and largely imaginary hypothesis, or series of hypotheses—"hypothesis built on hypothesis" (Orr); and nothing more strikingly reveals this than (a) the frequency with which in the text-analysis conjecture ("perhaps" and "probably") takes the place of reasoned proof; (b) the arbitrary manner in which the supposed documents are constructed by the critics who, without reason given, and often in violation of their own rules and principles, lift out of J (for instance) every word or clause they consider should belong to E or P, and vice versa every word or clause out of E or P that might suggest that the passage should be assigned to J, at the same time explaining the presence of the inconvenient word or clause in a document to which it did not belong by the careless or deliberate action of a redactor; and (c) the failure even thus to construct the documents, the most that J and E cannot with confidence be separated from each other—Kuenen himself saying that "the attempt to make out a Jehovistic and an Elohist writer or school of writers by means of the Divine names has failed of its ends in those of P substituted"; and some even denying that P ever existed as a separate document at all, Eerdmans (St, 33, 82), in particular, maintaining, as the result of elaborate exegesis, that P could not have been constructed in the post-exilic times "as an introduction to a legal work.

(2) Written record not impossible.—It is impossible to demonstrate that the story of Israel's "wanderings" was not committed to writing by Moses, who certainly was not unacquainted with the art of writing, who had the ability, if any man had, to prepare such a writing, whose interest it was, as the leader of his people, to see that such writing, whether done by himself or by others under his superintendence, was never allowed to be without at least a few such precautions as had been commanded by God to write the journeys of Israel (33 2). To suppose that for 500 years no reliable record of the fortunes of Israel existed, when during these years writing was practised in Egypt, and the Moabites had been commanded by God to write the journeys of Israel (33 2). To suppose that for 500 years no reliable record of the fortunes of Israel existed, when during these years writing was practised in Egypt, and the Moabites had been commanded by God to write the journeys of Israel (33 2). To suppose that for 500 years no reliable record of the fortunes of Israel existed, when during these years writing was practised in Egypt, and the Moabites had been commanded by God to write the journeys of Israel (33 2). To suppose that for 500 years no reliable record of the fortunes of Israel existed, when during these years writing was practised in Egypt, and the Moabites had been commanded by God to write the journeys of Israel (33 2). To suppose that for 500 years no reliable record of the fortunes of Israel existed, when during these years writing was practised in Egypt, and the Moabites had been commanded by God to write the journeys of Israel (33 2).

(3) No book constructed in this way.—No reliable evidence exists that any book either ancient or modern was ever constructed as, according to criticism, the Pent. and in particular Nu, was. Volumes have indeed been composed by two or more authors, acting in concert, but their contributions have never been intermixed as those of J, E, and P are declared to have been; nor, when joint authorship has been acknowledged on the title-page, has it been possible for readers confidently to assign to each author his own contribution. And yet, modern criticism, dealing with documents more than 2,000 years old and in a language quite different from the original, and modern, is, even in MSS not older than the 10th cent. AD (Buhl, Canon and Text of the OT, 28), and the text of which has been fixed not infallibly either as to consonant or vowel—claims that it can tell exactly (or nearly so) what parts, whether paragraphs, sentences, clauses or words, were supplied by J, E, P and D respectively. Credet Judaeus Apella! (4) Inherent difficulties of analysis.—The critical theory, besides making of the text of Nu, as of the other books of the Pent, such a patchwork as is unthinkably impossible in any document with ordinary pretension to historical veracity, is burdened with inherent difficulties which make it hard to credit, as the following examples, taken from Nu, will show.


P, 13 1-17a.21.25-26a (to Paran).32a; 14 1.2 (in the main); 5.7.10.26-38 (in the main).

Kautzsch generally agrees; and Hartford-Battles in HDB professes ability to divide between J and E.

(i) According to this analysis, however, up to the middle of the 5th cent. BC, either JE began at 13 178, in which case it wanted both the instruction to search the land and the names of the searchers, both of which were subsequently added from P (assuming it to have been a separate document, a notion which is doubtless); or, if JE contained both the instruction and the names, these were supplanted by 1-17a from P. As the former of these alternatives is hardly likely, one naturally asks why the opening verses of JE were removed and these verses of P substituted? And if they were removed, what has become of them? Does not the occurrence of Jeh in 1-17a, on the critical principles of some, suggest that this section is the missing paragraph of JE?

(ii) If these JE passages furnish a nearly complete narrative (Driver), why should the late compiler or editor have deemed it necessary to insert two whole verses, 21 and 25, and two halves, 26a and 32a, if not because without these the original JE narrative would have been incomplete? Ver 21 states in general terms that the spies searched the whole land, proceeding as far as. As Hamath, after which ver 22 mentions that they entered the country from the S. and went up to Hebron and Eshcol, a little without at Judges 13 21 and 32a, implying (Driver) that they traveled no farther N— the reason for specifying the visit to Eshcol being the interesting fact that there the extraordinary cluster of grapes was obtained. Vs 25.26a relate quite naturally their return from the Eshcol fresh after 40 days and reported what they had found to Moses and Aaron as well as to all the congregation.

Without these verses the narrative would have stated neither how long the land had been searched nor whether Moses and Aaron had received any report from their messengers, although ver 26b implies that a report was given to some person or persons unnamed. That Moses and Aaron should not have been named in JE is exceedingly improbable. Yet this is in no way inconsistent with vs 266-31, which state that the land was flowing with milk and honey. What ver 32a adds is an expression of the exaggerated fears of the spies, whose language could not mean that the land was so barren that they would die of starvation, a statement which would have expressly contradicted ver 27 (JE)—in which case why should it have been inserted?—but that, notwithstanding its fruitfulness, the population was continually being treated by interminable wars and the incursions of surrounding peoples. The starvations theory, moreover, is not supported by the texts (Lev 26 38; Ezek 36 13) usually quoted in its behalf.

(iii) To argue (Driver) for two documents because Joshua is not always mentioned with
Caleb is not strikingly convincing; while if Joshua is not included among the spies in Je, that is obviously because the passages containing his name have been assigned beforehand to P. But if Joshua's name did not occur in JE, why would it have been inserted in the story by a post-exilic writer, when even in Dt 1 38 Joshua is not among the witnesses of the prophecy? Throughout the language in Dt 1 38 tacitly suggests that both Caleb and Joshua were among the promoters of the expedition, and again the impression that Joshua was not among the spies is strongly suggested. If the text-analysis is as the critics argue, how comes it that in JE the name Jeh does not once occur, while all the verses containing it are allocated to P?  

(iii) The rebellion of Korah: Chs 16 and 17 are supposed to be the work of "two, if not three," contributors (Driver, Kautzsch)—the whole story being assigned to P (anach or continuity to experience). If one or another (text analysis are not unanimous), with the exception of 16.15:2.12-15:25.26:27-34, which are given to JE, though variations and interpolations are uniformly always. It is admitted that the JE verses, if read continuously, make out a story of Dathan and Abiram as distinct from and separate from the company that the motives of Dathan and Abiram probably differed from those of Korah, and that Dathan and Abiram were swallowed up by an earthquake, while the 250 incense-offerers were destroyed by fire. To conclude from this three or even two narratives have been intermixed is traveling beyond the premises.

(iii) If JE contained more about the conspiracy of the Peobaithites, Dathan and Abiram, than has been preserved in the verses assigned to it, what has become of the excised verses, if they are not those ascribed to P; and if they are not, what evidence exists that P's verses are better than the lost verses of JE? And how comes it that the same used throughout, with one exception, ver. 22, is Jeh, while in JE it occurs only 6 times? (ii) JE contains only the parts assigned to it and nothing more happened than the Reubenites smote, why should the Korahite rebellion have been added to it 4 centuries later. (iii) If the rebellion never happened? (iii) If the Korahite conspiracy did happen, why should it have been omitted in JE, and nothing whispered about it till after the exile? (iv) If the two conspiracies, ecclesiastical (among the princes) and civil (among the laymen), arose contemporaneously, and the conspirators made common cause with one another, in that there was nothing ground for two such stories, it is not understandable. If Moses addressed himself now to Korah and again to Dathan and Abiram, why should not the same document say so? (iii) If Dathan and Abiram were swallowed up by an earthquake, and the 250 princes were consumed by fire from the tabernacle, it is not at all clear what the events of the two documents since both events might have occurred together. (vii) It is not certain that P (vs 35-45) represents Korah as consumed by fire. While the JE (vs 3-6) declares he was swallowed up by the earth. At least P (36 10) distinctly states that Korah was swallowed up by the earth, since that only the 250 were consumed by fire. 

Therefore, in the face of these considerations, it is not too much to say that the evidence for more documents than one in this story is not convincing.

(c) The story of Balaam: Chs 22-24 fare more leniently at the hands of analysis, being all left with JE, except 22:23 which is definitely handed over to P. Uncertainty, however, exists as to how to partition ch 22 between J and E. Whether all should be given to E because of the almost uniform use of Elohim rather than of Jeh, with the exception of vs 92-94 which are the property of P because of the use of Jeh (Driver, Kautzsch); or whether some additional verses should not be assigned to J (Cornill, HDB), critics are not agreed. As to chs 23 and 24, authorities hesitate whether to give both to J or to E, or ch 23 to J and ch 24 to E, or both to a late redactor who had access to the two sources—surely an unsatisfactory demonstration in this case at least of the documentary hypothesis.

Comment on the use of the Divine names in this story is reserved till later. 

Yet, while declining to accept this hypothesis as proved, it is not contended that the material in Nu are always arranged in chronological order, or that the style of composition is throughout the same, or that the book as it stands has never been revised or edited, but is in every jot and tittle the same as when first constructed. In ch 7, e.g., the narrative goes back to the 1st day of the 1st month of the 2d year, and in ch 9 to the 1st month of the 2d year, though both begins with the 1st month of the 2d year. There are also legislative passages interspersed among the historical, and poetical among the prosaic, but diversity of authorship, as already suggested, cannot be inferred from either of these facts unless it is impossible for a writer to be sometimes the editor of the arrangement of his materials; and for a lawyer to be also a historian, and for a prose writer occasionally to burst into song. Assertions like these, however, cannot be entertained. Hence any argument for plurality of documents founded on them must be set aside. Nor is it a fair conclusion against the literary unity of the book that its contents are varied in substance and form and have been subjected, as is probable, to revision and even to interpolations, when the revisers and interpolators have not changed the meaning of the book. Whether, therefore, the Book of Nu has or has not been compiled from preexisting documents, it cannot be justly maintained that the text-analysis suggested by the critics has shown that the literary unity of Nu has been disproved.

III. Historical Credibility. —Were the narrative in this book written down immediately or soon after the events it records, no reason would exist for challenging its authenticity, unless it could be shown either from the narrative itself or from extraneous sources that the events chronicled were internally improbable, incredible or falsified. Even should it be proved that the text consists of two or more preexisting documents interwoven with one another, this would not necessarily invalidate its truthfulness, if these documents were practically contemporaneous with the incidents they report, and were not combined in such a way as to distort and misrepresent the occurrences they related. If, however, these preexisting documents were prepared 500 (JE) or 1,000 (P) years after the incidents they narrate, and were merely a fixing in written characters of traditions previously handed down (JE), or of oral traditions (P) or an entirely imaginary one, (P), it will not be easy to establish their historical validity. The credibility of this portion of the Pent has been assailed on the alleged ground that it contains chronological inaccuracies, statistical errors and physical improprieties.

1. The Pasover (9-10) —The critical argument is that a contemporary historian would naturally have placed this paragraph before 1 1. The answer is that pos-

Chrono-

logically he would have done so had his object been to observe strict chronolo-

gical order, which it manifestly was not (see chs 7 and 9), and had he when commencing the book deemed it necessary to state that the Israelites had celebrated a second Pasover on the legally appointed day, the 14th of the 1st month of the 2d year. This, however, he possibly at first assumed would be understood, and only afterward, when giving the reason for the supple-

mentary Pasover, realized that in after years readers might erroneously conclude that this was all the Pasover that had been kept in the 2d year. So to obviate any such mistaken inference, he pre-

fixed to his account of the Little Pasover, as it is sometimes called, a statement to the effect that the statutory Pasover, the one which had been observed at the usual time, in the usual way, and that, too, in obedience to the express commandment of Jeh.
(2) The thirty-seven years' chasm.—Whether 20 1 be considered the beginning of the 3d or of the 40th year, in either case 37 years is a round figure over—in at least one case in almost unbroken silence: in the other with scarcely anything of moment recorded save Korah's rebellion. The explanation that a flux of chains concurred with offerings to be made when the people reached the land of their habitation. To pronounce the whole book unhistorical, because of long intervals of absolute or comparative silence (Block) is unreasonable. Most historians believe there would be space into the whole period. Besides, a historian might have as good reason for passing over as for recording the incidents of any period of 20 years. This might have been the case with the author of Nu. From the moment sentence of death given at Kadesh till the hour when the new generation started out for Canaan, he may have counted that Israel had practically passed away: the least that the fortunes formed no part of the history of Jeh's kingdom; it is noticeable that scarcely had the tribes returned at Kadesh in preparation for their onward march than Miriam and Aaron, probably the last of the doomed generation, died. Accordingly, from this point on, the narrative is occupied with the fortunes of the new generation. Whether correct or not, this solution of 37 years' silence (Kurtz) is preferable to that which suggests (Ewald) that the late compiler, having found it impossible to locate all the tradition he had collected into the closing years of the wanderings, placed the rest of the story in a later date, and left this interval a blank, in a solution which has not even the merit of being clever and explains nothing. It does not explain why, if the narrative was begun in history, there could have been an interval at all. A romance would not have missed so splendid an opportunity for an incident, this art would have been spared, had the 37 years been unfiled, but like the writers of the apocryphal Gospels would have crowded it with manufactured details.

On the better theory, not only is the silence explained, but the items inserted are accounted for as well. Though the unbelching generation had ceased to be the people of Jeh, Aaron had not yet been sentenced to exclusion from the future land and was still one of the representatives of the kingdom of Jeh, and Korah's rebellion practically struck a blow at that kingdom. As such it was published, and as part of its breaking, and suppression was recorded, as a matter of vitally concerned the story of the departure of the last generation, the later narrative sections were included in the narrative. They were Jeh's acts and not the people's. They were statutes and ordinances for the new generation in the new land.

(3) The fortieth year.—The events recorded as having taken place between the 1st of the 5th month (the date of Moses' death) and the 1st of the 11th month (the date of Moses' address) are so numerous and important as to render it impossible, it is said, to maintain the credibility of this portion of the narrative. But (a) it is not certain that all the events in this section were fulfilled; before Moses began his oration, neither (b) nor (c) is it necessary to hold that they all occurred in succession; while the events (Ex 14) which follow one another so closely, that one is uncertain, it will not be possible to decide whether or not they could all have been begun and finished in a space of 6 months.

(1) Number of the fighting men.—This, which may be set down roughly at 600,000, has been challenged on two grounds: (a) that the 2,000,000 number is too large, and (b) that the statistical censuses at Sinai and in Moab are Errors too nearly equal.

The first of these objections will be considered in the following section when treating of the size of the congregation. The second will not appear formidable if it be remembered (a) that it is not impossible nor unusual for the population of a country to remain stationary for a long series of years; (b) that there was a special fitness in Israel's case that the doomed generation should be replaced by one as nearly as possible equal to that which had perished; (c) that had the narrative been invented, it is more than likely that the numbers would have been made either exactly equal or more widely divergent; and (d) that no such variations occurring in the strength of the tribes as numbered at Sinai and again in Moab, while nearly equal, is uncontroversial; constitutes a watermark of truthfulness which should not be overlooked.

(2) The size of the congregation.—Taking the fighting men at 600,000, and the whole community at 411 times that number, or about 271 millions, several difficulties emerge which have led to the suggestion (Erdmann, Conder, Wiener) that the 600,000 should be reduced (to, say, 6,000), and the entire population to less than 30,000. The following alleged impossibilities are believed to justify the reduction: (a) that of 700 millions between the descent into, and the departure from, Egypt; (b) that of 2½ millions being led out of Egypt in one day; (c) that of obtaining support for so large a multitude with their flocks in the Sinaitic desert, and flocks should have been either at the Mount Sinai, or on the limited territory of Pal; and (e) that of the long time it took to conquer Pal if the army was 600,000 strong.

(a) Multiplication of people: As to the possibility of 70 souls multiplying in the course of 215 years or 7 generations (to take the shorter interval rather than the longer of 430 years) into 2½ millions of persons giving 600,000 fighting men, that need not be regarded as incredible till the rate of increase in each family is exactly known. Allowing to each of Jacob's sons who were married (say 51 out of 53), 4 male descendants (Colenso allows 4), these would in 7 generations—not in 4 (Colenso)—amount to 835,584, and with surviving fathers and grandfathers added might well reach 600,000 in 20 years or 600,000 in 2,000 years of age. But in point of fact, without definite data about the number of generations, the rates of birth and of mortality in each generation, all calculations are at the best problematical. The most that can be done is to consider whether the narrative mentions any circumstances fitted to explain this large number of fighting men and the great size of the congregation, and then whether the customary objections to the Bib. statement can be satisfactorily answered.

As for confirmatory circumstances, the Bible expressly states that during the years of the oppression the Hebrews were extraordinarily fruitful, and that this was the reason why Pharaoh became alarmed and issued his edict for the destruction of the male children. The fruitfulness of the Hebrews, however, has been challenged (Erdmann, Vorgeschichte Israels, 78) on the ground that were the births so numerous as this presupposes, two midwives (Ex 1 20), who according to the narrative followed one another is ascertained, it will not be possible to decide whether or not they could all have been begun and finished in a space of 6 months.

(1) Number of the fighting men.—This, which may be set down roughly at 600,000, has been challenged on two grounds: (a) that the 2,000,000 number is too large, and (b) that the statistical censuses at Sinai and in Moab are Errors too nearly equal.

The first of these objections will be considered in the following section when treating of the size of the congregation. The second will not appear formidable if it be remembered (a) that it is not impossible nor unusual for the population of a country to remain stationary for a long series of years; (b) that there was a special fitness in Israel's case that the doomed generation should be replaced by one as nearly as possible equal to that which had perished; (c) that had the narrative been invented, it is more than likely that the numbers would have been made either exactly equal or more widely divergent; and (d) that no such variations occurring in the strength of the tribes as numbered at Sinai and again in Moab, while nearly equal, is uncontroversial; constitutes a watermark of truthfulness which should not be overlooked.

(2) The size of the congregation.—Taking the fighting men at 600,000, and the whole community at 411 times that number, or about 271 millions,
people thirsting for liberty and only waiting the signal to move, aware also of the hour at which that signal would be given, viz. at midnight, it does not appear so formidable a task as is imagined to get them all assembled in one day at a forsaken desert; nor is it probable they would be likely to delay or linger in their movements. But how could there have been 2½ millions of fugitives, it is asked (Eerdmans, Wiener), if Pharaoh deemed 600 chariots sufficient for pursuit? The answer is that Pharaoh did not reckon 600 chariots sufficient, but in addition to these, which were "chosen chariots," he took all the chariots of Egypt, his horsemen and his army (Ex 14 7.9), which were surely adequate to overcome a weaponless crowd, however big it might be. And that it was big, a vast horde indeed, Pharaoh's host implies.

(c) Support in wilderness: The supposed difficulty of obtaining support for 2½ millions of people with the flocks and herds in the Sinaitic desert takes for granted that the desert was then as barren a region as it is now, which cannot be proved, and is as little likely to be correct as it would be to argue that Egypt, which was then the granary of the world, was no more fertile than it was 10 years ago, or that the regions in which Babylon and Assyria were supposed to be the granaries of their region were not. This supposition disregards the fact that Moses fed the flocks of Jethro for 40 years in that same region of Sinai; that when the Israelites passed through it, it was inhabited by several powerful tribes. It overlooks, too, the fact that the flocks and herds of Israel were not necessarily all cooped up in one spot, but were most likely spread abroad in districts where water and vegetation could be found. And it ignores the statement in the narrative that they were not driven away by the produce of the desert, but had manna from heaven from the 1st day of the 2d month after leaving Egypt till they reached Canaan. Rationalistic expositors may relegate this statement to the limbo of fable, but unless the supernatural is to be eliminated altogether from the story, this statement must be accorded its full weight. So must the two miraculous supplies of water at Horeb (Ex 17) and at Kadesh (Nu 20) be treated. It is sometimes added that the Israelites were not driven away for 2½ millions of people with their flocks and herds; and that therefore the congregation could not have been so large. But the narrative in Nu states, and presumably it was the same in Ex, that the smitten rock at Horeb had water in a unceasing abundance, that "the people drank abundantly with their flocks." Wherefore no conclusion can be drawn from this against the reported size of the congregation.

(d) Room at Mt. Sinai: As to the impossibility of finding room for 2½ millions of people either before the Mount at Sinai or within the land of Canaan (Conder), few will regard this as self-evident. If the site of their encampment was the Ez-Rahal (Robinson, Staunton)—though the plan of Schayer, admittedly not so roomy, has been mentioned (Ritter, Kurtz, Knobel)—estimates differ as to the sufficiency of accommodation to be found there. Conder gives the dimensions of the plain as 4 sq. miles, which he deems insufficient, forgetting, perhaps, that its extent is farther increased by lateral valleys receding from the plain itself (Forty Days in the Desert, 73; cf Keil on Ex 19 1.2). Kailsch, though putting the size of the plain at a smaller figure, adds that not thus farminured were the sides, so that the host of Israel—"a conclusion accepted by Ebers, Ri hern and others. In any case it seems driving literal interpretation to extreme lengths to hold that camping before the Mount necessarily meant that every member of the host required to be in full view of Sinai. As to not finding room in Canaan, it is doubtful if, after the conquest, the remnants of both peoples at any time numbered as many persons as dwelt in Pal during the most flourishing years of the kingdom. There is no indication of the population of Pal today amounts to only about 600,000 souls; but Pal today under Turkish rule is no proper gauge for judging of Pal under David or even under Joshua.

(e) Slow movements of Canaan: The long time it took to conquer Pal (Eerdmans, Vorgeschichte Israel, 78) is no solid argument to prove the unreliable character of the statement about the size of the army, and therefore of the congregation. Every person knows that great hordes of modern warriors, which do not always go with the big battalions; and in this instance the desert-trained warriors allowed themselves to be seduced by the idolatries and immoralities of the Canaanites and forgot to execute the commands of God with the trust, viz. to drive out the Canaanites from the land which had been promised to their fathers. Had they been faithful to Jehovah, they would not have taken so long completely to possess the land (Ps 105 39; 106 13.14). If instead of the 30,092 Hebrew soldiers they had only possessed 6,000, it is not difficult to imagine how they could not drive out the Canaanites. The difficulty is to perceive how they could have achieved as much as they did.

(3) The number of the firstborn.—That the 22,273 firstborn males of the tribe of Judah (43) is out of all proportion to the 605,550 men of 20 years old and upward, being much too few, has frequently (Bleeck, Bohlen, Colenso and others) been felt as a difficulty, since it practically involves the conclusion that the firstborn of every family there must have been at least 12, since the Israelites were reckoned in each family. Various solutions of this difficulty have been offered, the prevalence of polygamy has been suggested (Michaelis, Havernick). The exclusion of firstborn sons who were married, the inclusion only of the mother's firstborn, the exclusion of males, but not of females, which may have been called in to surmount the difficulty (Kurtz). But perhaps the best explanation is that only those were counted who were born after the Law was given on the night of the departure from Egypt (Ex 13 2; Nu 8 13.17) (Kell, Delitzsch, Gerlach). It may be urged, of course, that this would require an exceptionally large number of births in the 15 months, but these exceptionally joyous circumstances of the emancipation this might not have been impossible. In any case, it appears probable that the solution of this difficulty, which might vanish are all the facts known, to impeach the historical accuracy of the narrative, even in this particular.

(4) As to the joint appearance of Aaron and his sons, it is supposed (Bleek, Delitzsch, Keil, et al.) that this phrase is intended to be illustrated in the following manner: Aaron was representing his tribe, and his sons the two tribes of the Levitical tribe (Joseph and Ephraim). In any case it is evident that the firstborn of the tribe of Levi was taken into the number of those who were numbered in the desert. The number of the firstborn was not reckoned, or it would have been 15,406, 600,000 in 20 years of age, for which there is no room.
(2) The assembling of the congregation.—The assembling of the congregation at the door of the tabernacle (10 3.4) has been added as another physical impossibility; and no doubt it was if every man, woman and child, or even only every man, would have to be counted to have the congregation was ordinarily represented by its "renowned" or "called" men, princes of the tribes of their fathers, heads of thousands of Israel (1 16). To suppose that anything else was meant is surely not required. When Moses called all Israel and spoke unto them (Dt 5 1; 29 2), no intelligent person understands that he personally addressed every individual, or spoke so as to be heard by every individual, though what he said was intended for all. An additional difficulty in the way of assembling the congregation, and by implication an argument against the size of the congregation, has been discovered in the two silver trumpets which, it is contended, were too few for summoning so vast a host as 23 3 millions of people. But it is not stated in the narrative either (a) that it was absolutely necessary that every individual in the camp should hear the sound of the trumpets any more than it was indispensable that Balaam's curse should have been spoken without the presence of his ass (Num 22 13), or that a public proclamation by a modern state, though prefixed by means of an "Oyez," should be heard by all within the state or even within its capital; or (b) if it was necessary that everyone should hear, that the trumpeters could not move about through the camp but must remain stationary at the tabernacle door; or (c) that in the clear air of the desert the sound of the trumpets would not travel farther than into the noisy and murky atmosphere of modern cities; or (d) that should occasion arise for more trumpets than two, Moses and his successors were forbidden to make them.

(3) The marching of the host.—The marching of the host in four main divisions of about half a million each (2; 10 14-20) has also been pronounced a stumbling-block (Colenso, Eerdmans, Doughty), inasmuch as the procession formed (i.e. if no division began to fall into line till its predecessor was completed) would require the whole day for its completion, and would make a column of unprecedented length—of 22 miles (Colenso), of 600 miles (Doughty)—and would even on the most favorable hypothesis travel out of the camp. It is the whole situation that need to reconstruct the camp. The simple statement of this shows its absurdity as an explanation of what actually took place on the march, and indirectly suggests that the narrative may be historical after all, as no remonancer of a late age would have risked his reputation by laying down such directions for the march, if they were susceptible of no other explanation than the above. How precisely the march was conducted may be difficult or even impossible to describe in such a way as to obviate all objections. But some considerations may be advanced to show that the march through the desert was neither impossible nor incredible. (a) The deploying of the four main divisions into line may have gone on simultaneously, as they were widely apart from each other, on the E. (Judah), on the S. (Reuben), on the W. (Ephraim) and on the N. (Dan). (b) There is no ground for thinking that the march would be conducted, at least at first, with the precision of a modern army, or that each division would extend itself to the length of 22 miles. It is more than likely that they would follow their standards as best they could or with such order as could be arranged by their captains. (c) If the camps of Judah and Reuben started their preparations together, say at 6 o'clock in the morning (which might be possible), and occupied 4 hours in completing these, they might begin to advance at 10 o'clock and cover 10 miles in another 4 hours, thus bringing them on to 2 PM, after which 4 hours more would enable them to encamp themselves for the night. The same would apply to the other two divisions falling into line, say at 2 o'clock, would arrive at 6 PM, and by 10 PM would be settled for the night. (d) It does not seem certain that every night upon the march they would arrange themselves into more or less rigorous, uncluted camps, rather it is reasonable to conclude that this would be done only when they had reached a spot where a halt was to be made for some time. (e) In any case, in the absence of more details as to how the march was conducted, astronomical calculations are of little value and are not entitled to discredit the truthfulness of the narrative.

(4) The victory over Midian.—This has been objected to on moral grounds which are not now referred to. It is the supposed impossibility of 12,000 Israelites slaying all the male Midianites, capturing all their women and children, including 32,000 virgins, seizing all their cattle and flocks, with all their goods, and burning all their cities and castles. The account of the battle without the complications of a vast march and all the difficulties of a night march was designed to obviate perplexity. Yet Scripture relates several victories of a similar description, as e.g. that of Abraham over the kings of the East (Gen 14 15), in which, so far as the record goes, no loss was incurred by the parting army; that of Gideon's 300 over the Midianites at a later date (Jgs 7 22); that of Samson single-handed over 1,000Philis (Jgs 15 15); and that of Jephoshaphat at the battle of Tekoa (2 Ch 20 24), which was won without a blow—all more or less miraculous, but not such occasions perplexity. Yet the narrative of Joshua shows that the account of the battle at the Mosaic age is entitled to a certain degree of confidence. The narrative is probably an element in which the Romans slaughtered all the foes without losing a single man; and Strabo (xvi. 1128) mentions a battle in which 1,000 Arabs were slain by only 2 Romans; while the life of Saladin contains a like statement concerning the issue of a battle (Hävernack, Intro, 380). Hence Israel's victory over Midian does not afford sufficient ground for challenging its historic credibility.

IV. Authorship. —Restricting attention to evidence from Nu itself, it may be observed in a general way that the question of authorship is practically settled by what has been advanced on its literary structure and historical credibility. For, if the materials of which the book were substantially the work of one pen (whoever may have been the chief collector or last redactor), and if these materials are upon the whole trustworthy, there will be little room to doubt that the original pen was in the hand of a contemporaries and eyewitness of the incidents narrated, and that the contemporary and eyewitness was Moses, who need not, however, have set down everything with his own hand, all that is necessary to justify the ascription of the writing to him being that it should have been composed by his authority and under his supervision. In this sense it is believed that indications are not wanting in the book both against and for the Mosiac authorship; and these may now be considered.

(1) The alternating use of Divine names.—This usage, after forming so characteristic a feature in Gen and largely disappearing in Ex, Against and Lev, reasserts itself in Nu, and the Mosaic more particularly in the story of Authorship Balaam. If chs 23 and 24 can be depended only on documents pieced together, because of the use of "God" in chs 23 and of "Lord" in ch 24, then Moses was not their author. But if the varying use of the Divine names is susceptible of explanation on the assumption that the two chapters originally formed one docu-
ment, then most distinctly the claim of Moses to authorship is not debarred. Now whether Balaam was a false or a true prophet, it is clear that he could hope to please Balak only by cursing Israel in the name of Jeh, the Elohim of Israel; and so it is always Jeh he consults or pretends to consult below, if Moses ever quotes Balak, considering times it did so (22 8; 19; 23 3,15); and 3 it is Elohim who met him (22 9; 20; 23 14), while every time it was Jeh who put the word in his mouth. Can any conclusion be fairer than that the historian regarded Elohim as speaking through the Divine Agency, and represented this as it were by a double emphasis, which showed (a) that the Jehovah whom Balaam consulted was Elohim or the supreme God, and (b) that the God who met Balaam and supplied him with oracles was Israel's Lord? Thus explained, the alternate use of the Divine names does not require the hypothesis of two single documents rolled into one; and indeed the argument from the use of the Divine names is now generally abandoned. (2) Traces of late authorship. Traces of late authorship and the belief that this influence has existed in several passages: (a) 15 32–36 seems to imply that the writer was no longer in the wilderness, which may well have been the case, if already he was in the land of Moab. (b) 20 5 suggests, it is said, that the people were then, 744, but there is the impression that they were not yet come to Canaan; and in point of fact the people were at Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin. (c) In 21 14, 15, 17, 18, 27–30, certain archaic songs are cited as if the people were familiar with them. The round and the Arnon is mentioned as the border of Moab long before Israel reached the river. But that poets were among the people at the time of the exodus and probably long before, the song of Moses (Ex 16) shows, and be forgotten. (c) 22, 24 3, according to the Arnon was begun to be composed soon after the defeat of Amalek is not an unreasonable hypothesis (Ex 17 14). As for the statement that “Armnon leant upon the borders of Moab;” that may have been superfluous as a matter of information to the contemporaries of Moses when they were about to cross the stream (Strack, Einl, 25), but it was quite in place in an old prophetic song, as showing that their present position had been long before anticipated. (d) 24 4, 5, or 6, like 22 34, could not have been composed before the rise of the monarchy; and certainly it could not, if prediction of future events is impossible. But if reference to a coming king in Israel was put into Balaam's mouth, it could not have been in the time of Moses, then it could easily have been made before the monarchy; and so could (e) 24 17, 18 have been written before the reign of David, though the conquest of the Edomites only then began (25 8 14; 1 K 11 1; 1 Ch 18 12, 13).

Examples such as these show that many, if not most, of the like objections against the Moses authorship of this book are capable of at least possible solution; and that Kuenen's caution should not be forgotten: "He who relies upon the impression made by the whole, without interrogation of the parts one by one, repudiates the first principles of all scientific research, and pays homage to superficiality" (Rdl. of Israel, I, 11).

(1) Certain passages have the appearance of having been written later than Moses.—These are: (a) those which bear evidence of having been intended for a people not settled in cities but dwelling in tents and camps, as e.g. chs 1–4, describing the arrangements for the formation of the camp; 6 24–26, the high-priestly benediction; 10 35, 36, the orders for the marching and the halting of the host; 10 1–9, the directions about the silver trumpets; ch 19, the legislation which obviously presupposes the wilderness as the place for its observance (vs 3.7.9.14). If criticism allows that these and other passages have descended from the Mosaic age, why should it be necessary to seek another author for them than Moses? And if Moses ever quotes Balak, consideration of the presumption at least is created that the whole book has proceeded from his pen. (b) The patriotic songs taken from the Book of the Wars of the Lord (ch 21), which some critics (Cornill, Kautzsch and others) hold not to have been composed by Moses, are by equally competent scholars (Bleek, De Wette, E. Meyer, Königs and others) recognized as parts of Israel's inheritance from the Mosaic age, whenever they were incorporated in Nu. (c) The list of camping stations (ch 33) is expressly assigned to him. Whether "by the commandment of the Lord" should be connected with the "journeys" (König) or the "writing" makes no difference as to the authorship of this chapter, at least in the sense that it is based on a Mosaic document (Strack). It is true that even if this chapter as it stands was prep-
NUN, nōn (נון, Νῖν): The 14th letter of the Heb alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopaedia as n. It came also to be used for the number 50. For name, etc, see ALPHABET.

NUN, nun (נון, נון, “fish,” derivative meaning “fecundity”): Father of Joshua (referred to thus 20 t.) (Ex 33 11; Nu 11 28, etc; 1 Ch 7 27, m “Non”; Sir 46 1, m “Nave”).

NURSE, när's, NURSING, när's'ing: “Nurse” in AV represents two different Heb words: In 8 passages (Gen 24 59; 35 8; Ex 2 7 bis 9; 2 K 11 2; 2 Ch 22 11; Isa 49 23) the word nun or ve renders some form of the vb מָנוּנָה, מָנוּנָה, “to suck.” The fem. causative part. of this vb. is commonly used to denote nurse or foster-mother. According to Ex 2 7 Moses’ mother—“a nurse of the Heb women”—became, at Pharaoh’s daughter’s request, the foster-mother of the foundling. Joshua, the son of Ahihu, was in charge of a nurse until he was 7 years old (2 K 11 2; 2 Ch 22 11). But it is obvious that the term was used in a more general way, e.g. of a lady’s maid or nurse-woman. Rebekah was accompanied by her nurse when she left home to be married (Gen 24 59; 35 8). In 5 passages (Nu 11 12; Ruth 4 16; 2 S 4 4; Isa 49 23; 60 4 AV) “nurse” represents the Heb word מָנה, מָנה, “to support,” “be faithful,” “nourish.” The part. of this vb. denoted a person who had charge of young children—a guardian or nurse. Naomi took charge of Ruth’s child “and became nurse unto it” (Ruth 4 16). In Nu 11 12 Moses asks whether he has to take charge of the Israelites “as a nursing-father cherish the suckling child.” The same word is found in 2 K 10 15 (AV “them that brought up,” i.e. guardians of the sons of Ahab) and in Est 2 7 (AV “and he brought up,” i.e. he [Mordecai] adopted, his niece). Deutero-Isa uses both terms together (49 23) to describe the exalted position of Israel in the future when foreign kings and queens will offer their services and wait upon the chosen people.

In the solitary passage in the NT where “nurse” occurs, it renders the Gr word γυνή, γυναίκα. In this case the word does not mean a hired nurse, but a mother who nurses her own children (1 Thess 2 7).

T. LEWIS

NUMENIUS, Num-ēn'i-us (Νουμένιος, Νουμένιος): The son of Antiochus and Antipater were the two ambassadors whom Jonathan sent to the Romans, “to the Spartans, and to other places,” after his victory in the plain of Hasor (Galilee) over the princes of Demetrius (1 Macc 12 10) about 144 BC. Their mission was to confirm and renew the friendship and treaty which had existed from the days of Judas (7 17 ff). They were well received and successful, both at Rome (12 3 ff) and at Sparta (12 19 ff; 14 22 ff). After the death of Jonathan, the victories of Simon and the establishment of peace, Simon sent Numenius on a second embassy to Rome (14 24), again to confirm the treaty and present a golden shield weighing 1,000 minæs—apparently just before the popular decree by which Simon was created high priest, leader and captain “for ever” (1 Macc 14 27 ff), September, 141 BC. The embassy returned in 139 BC, bearing letters from the son to the kings of Egypt, Syria and “all the countries,” confirming the integrity of Jewish territory, and forbidding these kings to disturb the Jews, and requiring them also to surrender any deserters (14 15 ff). See also Lucius; Schürer, Gesch. des jüdischen Volkes (3d and 4th edd), I., 236, 250 ff.

NUTS, nuts: (1) מָנוּנָה, מָנוּנָה, כַרָפָה, כָרָפָה; Arab. jaus, “the walnut” (Gen 1 11): This is certainly the walnut tree, Juglans regia, a native of Persia and the Himalayas which flourishes under favorable conditions in all parts of Pal; particularly in the moun-

Pistacia Nut (Pistacia vera).
church in Colossae, the latter city being only a very few miles distant from Laodicea. Indeed, so near were they, that Paul directs that the Ep. to the Col be read also in Laodicea. If Nymphas if Nymph be read, then it is a Christian lady who is meant—a person of outstanding worth and importance in the church of Laodicea, for he had granted the use of his dwelling-house for the ordinary weekly meetings of the church. The apostle’s substitution is a 3-fold one—to the brethren that are in Laodicea, that is, to the whole of the Christian community in that city, and to Nymphas, and to the church in his house.

1. A Christian in Laodicea


OAK, 6k: Several Heb words are so tr2, but there has always been great doubt as to which words should be tr2 "oak" and which ‘terebinth’. This uncertainty appears in the LXX and all through EV; in recent revisions ‘terebinth’ has been increasingly added in the m. All the Heb words are closely allied and originally had simply the meaning of ‘tree’, but it is clear that, when the OT was written, they indicated some special kind of tree.

The words and references are as follows:

1. Hebrew
   1 Hebrew K 13 14; 1 Ch 10 12; Isa 1 30; Ezek Words and 6 13; in all those m. ‘terebinth’.

2. References
   Ref.
   References

3. English
   (1) oaks. (2) oaks. (3) oaks.
   (4) oaks. (5) oaks. (6) oaks.
   (7) oaks.
   (8) oaks.
   (9) oaks.
   (10) oaks.
   (11) oaks.

4. Similar
   (1) oaks. (2) oaks. (3) oaks.
   (4) oaks. (5) oaks. (6) oaks.
   (7) oaks.
   (8) oaks.
   (9) oaks.

5. Greek
   (1) oaks. (2) oaks. (3) oaks.
   (4) oaks. (5) oaks. (6) oaks.

One, then, of the many ‘oaks’ of Paul’s letter to the Ephesians is a 3-fold one—oaks Terebinths; oaks Terebinths; oaks Terebinths. This is shown by the context, or the reference to the.oak. There, in the last 12 verses of the chapter, there is a great deal of variety in the use of these words. The readers have been shown, in this place, to recognize the ‘oaks’ as such.

OAK at Gilgal, the Sladean Oak (Quercus coccifera).

It attains to great size, reaching as much as 60 ft. in height. It is distinguished by its large sessile acorns with hemispherical caps covered with long, narrow, almost bristly, scales, giving them a mossy aspect. The wood is hard and of fine grain. Acorns are common upon its branches.

(2) Quercus lusitanica (or Ballota), also known in Arab. as Bollt, like the last is frequently found dashed to a bush, both, when protected, attains a height of 30 ft. or more. The leaves are dentate or crenate and last late into the winter, but are shed before the new twigs are developed. The acorns are solitary or few in cluster, and the cupules are more or less smooth. Acorns are common, and a variety of this species is often known as Q. infectoria, on account of its liability to infection with gall-worms.

(3) The Valonia oak (Q. coccifera), known in Arab. as Mollt, has large oblong or ovate deciduous leaves, with deep serrations terminating in a bristle-like point, and very large acorns, globular, thick cupules covered with long reflexed scales. The

2. The Church in His House

This fact, that the church met there, also shows that Nymphas was a person of some means, for a very small house could not be occupied by the Christian men and women who gathered together on the first day of every week for the purposes of Christian worship, but also from what is said of it in Rev 3.17 AV—must have been large and influential; ‘Thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing.’ The house of Nymphas, therefore, must, have possessed a large room or saloon sufficiently commodious to allow the meeting of a numerous company. Nymphas would be a person both of Christian character and of generous feeling, and of some amount of wealth. Nothing more is known regarding him, as this is the only passage in which he is named.

JOHN RUTHERFORD
cupules, known commercially as valonia, furnish one of the richest of tanning materials.

(4) The Evergreen oak is often classed under the general name “live oak” or Holm (i.e. holly-like) oak. Several varieties are described as occurring in Pal. Q. ilex usually has rather a shrublike growth, with abundant glossy, dark-green leaves, oval in shape and more or less prickly at the margins, though sometimes entire. The cupules of the acorns are woolly. It shows a marked predilection for the neighborhood of the sea. The Q. coccifera (with var. Q. pseudococcifera) is known in Arab. as Sīnīdān. The leaves, like the last, usually are prickly. The acorns are solitary or twin, and the hemispherical cupules are more or less velvety. On the Q. coccifera are found the insects which make the well-known Kermes dyes. These evergreen oaks are the common trees at sacred tombs, and the once magnificent, but now dying, “Abraham’s oak” at Hebron is one of this species.

Oaks occur in all parts of Pal, in spite of the steady ruthless destruction which has been going on for centuries. All over Carmel, Tabor, around Banias and in the hills to the Modern W. of Nazareth, to mention well-known localities, there are forests of oak; great tracts of country, esp. in Galilee and E. of the Jordan, are covered by a stunted brushwood which, were it not for the wood-cutter, would grow into noble trees. Solitary oaks of magnificent proportions occur in many parts of the land, esp. upon hillslopes; such trees are saved from destruction because of their “sacred” character. To bury beneath such a tree has ever been a favorite custom (cf Gen 35 8; 1 Ch 10 12). Large trees like these, seen often from great distances, are frequently landmarks (Josh 19 33) or places of meeting (cf “Oak of Tabor,” 1 S 10 3). The custom of heathen worship beneath oaks or terebinths (Hos 4 13; Ezek 6 13, etc) finds its modern counterpart in the cult of the Wolly in Pal. The oak is sometimes connected with some historical event, as e.g. Abraham’s oak of Mamre now shown at Hebron, and “the oak of weeping,” Allon bocath, of Gen 35 8.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

OAK OF TABOR (אֹ֣בֵ֥ק תָּבוֹ֖ר, ‘elôn tâbôr): Thus RV in 1 S 10 3 for AV “plain of Tabor” (RVm “terebinth”). Tabor was famous for its groves of oak, but what “oak” is meant here is not known. Ewald thinks that “Tabor” is a different pronunciation for “Deborah,” and connects with Gen 35 8; but this is not likely. See Oak, 3.

OAR, or. See Ships and Boats, II, 2, (3).

OATH, 6th (אָהַ֛ת, shêbhah’âh, probably from shêbha, “seven,” the sacred number, which occurs frequently in the ritual of an offering, or sacrifice), and the stronger word נָקָ֖ת, ‘âdhâh, by which a curse is actually invoked upon the oath-breaker (LXX ἀφα, arid): In Mt 26 70–74 Peter first denies his Lord simply, then with an oath (shêbhâh’âh), then invokes a curse (‘âdhâh), thus passing through every stage of asseveration.

The oath is the invoking of a curse upon one’s self if one has not spoken the truth (Mt 26 74), or if one fails to keep a promise (1 S 19 1). Law regarding oaths played a very important part, not only in the lawsuits (Ex 23 1; Lev 19 12) and state affairs (Am 7 10, x, 4), but also in the dealings of everyday life (Gen 24 37; 50 5; Jgs 21 5; 1 K 18 10; Ezr 10 5). The Mosaic laws concerning oaths were not meant to limit the widespread custom of making oaths, so much as to impress upon the people the use of a sacred oath, forbidding on the one hand swearing falsely (Ex 20 7; Lev 19 12; Zec 8 17, etc), and on the other swearing by false gods, which latter was considered to be a very dark sin (Jer 12 16; Am 8 14). In the Law only two kinds of false swearing are mentioned: false swearing of a witness, and false asseveration upon oath regarding a thing found or received (Lev 5 1; 6 2 f; cf Prov 29 24). Both required a sin offering (Lev 5 1 f). The Talm gives additional rules, and lays down certain punishments for false swearing; in the case of a thing found it states what the false swearer must pay (Makkoth 2 3; Shêbhâh’âh 8 3). The Jewish interpretation of the 3d commandment is that it is not concerned with oaths, but rather forbids the use of the name of Jehovah in ordinary cases (so Dalman).

Swearing in the name of the Lord (Gen 14 22; Dt 6 13; Jgs 21 7; Ruth 1 17, etc) was a sign of loyalty to Him (Dt 10 20; Isa 58 18). We know from Swearing Scripture (see above) that swearing by false gods was frequent, and we learn also from the newly discovered Elephantine papyrius that the people not only swore by Jahu (=Jeh) or by the Lord of Heaven, but also among a certain class of other gods, e.g. by Horun-Bethel, and by Isun. In ordinary intercourse it was customary to swear by the life of the person addressed (1 S 1 26; 20 3; 2 K 2 2); by the life of the king (1 S 17 55; 26 26; 2 S 11 11); by one’s own head (Mt 3 30); by the earth (Mt 5 35); by the heaven (Mt 5 34; 23 22); by the angels (BJ, II, xvi, 4); by the temple (Mt 23 16), and by different parts of it (Mt 23 16); by Jesus (Mt 5 35; Mar 13 31; Lk 23 46). The oath “by heaven” (Mt 5 34; 23 22) is connected by Jesus as the oath in which God’s name is invoked. Jesus does not mean that God and heaven are identical, but He desires to rebuke those who paltered with an oath by avoiding a direct mention of a name of God. He teaches that such an oath is a real oath and must be considered as sacredly binding.
Not much is told us as to the ceremonies observed in taking an oath. In patriarchal times he who took the oath put his hand under the thigh of him to whom the oath was given (Gen 24 2; 47 29). The most usual form was to hold up the hand to heaven (Gen 14 22; Ex 6 8; Dt 32 40; Ezek 20 5). The wife suspected of unfaithfulness, when brought before the priest, had to answer "Amen, Amen" to his adjuration, and this was considered to be an oath on her part (Nu 6 22). The usual formula of an oath was either: "God is witness betwixt me and thee" (Gen 31 50), or more commonly: "As Jehovah [or God] liveth" (Jgs 8 19; Ruth 3 13; 2 S 2 27; Jer 38 16), or "Jehovah be a true and faithful witness amongst us." (Jer 42 5). Usually the penalty invoked by the oath was only suggested: "Jehovah [or God] do so to me" (Ruth 1 17; 2 S 3 35; 1 K 2 23; 2 K 6 31); in some cases the punishment was expressly mentioned (Jer 29 22). Nowack suggests that in general the punishment was not expressly mentioned because of a superstitious fear to hear the sentence, although speaking the truth, might draw upon himself some of the punishment by merely mentioning it.

Philo expresses the desire (il. 194) that the practice of swearing should be discontinued, and the Egyptians used no oaths (Bj II, viii, 6; Ant, XV, x, 4).

That oaths are permissible to Christians is shown by the example of Our Lord (Mt 26 63 f.) and of Paul (2 Cor 1 23; Gal 1 20) and some writers of the primitive church (He 6 13–18).

Permissible Consequently when Christ said, "Swear not at all" (Mt 5 34), He was laying down the principle that the Christian must not have two standards of truth, but that his ordinary speech must be as truly true as his oath. In the kingdom of God, where that principle holds sway, oaths become unnecessary.

Paul Levertoff

OBA DI AH, 5-ba-di'a (יְבַדִּי), 'obhad labhý 'abhadhāyha, more fully 7740, 7722, 'abhabhāyha, 'servant of Jehovah':

(1) The steward or prime minister of Ahab, who did his best to protect the prophets of Jehovah against Jezebel's enmity. He met Edom on his return from Zarephath, and bore to Ahab the news of Elijah's reappearance (1 K 18 3–16).

(2) The prophet (Ob 1). See OBA DI AH, Book of.

3. A descendant of David (1 Ch 3 21).

(4) A chief of the tribe of Issachar (1 Ch 7 3).

(5) A descendant of Saul (1 Ch 8 38; 9 44).

(6) A Levite descended from Jeduthun (1 Ch 9 16), identical with Abia (Neh 11 17).

(7) A chief of the Gadites (1 Ch 12 9).

(8) A Zebulunite, father of the chief Ishmaiah (1 Ch 27 19).

(9) One of the princes sent by Jehoshaphat to teach the law in Judah (2 Ch 17 7).

(10) A Merarite encamped by Jehovah to oversee the workmen in repairing the temple (2 Ch 34 12).

(11) The head of a family who went up with Ezra from Babylon (Ex 8 9).

(12) One of the men who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh 10 5).

(13) A gate-keeper in the days of Nehemiah (Neh 12 25).

The name "Obadiah" was common in Israel from the days of David to the close of the OT. An ancient Heb seal bears the inscription "Obadiah the servant of the King."  

John Richard Sampey

OBA DI AH, BOOK OF: Obadiah is the shortest book in the OT. The theme of the book is the destruction of Edom. Consequently upon the overthrow of Edom is the enlargement of the borders of Judah and the establishment of the kingship of Jeh. Thus far all scholars are agreed; but on questions of authorship and date there is wide divergence of opinion.

(1) Jeh summons the nations to the overthrow of proud Edom. The men of Edom will be brought down from their lofty strongholds;  

1. Contents their hidden treasures will be rifled; of the Book their confederates will turn against them; nor will the wise and the mighty men of Edom be able to avert the coming calamity (vs 1–9).

(2) The overthrow of Edom is due to the violence and cruelty shown toward his brother Jacob. The prophet describes the cruelty and shameless gloating over a brother's calamity, in the form of earnest appeals to Edom not to be selfish and heartless deed of which he had been guilty when Jerus was sacked by foreign foes (vs 10–14).

(3) The day of the display of Jeh's retributive righteousness upon the nations is near. Edom shall be completely cut off, the man whom he has tried to uphold, while Israel's captives shall return to take possession of their own land and also to seize and rule the mount of Esau. Thus the kingship of Jeh shall be established (vs 15–21).

The unity of Ob is first challenged by Eichhorn in 1824, vs 17–19 of Pusey regarded as an appendix attached to the original exilic prophecy (Ps 89: 24–29), and to this time of Amos (Ob 7–8 BC). Ewald thought that an exilic prophecy, to whom he ascribed vs 11–14, 18–21, had been readapted by the prophet Obadiah. Obadiah's prophecy by Obadiah in vs 1–10, and vs 15–18 of material from another older prophecy, which was contemporary, like Obadiah, with Isaiah. As the years went on, the material assigned to the older oracle was limited in vs 1–10 only some to the oracle of Jehovah assigned to Obadiah vs 1–5, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, while all else was regarded as a later appendix; and the composition of Ob is thus summed up by Beyer: "Vs 1–6 is a preexilic oracle of Obadiah, which was afterwards, by Jeremiah, and readapted with additions (vs 7–15) by another Obadiah in the early post-exilic days: vs 16–21 in an appendix, probably by Micah, ruled by that of Obadiah's; (p. 92). Beyer's own view is closely akin to Barton's. He thinks that Obadiah, writing in the 5th cent., "quotes vs 1–4 almost word for word literally; that he commented on the older oracle in vs 5–7, partly in the words of the older prophet, partly in his own words, in order to show that it had been fulfilled in his own day; and that in vs 8–9 he quotes once more by the older oracle without any show of littleness." He ascribes to Obadiah vs 10–14 and 159. The appendix consists of two sections: vs 12–15 and 159. It was added by two different authors, vs 18 being a quotation from some older prophet or prophets. To the average reader, who is not a student of prophecy, an minute analysis of a brief prophecy must seem hypercritical. He will prefer to read the book as a unity: and in doing so will get the essence of the message it has for the present day.

Certain preliminary problems require solution before the question of date can be settled.

(1) Relation of Ob and Ob 49.—

3. Date of Ob 1. Did Obadiah quote from Jer? The Book Pusey thus sets forth the impossibility of such a solution: "Out of 16 verses of which the prophecy of Jeremiah against Edom consists, four are identical with those of Obadiah; but 12 of the 16 verses of Obadiah are derived from verses which remain, ten have some turns of expression or idioms, more or fewer, which recur in Jer, either in these prophecies against foreign nations, or in his prophecies generally. Now it would be wholly improbable that a single verse of the prophecy of Jeremiah, should have selected precisely those which contain none of Jeremiah's characteristic expressions; whereas it perfectly fits in with the supposition that Jeremiah interwove other verses of Obadiah with his own. So that on the one hand, the obvious absence of any verses which recur in Obadiah, and the presence of some peculiar turns of expression which occurs elsewhere in Jer' (Minor Prophets, I, 347).

(b) Did Jeremiah quote from Ob? It is almost incredible that the vigorous and well-articulated prophecy in Ob could have been made
by piecing together detached quotations from Jer; but Jeremiah may well have taken from Ob many expressions that fell in with his general purpose. There are differences among modern scholars, most of whom think that Obadiah preserves the vigor of the original, while Jeremiah quotes with more freedom; but Betz in TCE, after a detailed comparison, thus sums up: "Our conclusion is that Obadiah quoted in vs 1–9 an older source, and in vs 10–15 a better preserved version of Jer 49." The student will do well to get his own first-hand impression from a careful comparison of the two passages. With Ob vs 1–4 cf Jer 49 14–16, with Ob vs 5 cf Jer 49 9.10s; with Ob vs 8 cf Jer 49 7; with Ob vs 9 cf Jer 49 22. On the whole, the view that Jeremiah, who often quotes from earlier prophets, draws directly from Ob, with free working over of the older prophets, seems still tenable. (2) Relation of Ob and Joel.—There seems to be in Joel 2 32 (Heb 3 5) a direct allusion to Ob 17. If Joel prophesied during the minority of the king Joash (c. 830 BC), Obadiah would be, on this hypothesis, the earliest of the writing prophets.

(3) What capture of Jerus is described in Ob vs 10–14?—The disaster seems to have been great enough to be called "destruction" (Ob vs 12). Hence most scholars identify the calamity described by Ob with the fall and destruction of Jerus by the Chaldaeans in 587 BC. But it is remarkable, on this hypothesis, that no allusion is made either in Ob or Jer 49 7–22 to the Chaldaeans or to the destruction of the temple or to the wholesale transportation of the inhabitants of Jerus to Babylon. We know, however, from Ezk 36 1–15 and Ps 137 7 that Edom rejoiced over the final destruction of Jerus by the Chaldaeans in 587 BC, and that they encouraged the destroyers to blot out the holy city. Certain it is that the events of 587 accord remarkably with the language of Ob vs 10–14. Pusey indeed argues from the use of the form of the direct prohibition in Ob vs 12–14 that Edom had not yet committed the sins against which the prophesied calamity was uttered; but Judah was not yet destroyed, when Obadiah wrote. But almost all modern scholars interpret the language of vs 12–14 as referring to what was already past; the prophet "speaks of what the Edomites had actually done as our author ought scholars who, regard Obadiah as the first of the writing prophets locate his ministry in Judah during the reign of Jehoram (c. 845 BC). Both 2 K and 2 Ch tell of the war of rebellion in the days of Jehoram when Edom rose after a fence struggle, threw off the yoke of Judah (2 K 8 20–22; 2 Ch 21 8–10). Shortly after the revolt of Edom, according to 2 Ch 21 16 f., the Philis and Arabians broke into Judah, "and carried away all the substance that was found in the king's house, and his sons also, and his wives; so that there was never a son left him, save Jehoahaz, the youngest of his sons." Evidently the capital city fell into the hands of the invaders. It was a calamity of no mean proportions.

The advocates of a late date call attention to three points that weaken the case for an early date for Ob: (a) The silence of 2 K as to the invasion of the Philis and Arabians. But what motive could the author of Ch have for inventing the story? (b) The absence of any mention of the destruction of the city by the Philis and Arabians. It must be acknowledged that the events of 587 BC accord more fully with the description in Ob vs 10–14, though the disaster in the days of Jehoram must have been terrible. (c) The silence as to Edom in 2 Ch 21 16 f. But so also are the historic books silent as to the Edomites; the latter destruction of Jerus in 587. It is true that exilic and post-exilic prophets and psalmists speak in bitter denunciation of the unbrotherly conduct of Edom (Lam 4 21–22; Ezk 25 12–14; 36 1–15; Ps 137 7; Mal 1 1–5; of also Isa 34 and 63 1–6); but it is also true that the earliest Heb literature bears witness to the keen rivalry between Edsam and Jacob (Gen 25 22; 27 41; Nu 20 14–21), and one of the earliest of the writing prophets denounces Edom for unnatural cruelty toward its brother (Am 1 11; cf Joel 3 19 [Heb 4 19]).

(4) The style of Ob.—Most early critics praise the style. Some of the more recent critics argue for different authors on the basis of a marked difference in style within the compass of the twenty-one verses in the little roll. Thus Seebach writes in HDB: "There is a difference in style between the two halves of the book, the first being terse, animated, and full of striking figures, while the second is diffuse and marked by poverty of ideas and aimless figures. The criticism that the style of the book is somewhat exaggerated, though it may be freely granted that the first half is more original and vigorous. The Heb of the book is classic, with scarcely an admixture of Aram. words or constructions. The author may well have lived in the golden age of the Heb language and literature."

(5) Geographical and historical allusions.—The references to the different sections and cities in the land of Israel and in the land of Edom are quite intelligible. As to Sepharad (ver 20) there is considerable difference of opinion. Schrader and some others identify it with a Shapardia in Media, mentioned in the annals of Sargon (722–705 BC). Many think of Asia Minor, or a region in Asia Minor mentioned in Pers inscriptions, perhaps Bitinka or Galatia (Soyate). Some think that the mention of "the captives of this host of the children of Israel" and "the captives of Jerus" (ver 20) proves that both the Assyr captivity and the Bab exile were already past. This argument has considerable force; but it is well to remember that Ezek, in the second half of the book, describes wholesale deportations from the land of Israel by men engaged in the slave trade (Am 1 6–10). The problem of the date of Ob has not been solved to the satisfaction of Bib. students. Our choice must be between a very early date (c 845) and a date shortly after 587, with the scales almost evenly balanced. One of the elements of historic description is that Ob is to be interpreted as prediction of the Book rather than history. In vs 11–14 there are elements of historic description, but vs 1–10 and 15–21 are predictive. LITERATURE.—Comm.: Caspari, Der Prophet Obadiah ausgelegt, 1842; Pusey, The Minor Prophets, 1860; Ewald, Comm. on the Prophets of the OT (ET), II, 277 ff. 1875; Kel (ET), 1880; T. T. Perrowne (In Cambridge Bible), 1880; von Orelli (ET), The Minor Prophets, 1893; Weisheuvel, Die kleinen Propheta, 1888; G. A. Smith, The Book of the Twelve Prophets, II, 163 ff. 1898; Nowack, Die kleinen Propheten, 1903; Marti, Dodkathrephephon, 1903; Eisselen, The Minor Prophets, 1923; Bote, Die Propheten der ersten Hälfte des Alten Testaments, 1911; Miscellaneous: Kirkpatrick, Doctrine of the prophets, 33 ff. The sources of Driven, in CB 1881, 577–80; Barton in JB, IX, 369–70; Cheyne in EB, III, 345–62; Peckham, An Intro to the Study of Ob, 1910; Kent, Students OT. III, 1911; etc.

JOHN RICHARD SAMPEY

OBAL, oi-bal. See Ebal, 1.

OBDAIA, ob-daia, (A, O'hbaia, Obdaia, B, O'hbaa, Hobbaia); One of the families of usurping priests (1 Esd 5 38) = "Hobaiah" of Ezra 2 61; "Hobaiah" of Neh 7 63.
Obed, obed (אבד, אָבֵד, abed, "worshipper"); in the NT ἀβεδ, ἀβδός, ἀβδόν.
(1) Son of Boaz and Ruth and grandfather of David (1 Sam 17:25).
(2) Son of Ephal and descendant of Sheshan, the Jerahmeelite, through his daughter who was married to Jareh, an Egyptian servant of her father's (1 Ch 2 37,38).
(3) Son of David's mighty men (1 Ch 11:47).
(4) A Korahite doorkeeper, son of Shemaiah, and grandson of Obad-edom (1 Ch 26:7).
(5) Father of Azariah, one of the centurions who took part with Jehoiada in depositing Queen Athallah and crowning Josiah (2 Ch 23:1; cf 2 K 11:1–16).

David Francis Roberts

Obed-edom, obed-edom (אֲבֶד-אֶדֹם, oved-edom, אֲבֶד-אָדֹם, oved-adom) [2 Ch 25 24, 26; 2 S 6 10; 1 Ch 13 13,14; 15 25], but elsewhere without yodh, ῥαβδήκτης, "servant of [god] Edom"; so W. R. Smith, Religion of Semites, 42, and H. P. Smith, Samuel, 294 f, though others explain it as = "servant of man": In 2 S 6 10.11,12; 1 Ch 13 13.14 a Philistine of Gath and servant of David, who received the Ark of Jeh into his house when David brought it into Jerusalem from Kirjath-jearim. Because of the sudden death of Uzzah, David was unwilling to place the Ark to his house until and it remained three months in the house of Obed-edom, "an Arab blessed Obad-edom, and all his house" (2 S 6 11). According to 1 Ch 13.14 the Ark had a special "house" of its own while there. He is probably the same as the Levite of 1 Ch 15 25. In 1 Ch 15 16–21 Obad-edom is a "singer," and in 1 Ch 15 24 a "doorkeeper," while according to 1 Ch 26 4–8.15 he is a Korahite doorkeeper, to whose house fell the overseership of the storehouse (ver 15), who names himself as a "servant before the ark," a member of the house or perhaps a Temple of Jeduthun (see 2 Ch 26 24).

Obad-edom is an illustration of the service rendered to Heb religion by foreigners, reminded one of the Simon of Cyrene who bore the cross of Jesus (Mt 27 32, etc.). The Chronicler naturally desired to think that only Levites could discharge such duties as Obad-edom performed, and hence the references to him as a Levite.

David Francis Roberts

Obedience, δοκίμασιν, OBED, δοκίμα (δοκίμα, shāma'; ὀπακός, ὁπακός): In its simpler OT meaning the word signifies "to hear," "to 1. Meaning listen." It carries with it, however, of Terms the ethical significance of hearing with reverent and obedient assent. In the NT a different origin is suggestive of "hearing under" or of subordinating one's self to the person or thing heard, hence, "to obey." There is another NT usage, however, indicating persuasion from, "ἀποδείξεως, ἀποδήμων.

The relation expressed is twofold: first, human, as between master and servant, and particularly between parents and children. "If a man have a stubborn and rebellious son, that will not obey the voice of his father, or the voice of his mother, and, though they chasten him, will not hearken unto them; then shall his father and his mother lay hold on him, and bring him out unto the elders of his city, and unto the gate of his place" (Dt 21 18,19; cf Prov 15 20); or between sovereign and subjects, "The sovereign shall shun themselves unto me; as soon as they hear of me, they shall obey me" (2 S 22 45; 1 Ch 29 23).

The highest significance of its usage, however, is that of the relation of man to God. Obedience is the supreme test of faith in God and reverence for Him. The OT conception of obedience was vital. It was the one important relationship which must not be broken. While sometimes this relation may have been formal and cold, it nevertheless was the one strong tie which held the people close to God. The significant spiritual relationship as expressed by Samuel when he asks the question, "Hath Jeh as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of Jeh? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice; and to hear than the fat of rams" (1 S 15 22). It was the condition without which no right relation might be sustained to Jeh. This is most clearly stated in the relation between Abra-]

The one ceases to be a Sin, for he is to be "truth and obedience of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Tit 3 7). In pro
gnostic utterances, future blessing and prosperity were conditioned upon obedience: "If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land" (Isa 1 19). After surveying the glories of the Messianic kingdom, the prophet assures the people that "this shall come to pass if ye diligently obey the voice of Jeh your God" (Zec 6 15). On the other hand misfortune, calamity, distress and famine are due to their disobedience and distrust of Jeh. See Deborah.

This obedience or disobedience was usually related to the specific commands of Jeh as contained in the law, yet they conceived of God as giving commands by other means. Note esp. the rebuke of Sarah to Saul: "...he obeyed not the voice of Jeh, ... therefore Jeh hath done this thing unto thee this day" (1 S 28 18).

In the NT a higher spiritual and moral relation is sustained than in the OT. The importance of obedience is just as emphasized. Christ Himself is its one great Conception. The illustration of obedience. He "humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross" (Phil 2 8). By obedience to Him we are through Him made partakers of His salvation (He 5 9). This act is a supreme test of faith in Christ. Indeed, it is so vitally related that they are in some cases almost synonymous. "Obedience of faith" is a combination used by Paul to express this idea (Rom 1 5). Peter designates believers in Christ as "children of obedience" (1 Pet 1 14). Thus it is seen that the test of fellowship with Jeh in the OT is obedience. The bond of union with Christ in the NT is obedience through faith, by which the believer is identified and the believer becomes a disciple.

Walter G. Clippinger

OBEDIENCE OF CHRIST: The "obedience" (ὑπακοή, ὕπακος) of Christ is directly mentioned but only three times in the NT, although many other passages describe or allude to it: 1. "Through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous" (Rom 5 19); "He humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross" (Phil 2 8); "Though he was a Son, yet...he submitted obedience by the things which he suffered" (He 5 8). In 2 Cor 10 5, the phrase signifies an attitude toward Christ: "every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ.

His subjection to His parents (Lk 2 51) was a necessary manifestation of His loving and sinless character, and of His disposition and power to do the right in any situation. 1. As an Element of His obedience to the moral law in concert with His subjection to God's will and the NT writers: "without sin" (He 4 15); "character "who knew no sin" (2 Cor 5 21); • holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners (He 7 26), etc; and is affirmed by Himself: "Which of you convinceth me sin" (John 8 46); and implicitly conceded by His ene-
Obedience of Christ
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mies, since no shadow of accusation against His character appears. Of His ready, loving, joyful, exact and eager obedience to the Father, mention will be made later, but it was His central and most outstand characteristic. As God at its highest reach, limitless, "unto death." He was usually submissive and law-abiding attitude toward the authorities and the great movements and religious requirements of His day was a part of His loyalty to God, and of the strategy of His campaign, the action of the one who would set an example and would have a new influence, as at His baptism: "Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness" (Mt 3:15); the synagogal worship (Lk 4:16, "as His custom was"); the incident of the tribute money: "Therefore the sons are free. But, lest we cause them to stumble," etc (Mt 17:24-27). Early, however, the necessities of His mission as Son of God and institutor of the new dispensation obliged Him frequently to display a judicial antagonism to current prescription and an authoritative superiority to the rulers, and even to important details of the Law, that would in most eyes mark Him as insurgent, and did culminate in the cross, but was the sublimest obedience to the Father, whose authority alone He held as full-grown man, and Son of man, could recognize.

Two Scriptural statements raise an important question as to the inner experience of Jesus. He 5:8 states that "though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered" (ἐναθέναν ταλ ματιάν ἐρημήσατο τὸν ἱππόκαινον). Phil 2:6, 8: "Existing in the form of God . . . he humbled himself, becoming obedient, even unto death." As Son of God, His words were never out of accord with the Father's will. How then was it necessary to, or could He, learn obedience, or become obedient? The same question in another form arises from another part of the passage in He 5:9: "and having been made perfect, he became unto all them that obey him the author [cause] of eternal salvation"; also He 2:10: "It became him [God] . . . to make the author [captain] of their salvation perfect through suffering." How was this done, and why should He make it perfect? Gethsemane, with which, indeed, He 5:8 is directly related, presents the same problem. It finds its solution in the conditions of the Redeemer's work and life on earth in the light of His true humanity and of His eternal essence in His human existence, obedience to His Father was His dominant principle, so declared through the prophet- psalmist before His birth: He 10:7 (Ps 40:7), "Lo, I am come (in the roll of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God." It was His law of life: "I do always the things that are pleasing to him. I do nothing of myself, but as the Father taught me, I speak these things" (Jn 8:29); "I can of myself do nothing. . . . I seek mine own will, but the will of him that sent me" (5:30). It was the indispensable preparation of His activity as the "image of the invisible God," the expression of the Deity in terms of the phenomenal and the human. He could be a perfect revelation only by the perfect correspondence in every detail, of will, word and work with the Father's will (Jn 5:19). Obedience was also His life nourishment and satisfaction (Jn 4:34). It was the guiding principle which directed the details of His work: "I have power to lay it [life] down, and I have power to take it again." The Lord received 1 from my Father" (Jn 10:18); "The Father that sent me, he hath given me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak" (Jn 12:49; cf 14:31, etc.). But in the Incarnation this essential and filial obedience must find expression in human forms according to human demands and processes of development. As true man, obedient disposition on His part must meet the test of voluntary choice under all representative conditions, or He was not the Prince and Saviour, or the practical virtue of obedience on earth. Gethsemane was the culmination of this process, when in full view of the awful, shameful, horrifying meaning of Calvary, the obedient disposition was crowned, and the obedient Divine-human life reached its highest manifestation, in the great ratification: "Nevertheless, not my will, but thine, be done." But just as Jesus' growth in knowledge was not from error to truth, but from partial knowledge to completer, so His "learning obedience" led Him not from disobedience or debate to submission, but from obedience at the present stage to an obedience at ever deeper and deeper cost. The process was necessary for His complete humanity, in which sense He was "made perfect by obedience" to the Father (He 5:9), also necessary for His perfection as example and sympathetic High Priest. He must fight the human battles under the human conditions. Having translated obedient aspiration and disposition into obedient action in the face of, and in suffering unanimous death, even the death of the cross, He is able to lead the procession of obedient sons of God through every possible trial and surrender, Without this testing of His obedience He could have had no sympathy of His suffering, His "known what was in man," but He would have lacked the sympathy of a kindred experience. Lacking this, He would have been for us, and perhaps also in Himself, but an imperfect "captain of our salvation," certainly no "leader" going before us in the very paths we have to tread, and tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin. It may be worth noting that He "learned obedience" and was made perfect by suffering, not the results of His sin being suffered, but, alto- gether the results of the sins of others.

In Rom 5:19, in the series of contrasts between sin and salvation ("Not as the trespass, so also is the free gift"); we are told: "For as through the one man's disobedience the many were made disobedient, so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous." Interpreters and theologians, esp. the latter, differ as to whether "obedience" here refers to the specific and supreme act of obedience on the cross, or to the sum total of Christ's Incarnate obedience through His whole life; and they have made the distinction between His "passive obedience," yielded on the cross, and His "active obedience" in carrying out without a flaw the Father's will at all times. This distinction is hardly tenable, as the whole Scriptural representation, esp. His own, is that He was never more intensely active than in His death: "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till I be accomplished" (Lk 12:50); "I lay down my life, that I may take it again." No one takes it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again" (Jn 10:18). "Who, having offered himself without blemish unto God, is applicates the active obedience of one who was both priest and sacrifice. As to the question whether it was the total obedience of Christ, or His death on the cross, that constituted the atonement,
the kindred question whether it was not the spirit of obedience in the act of death, rather than the act itself, that furnished the value of His redemptive work, it might conceivably, though improbably, be said that the slave to his master, in the presence of Deity, and is generally rendered, "to worship" in AV. In all probability this was the original significance of the word (Gen 24:26, etc.). Obedience (=obedience) originally signified the vow of obedience made by a vassal to his lord or a slave to his master, but in time denoted the act of bowing as a token of respect. T. LEWIS

OBELISK, ob'e-lisk, ob'd-lisk: A sacred stone or maszêbhôh. For maszêbhôh RV has used "pillar" in the text, with "obelisk" in the margin in many instances (Ex 33:24; Lev 26:1; Deut 12:3; 1 K 14:23; Hos 3:4; 10:1,2, etc), but not consistently (e.g. Gen 28:18). See Pillar.

OBETH, o'beth (Oôbêth, B, Oûbê, Dubbên): One of those who went up with Ezra (1 Esd 8:32) ="Ebed" of Ezr 8:6.

OBJEKT, ob'jek't: Now used only in the sense "to make objection," but formerly in a variety of meanings derived from the literal sense "to throw against." So with the meaning "to charge with" in Wied 2:11, AV ob's-ku'ri-ti: a general term for all kinds of offering, but used only in Ezk, Lev and Nu. RV renders consistently "oblation." In Ezk (also Isa 40:20), "oblation" renders הַכֹּ֧ל, הַכֹּל, generally tr4 "heave offering." In some cases (e.g. Isa 1:13; Dn 9:21) "oblation" in AV corresponds to הַכֹּל, חַיָּ֔הוֹ, the ordinary word for "gift," in P "grain offering." See Sacrifice.

OBOOTH, o'booth, o'bôth (Oôbôth, 'obhôth, "water-bags"): A desert camp of the Israelites, the 3d after leaving Mt. Hor and close to the borders of Moab (Nu 21:10,11; 33:43,44). See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

OBSCURITY, ob-skû'rî-ti: In modern Eng. generally denotes a state of very faint but still perceptible illumination, and only when preceded by some such adj. as "total" does it imply the absence of all light. In Bib. Eng., however, only the latter meaning is found. So in Isa 29:18 (מִרְמָּר, "opHEL, "darkness"); 58:10; 69:9 (מִרְמָּר, בֹּדֵה, "darkness"); Ad Est 11:8 (גְּדֹפֶּה, גְּדֹפֶּה, "darkness"); Cf Prov 20:20, AV "in obscure darkness," ERV "in the blackest darkness," ARV "in blackness of darkness."

OBSERVE, ob-zôr'v (representing various words, but chiefly מִרְמָּר, שָׂמֵר, "to keep," "to watch," etc): Properly means "to take heed to," as in Isa 43:20, "Thou seest many things, but thou observest not" and from this sense all the usages of the word in EV can be understood. Most of them, indeed, are quite good modern usage (as "observe a feast," Ex 12:17, etc.; "observe a law," Lev 19:37, etc), but a few are archaic. So Gen 37:11, AV "His father observed the saying" (RV "kept the act in mind"); Hos 13:7, "As a leopard. . . . will I observe them" (RV "watch"); Jon 2:8, "ob-
serve lying vanities" (RV "regard," but "give heed to" would be clearer; cf Ps 107:43). Still farther from modern usage is Hos 14:8; "I have heard him, and observed him" (RV "will regard;" the meaning is "care for"); and Mk 6:20, "For Herod feared John . . . and observed him" (RV "kept him safe"). In the last case, the AV editors seem to have used "to observe" as meaning "to give reverence to.

Observation(4) is found in Lk 17:20, "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation" (metá vaspá-rhí-seos, metá paratéríseos). The meaning of the Eng. is, "so that it can be observed," but the exact force of the underlying Gr ("visibly") so that it can be computed in advance(5) is a matter of extraordinary dispute at the present time. See Kingdom of God.

Burtón Scott Easton

OBSERVATION, ob-zur'vér, OF TIMES. See Divi-
nation.

OBSTINACY, ob-sti-nä-si. See HArdening.

OCCASION, o-kä-shën: The uses in RV are all modern, but in Jer 2:24 "occasion" is employed (both in Heb and Eng.) as a euphemism for "time of conception of offspring."

OCCUPY, ok'ä-pi: Is in AV the tr of 7 different words: (1) ἐπιτάξαν; (2) ἐπιχείρησα; (3) ἔργάζόμεθα; (4) εἴσηγον; (5) ἐναπλα-

OCCURRENCE, o-kür'ənt (AV, ERV, 1 K 5:4): An obsolete form of occurrence (so ARV). See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

ODOLLOM, o'do-löm (Odolámm, Odołóm): The Gr form of ÆDULLAM (q.v.), found only in 2 Macc 12:38.

ODOMERA, o'do-mér-ä (Odomérä, Odómérä, B, O'dou'mer, Odo'marris, Iuda Odeare, AV Odonarkes, m Odomarres): It is not certain whether Odomera was an independent Bedouin chief, perhaps an ally of the Syrians, or an officer of Bacchides. He was defeated by Jonathan in his campaign against Bacchides (1 Macc 9:60) in 156 BC. See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

ODOR, o'dör: In the OT the rendering of ἐνθαλ'æ, besem, "fragrance" (2 Ch 16:14; Est 2:12; in Jer 34:5, RV "burnings"), and of one or two other
words; in the NT of ἵνα, ὑπέρ (Jn 12 3; Phil 4 18; Eph 5 2 RV); in Rev 5 8; 18 13, of ὑποκατάστασις, ἀναστάσις, where RV (with AVm in former passing) has "incense." See also Savon.

OF, ov: (1) In Anglo-Saxon, had the meaning "from," "away from" (as the strengthened form "off" has still), and was not used for genuine or possessive separations being expressed by special case-forms. In the Norman period, however, "of" was taken to represent the French de (a use well developed by the time of Chaucer), and in the Elizabethan period both senses of "of" were in common use. But after about 1600 the later force of the word became predominant, and the old construction (which is now practically obsolete) it was replaced by other prepositions. In consequence AV (and in some cases RV) contains many uses of "of" that are not any more similar—most of them, to be sure, causing no difficulty, but there still being a few responsible for real obscurities. (2) Of the uses where "of" signifies "from," the most common obscure passages are those where "of" follows a vb. of hearing. In modern Eng. "hear of" signifies "to gain news about," etc. AV (Mk 7 25; Rom 10 11, etc.). But more commonly this use of "of" in AV denotes the source from which the information is derived. So Jn 16 15, "all things that I have heard of my Father." Acts 20 29, etc. Other uses of "of" are 22 29, "the desire to hear of thee;" cf 1 These 2 13; 2 Tim 1 13; 2 2, etc (similarly Mt 11 29, "and learn of me;" cf Jn 6 45). All of these are ambiguous and in modern Eng. give a wrong meaning, so that in most cases (but not Mt 11 29 or Acts 20 29) RV substitutes "from." A different example of the same use of "of" is 2 Cor 5 1, "a building of God" (RV "from"). So Mk 9 21, "of a child," means "from childhood" ("from a child," RV, is dubious). A still more obscure passage is Mt 23 25, "full of extortion and excess.""Full of" sometimes a case where AV (and even in the immediate context, Mt 23 27 28) refers to the contents, but here the "of" represents the Gr ἐκ, ὑπέρ, "out of," and denotes the source—"The contents of your cup and platter have been purchased from the gains of extortion and excess." RV again substitutes "from," with rather awkward results, but the Gr itself is unduly compressed. In Mk 11 8, one of the changes made after AV is the substitution of "full of" for where the el of 1611 read "cut down branches of the trees," the modern ed have "off" (RV "from"). For clear examples of this use of "of," without the obscurities, of Jn 2 21, they went forth of Nineveh; 2 Macc 4 25, "for the sanctuary;" and, esp. Mt 21 25, "the baptism of John, whence was it from heaven, or of men?" Here "from" and "of" represent exactly the same Gr prep., and the change in Eng. is arbitrary (RV writes "from" in both cases). The same sense use of "of" as "from" was employed rather loosely to connect an act with its source or motive. Such uses are generally clear enough, but the Eng. today seems sometimes rather curious: Mt 13 13, "rejoicing more of that sheep" (RV "over"); Ps 99 8, "vengeance of their inventions" (so AV); 1 Cor 7 4, "hath not power of her own body" (RV "over"); etc. (4) A very common use of "of" in AV is to designate the agent—a use complicated by the fact that "by" is also employed for the instrument. There are also the two interchanged freely. So in Lk 9 7, "all that was done by him ... it was said of some ..." the two words are used side by side for the same Gr prep. (RV replaces "of" by "by," but follows a different text in the first part of the verse). Again, most of the examples are clear enough, but there are some obscurities.

So in Mt 19 12, "which were made eunuchs of men," the "of men" is at first sight possessive (RV "by men"). Similarly, 2 Esd 16 30, "there are left some of the children of them that digged through the vineyard." (RV "by them"). So 1 Cor 14 24, "He is convinced of all, he is judged of all," is quite misleading (RV "by all" in both cases). Phil 3 12, AV I am apprehended of Christ Jesus, seems almost meaningless (RV "by") but there are no other instances of this use. In 2 Cor 2 12, "A door was opened unto me of the Lord" should be "in the Lord" (so RV). 2 S 21 4, "We will have no silver nor gold of Saul, nor of his house," is very loose, and RV revives the verse entirely. In all these cases, AV seems to have looked solely for smooth Eng., without caring much for exactness. In 1 Pet 1 11, however, "sufferings of Christ" probably yields a correct sense for a difficult phrase with the meaning of "sufferings of Christ in the Gr (34 times). Frequently a paraphrase is needed to give the precise meaning. And, finally, in He 11 18, the Gr itself is ambiguous and there is no way of deciding whether the prep. employed (ἐπί, πρός) means "to" (so RV) or "of" (so AVm, RVm; cf He 1 17, "through").

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

OFFENCE, o-iens', OFFEND, o-ends' (Ἐπίθεσις, ἀφήμ, ἀφαγμ, ὑπεράγμ, ἁπάντα, σκανδάλω, σκανδαλίζομαι, skandalon, σκανδαλίζομαι, skandalizō): "Offend" is either trans or intran. As trans it primarily "to strike against," hence "to displease," "to make angry," "to do harm to," "to affront," in Scripture, "to cause to stumble;" intran it is "anger," in Scripture, "to be caused to sin." "Offence" is either the cause of anger, displeasure, etc., or a sin. In Scripture we have the special significance of a stumbling-block, or cause of falling, sin, etc.

In the OT it is frequently the tr of ἀφαγμ, "to be guilty," "to transgress": Jer 2 3, RV "shall be held guilty;" 50 7, RV "not guilty;" Ezek 25 12, "he hath greatly offended;" Ps 5 15, "all they acknowledge their offence," RVm "have borne their guilt;" 13 1, He offended in Baal, RVm "became guilty;" Hab 1 11, He shall pass over, and offend, [imputing] this his power upon his god, RV "his god" by [as] a wind, and shall pass over [in "transgress"], and be guilty, [even] he whose might is his god.

In 2 Ch 28 13, we have σκανδαλίζω ἀν' ἐξετασάμ. The "offending against, RV a trespass [in 'or guilt] against Jehu; we have also ἂν ἔστω, to mislead the mark, in Ex 15 22, "to err." (Gen 20 9, RV "sinned against thee;" 40 1, "offended their lord;" 2 K 13 14; Jer 37 18, RV "sinned against thee"); RSV "false dealing against;" (Ps 75 15, "offend against the generation of thy children," RV "dealt treacherously with"); kobhtai "to act wickedly;" (Job 34 31; miktheth, a stumbling block) (Lev 19 14: 19 14); in Is 8 14, "a rock of offence;" cf Ezek 15 4; Is 21 5; Ps 119 103, "nothing shall offend," RV "no occasion of stumbling;" cf Is 57 17; Jer 6 21, etc; plēkha, "to be fraudulent or to transgress;" Prov 18 19, "a brother offended," RVm "injured."); "Offence in miktheth (see above, 18 17; 19 8 14); in Is 8 14); in Ezek 15 4; (2 Cor 13 4), "Yielding and yielding your greatest offences;" RV "They yield;" ERY "yielding;" allayeth, ARVm "Calmness (ERY "gentleness)"); leavest great sins undone;" Acts "to offend: it is bitter (1 K 11 21, m. "Heb sinners); Is 29 21, that make a man an offender for a word," ARVm "that make a man an offender in his cause;" m. "make men to offend by [their] words;" or, "for a word." ERY in a cause, in make men to offend by [their] words;"

The NT usage of these words deserves special attention. The word most frequently used in AV is skandalizō (skandalon, "offence"); very
frequent in the Gospels (Mt 5 29, "if thy right eye offend thee"; 5 30; 11 6; 18 6, "whoso shall offend one of these little ones"); 13 41, 2. NT "all things that offend"; Lk 17 1, "It Usage is impossible but that offences will come," etc; Rom 14 21; 16 17, "Mark them which cause divisions and offences...offence; 1 Cor 8:8 11 bis, "if meat make my brother to offend," etc. Skandalon is primarily "a trap-stick," "a bent-stick on which the bait is fastened which the animal strikes against and so springs the trap," hence it comes to denote "snare" or anything which strikes against injuriously (it is LXX for μολὼνκλ. Lev 19 14). For skandalize, skandalon, tv in AV "offend," "offence," RV gives "cause to stumble," "stumbling-block," etc; thus; Mt 5 29, "if thy right eye causeth thee to stumble," i.e. "is an occasion for thy falling into sin"; Mt 16 23, "Thou art a stumbling-block unto me," an occasion of turning aside from the right path; Mt 26:31-33 bis, "offended" is retained, m 33 bis, "Gr caused to stumble" (same word in ver 31); Mk 9 42, "whosoever shall cause one of these little ones that believe on me to stumble," to fall away from the faith, or to so sin (Lk 17 1), "It is impossible but that occasions of stumbling should come; but woe unto him, through whom they come"; in Rom 14 21; 16 17; in 1 Cor 8, Paul's language has the same meaning, and we see how truly he had laid to heart the Saviour's earnest admonitions—"break brethren"—with him answering to the master's "little ones who believe"; Rom 14 21, "It is good not to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor to do anything whereby thy brother stumbles," i.e. "is led by your example to do that which he cannot do with a good conscience"; ver 20, "It is evil for that man who eateth with offences [did prosōmatos]," so as to place a stumbling-block before his brother, or, rather, "without the confidence that he is doing right," cf ver 23, "He that doubteth is condemned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith; and whatsoever is not of faith is sin"; so 1 Cor 10 13; Rom 16 17. "Mark them that are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine, [so that] every man which is taught, and knoweth, is not then "teaching" of Christ Himself implied here? Everything that would embolden another to do that which would be wrong for him, or that would turn any one away from the faith, must be carefully avoided, so as not to put stumbling-blocks in the way of his brother, "for whom Christ died," "giving no occasion of stumbling [proskapel] in anything" (2 Cor 6 3).

A próskopos, "not causing to stumble," is tvr "void of offence;" Acts 4 16, "a conscience void of offence;" 1 Cor 10 32, RV "occasions of stumbling;" Phil 1 10, "void of offence;" khamartelion, "to miss the mark;" "to sin," "to err," is tvr "offended" (Acts 9 22, RV "sinned"); khamartia, "sin;" "error" (2 Cor 11 7, RV "Did I commit sin in the things?"; 2 Thess 2 3 2 bis, "stumble," "offend;" RV "tripped up;"

patamó, "a falling aside or away," is tvr "offence" (Rom 4 25; 5 13bis 16 17 18 20, in each case RV "trespass"); adikía, "to be unrighteous" (Acts 25 11, RV "wrong-doer;" AV "offender").

In Apoc we have "offence" (skandalon, Jth 12 2); RV "I will not eat thereof, lest there be occasion of stumbling;" offended (khamartelion, Ex 7 7); RV "sin;" "greatly offended" (prosochelion, 23 21) "offended" (skandalis, 32 15), "stumble;"

W. L. WALKER

OFFER, of'tr, OFFERING, of'ing. See SACRIFICE.

OFFICE, of's: In the OT the word is often used in periphrastic renderings, e.g. "minister...in the priest's office...lit. act as priest" (Ex. 28 31, etc); "do the office of a midwife," lit. cause or help to give birth (Ex 1 16). But the word is also used as a rendering of different Heb words, e.g. יָדוֹן, "pedestal," "place" (Gen 40 13, AV "place"); 41 13); רָבָז, "abhàdhàh, "labor," "work" (1 Ch 6 32); 7:25, pr'íudáh, "oversight," "charge" (Ps 109 8); רָבָז, ma'ánâdâh, lit. "standing," e.g. waiting at table (1 Ch 23 28); רָבָז, mish'mâr, "charge," observance or service of the temple (Neh 13 14 AV). Similarly in the NT the word is used in periphrastic renderings, e.g. priest's office (Lk 1 8 9); office of a deacon (dakosia, dialonta, 1 Tim 3 10); office of a bishop (episkopos, episkopad, 1 Tim 3 1). RV uses other renderings, e.g. "ministry" (Rom 11 13); "serve as deacons" (1 Tim 3 10). In Acts 1 20, RV has "office" (m "overservice") for AV "bishoprick." T. LEWIS

OFFICER. of's: In AV the term is employed to render different words denoting various officials, domestic, civil and military, such as διάκονος, "eunuch," "minister of state" (Gen 37 36); πράξας, πακisted, "person in charge," "overseer" (Gen 41 36); パース, νηπίστ, "stationed," "garrison," "prefect" (1 K 4 19); מנה, שדָדיא, "scribe" or "secretary" (perhaps arranger or organizer), then any official or overseer. In Est 9 3 for AV "officers" of the king, RV has (more literal) "they that did the king's business." In the NT "officer" generally corresponds to the Gr word ἱερέως, ὕπερελωτέρ, "servant," or any person in the employ of another. In Mt 25 the term evidently means "bailiff" or exactor of the fine imposed by the magistrate, and corresponds to παρκῶνειν, πρῶτωρ, used in Lk 12 58. T. LEWIS

OFFICES OF CHRIST. See Christ, OFFICES OF.

OFFSCOURING, of'skour-ing: This strong and expressive word occurs only once in the OT and once in the NT. The weeping prophet uses it as he looks upon his exiled race and holy city, despoiled, defiled, derided by the profane, the scourings of God and of His people (Lam 3 45, רָבָז, סחי). The favored people, whose city lies in heaps and is patrolled by the heathen, are haled and held up as the scrapings, the offscouring, the offal of the earth. They were "humbled in the dust, carried away to be the slaves of licentious idolaters. The haughty, cruel, cutting boastfulness of the victors covered Israel with contumely.

In 1 Cor 4 13 the greatest of the apostles reminds the prosperous and self-satisfied Corinthians that they, the apostles, were "made as the filth of the world, the offscouring of all things." In such contempt were they held by the unbelieving world and by false apostles. The strange, strong word παρπατος, parpato, should be reminded as what it cost in former times to be a true servant of Christ. G. H. GERBERING

OFFSPRING, of'spring. See CHILDREN.

OFTEN, of'en (παρχόνα, palkos, "thick," "close"): An archaic usage for "frequent;" "Thine often infirmities" (1 Tim 5 23); cf "by often rumination" (Shakespeare, As You Like It, IV, i, 18); "The often round" (Ben Jonson, The Forest, III); "Of wretched and broken limb—an often chance!" (Tennyson, Gareth and Lynette).

OG (גֶּלֶת, גַּפֶּה; ὡς, ὑπό): King of Bashan, whose territory, embracing 60 cities, was conquered by Moses and the Israelites immediately after the conquest of Sihon, king of the Amorites (Nu 21
33–35; Dt 3 1–12). The defeat took place at Edrei, one of the chief of these cities (Nu 21 33; Josh 12 4), and Og and his people were "utterly destroyed" (Dt 3 6). Og is described as the last of the "giant-race" of that district, and his giant stature is borne out by what is told in Dt 3 11 of the dimensions of his "bedstead of iron" (Ceres barzel), 9 cubits long and 4 broad (13 ft. by 6 ft.), said to be still preserved at Rabbabah of Ammon when the verse describing it was written. It is not, however, necessary to conclude that Og's own height, though immense, was as great as this. Some, however, prefer to suppose that what is intended is a "sarcophagus of black basalt," which iron-like substance abounds in the Hauran. The conquered territory was subsequently bestowed on the Reubenites, Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh (Nu 32 33; Dt 3 12.13). Other references to Og are Dtr 1 4; 4 47; 31 4; Josh 2 10; 9 10; 13 12.30. The memory of this great conquest lingered all through the national history (Ps 135 11; 136 20). On the conquest, cf Stanley, Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church, 1, 185–87, and see Archeology. JAMES ORR

OHALAH,  образом, 'orhal', meaning unknown: A son of Simeon, mentioned as third in order (Gen 46 10; Ex 6 16.16). The name is not found in the list of Nu 26 12–14.

OHEL,  המֶרְבָּע, 'obel', "tent"): A son of Zerubbabel (1 Ch 3 20).

OHALAH,  "father's tent"; AV Aholab): A Danite artificer, who assisted Bezaleel in the construction of tabernacle and its furniture (Ex 31 6; 35 34; 35 11; 38 23).

OHLIBAH,  הָוָלָה, 'ohlibah, "tent in her," or "my tent is in her"): An opprobrious and symbolic name given by Ezekiel to Jerusalem, representing the kingdom of Judah, because of her intrigues and base alliances with Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia, just as the name Oholah (q.v.) was given to Samaria or the Northern Kingdom, because of her alliances with Egypt and Assyria. There is a play upon the words in the Heb which cannot be reproduced in Eng. Both Oholah and Oholibah, or Samaria and Jerus, are the daughters of one mother, and wives of Jeh, and both are guilty of religious and political alliance with heathen nations. Idolatry is constantly compared by the Heb prophets to marital unfaithfulness or adultery. W. W. DAVIES

OHLIBAHAMAH,  מֶרְבָּע, 'ohlibhamah, "tent of the high place");

1. One of Esau's wives, and a daughter of Anah the Hivite (Gen 36 2.5). It is strange that she is not named along with Esau's other wives in either Gen 28 9 or 26 30. Various explanations have been given, but none of them is satisfactory. There is probably some error in the text.

2. An Edomite chief (Gen 36 41; 1 Ch 1 52).

OIL,  שֶׁמֶן, "oil," or "olive," occurs with shemen in several passages (Ex 27 20; 30 24; Lev 24 2). The corresponding Arab. ça, a contraction of zeitun, which is the name for the olive tree as a plant, is now applied to oils in general, to distinguish them from solid fats. Zeit usually means olive oil, unless some qualifying name indicates another oil. A corresponding use was made of shemen, and the oil referred to so many times in the Bible was olive oil (except Est 2 12). Compare the use with the Gr ἐλαιόν, "oil," a neuter from ἐλαῖον, ἐλάτη, "olive," the origin of the Eng. word "oil." סֶפֶן, zephah, lit. "glistening," which occurs less frequently, is used possibly because of the light-giving quality of olive oil, or it may have been used to indicate fresh oil, as the clean, newly pressed oil is bright. סֶפֶן, mesubah, a Chal. word, occurs twice: Ezr 6 9; 7 22. ḫna, ḫlaon, is the NT term.

Olive oil has been obtained, from the earliest times, by pressing the fruit in such a way as to filter out the oil and other liquids from the press residue. The Scripture references correspond so nearly to the methods practised in Syria up to the present time, and the presses uncovered by excavators at such sites as Gezer substantiate so well the similarity of these methods, that a description of the oil presses and modes of expression still being employed in Syria will be equally true of those in use in early Israelitish times.

The olives to yield the greatest amount of oil are allowed to ripen, although some oil is extracted from the green fruit. As the olive ripens it turns black. The fruit begins to fall from the trees in September, but the main crop is gathered after the first rains in November. The olives which have not fallen naturally or have not been blown off by the storms are beaten from the trees with long poles (cf Dt 24 20). The fruit is gathered from the ground into baskets and carried on the heads of the women, or on donkeys to the houses or oil presses. Those carried to the houses are preserved for eating. Those carried to the presses are piled in heaps until fermentation begins. This breaks down the oil cells and causes a more abundant flow of oil. The fruit thus softened may be trod out with the feet (Mic 6 15), which is now seldom practised or crushed in a handmill. Such a mill was uncovered at Gezer beside an oil press. Stone mortars with wooden pestles are also used. Any of these methods crushes the fruit, leaving only the stone unbroken, and yields a purer oil (Ex 27 20). The method now generally practised of crushing the fruit and kernels with an edgerunner mill probably dates from Rom times. These mills are of crude construction. The stones are cut from native limestone and are turned by horses or mules. Remains of huge stone in this type of mill yield Rom presses in Mt. Lebanon and other districts.

The second step in the preparation of the oil is

1. Terms
2. Production and Storage
3. Uses
4. Figurative Uses

Shemen, lit. "fat," corresponds to the common Arab. za, of similar meaning, although now applied to boiled butter fat. Another

Shemen, lit. "fat," corresponds to the common

Arab. za, of similar meaning, although now applied to boiled butter fat. Another
the expression. In districts where the olives are plentiful and there is no commercial demand for the oil, the householders crush the fruit in a mortar, mix the crushed mass with water, and after the solid portions have had time to settle, the pure sweet oil is skimmed from the surface of the water.

Ancient Oil Presses (Land and the Book).

This method gives a delicious oil, but is wasteful. This is no doubt the beaten oil referred to in connection with religious ceremonies (Ex 27:29). Usually the crushed fruit is spread in portions on mats of reeds or goats' hair, the corners of which are folded over the mass, and the packets thus formed are piled one upon another between upright supports. These supports were formerly two stone columns or the two sections of a split stone cylinder hollowed out within to receive the mats. Large hollow tree trunks are still similarly used in Syria. A flat stone is next placed on top, and then a heavy log is placed on the pile in such a manner that one end can be fitted into a socket made in a wall or rock in close proximity to the pile. This socket becomes the fulcrum of a large lever of the second class. The lever is worked in the same manner as that used in the wine presses (see WINE PRESS). These presses are now being almost wholly superseded by hydraulic presses. The juice which runs from the press, consisting of oil, extractive matter and water, is conducted to vats or run into jars and allowed to stand until the oil separates. The oil is then drawn off from the surface, or the watery fluid and sediment is drawn away through a hole near the bottom of the jar, leaving the oil in the container. (For the construction of the ancient oil presses, see Excavations of Gzer, esp. Macalister.)

The oil, after standing for some time to allow further sediment to settle, is stored either in huge earthenware jars holding 100 to 200 gallons, or in underground cisterns (cf 1 Ch 27:28) holding a much larger quantity. Some of these cisterns in Beirut hold several tons of oil each (2 Ch 11:11; 32:28; Neh 13:3; Prov 21:20). In the homes the oil is kept in small earthen jars of various shapes, usually having spouts by which the oil can be easily poured (1 K 17:12; 2 K 4:2). In 1 S 16:13; 1 K 1:39, horns of oil are mentioned.

1. As a commodity of exchange.—Oliver oil when properly made and stored will keep sweet for years, hence was a good form of merchandise to hold. Oil is still sometimes given in payment (1 K 5:11; Ezek 27:17; Hos 12:1; Lk 16:6; Rev 18:13).

2. As a cosmetic.—From earliest times oil was used as a cosmetic, esp. for oiling the limbs and head. Oil used in this way was usually scented (see OINTMENT). Oil is still used in this manner by the Arabs, principally to keep the skin and scalp soft when traveling in dry desert regions where there is no opportunity to bathe. Sesame oil has replaced olive oil to some extent for this purpose. Homer, Pliny and other early writers mention its use for external application. Pinny oil was supposed to protect the body against the cold. Many Bib. references indicate the use of oil as a cosmetic (Ex 25:6; Dt 25:40; Ruth 3:3; 2 S 12:20; 14:2; Est 2:12; Ps 23:5; 92:10; 104:15; 141:5; Ezek 16:9; Mic 6:15; Lk 7:46).

3. As a medicine.—From early Egypt literature down to late Arab. medical works, oil is mentioned as a valuable remedy. Many queer prescriptions contain olive oil as one of their ingredients. The good Samaritan used olive oil mingled with wine to dress the wounds of the man who fell among robbers (Mk 6:13; Lk 10:34).

4. As a food.—Olive oil replaces butter to a large extent in the diet of the people of the Mediterranean countries. In Bible lands food is fried in it, it is added to stews, and is poured over boiled vegetables, such as beans, peas and lentils, and over salads, sour milk, cheese and other foods as a dressing. A cake is prepared from ordinary bread dough which is smeared with oil and sprinkled with herbs before baking (Lev 8:5). At times of fasting (oriental Christians use only vegetable oil for cooking, for Bib. references to the use of oil as food see Nu 11:8; Dt 7:13; 14:23; 32:13; 1 K 17:12; 14:16; 2 K 4:27; 1 Ch 12:40; 2 Ch 2:10-15; Ezk 3:7; Prov 21:17; Ezek 16:13; Hos 10:22; Hag 2:12; Rev 6:6).

5. As an illuminant.—Olive oil until recent years was universally used for lighting purposes (see LAMP). In Palestine there were a few primitive forms of lamp similar to those employed by the Israelites in oil, and some in favor of the exclusive use of olive oil for lighting holy places is disappearing. Formerly any other illuminant was forbidden (cf. Ex 25:6; 27:20; 35:8.14.28; 39:37; Mt 25:3.4.8).

6. In religious rites.—(a) Consecration of officials or sacred things (Gen 28:18; 35:14; Ex 29:21.22; Lev 2:18; Nu 4:9ff; 1 S 10:1; 16:13; 2 S 1:21; 1 K 1:39; 2 K 9:13.6; Ps 89:20). This was adopted by the early Christians in their ceremonies (Jas 5:14), and is still in the consecration of crowned rulers and church dignitaries. (b) Offerings, votive and otherwise: The custom of making offerings of oil to holy places still survives in oriental religions. One may see burning before the shrines along a Syrian roadside or in the churches, small lamps with oil as the supply of oil, as necessary. In Israelitic times oil was used in the meal offering, in the consecration offerings, offerings of purification from leprosy, etc (Ex 29:22; 40:9ff; Lev 2:2ff; Nu 4:9ff; Dt 18:4; 1 Ch 9:29; 2 Ch 31:5; Neh 10:37-39; 13:5.12; Ezek 16:18,19; 46:46; Mic 6:7). (c) In connection with the burial of the dead: Eadep papyri mention this use. In the OT no direct mention is made of the custom. Jesus referred to it in connection with His own burial (Mt 26:12; Mk 14:8-9; Lk 23:56; Jn 12:3-5; 19:40). Abundant oil was a figure of general prosperity (Dt 32:13; 33:21; 2 K 18:32; Job 29:6; Joel 2:19.24). Languishing of the oil indicated general famine (Jdel 1:10; Zech 14:11).

4. Figurative.—The oil of the olive is still described as the oil of joy (Isa 61:3), or the oil of gladness (Ps 46:7; He 1:9). Ezekiel prophesies that the rivers shall run like oil, i.e. become viscous (Ezek 32:14). Words of deceit are softer than oil (Ps 56:21; Job 23:9). Cursing becomes a habit with the wicked as readily as oil soaks into stones (Ps 109:18). Excessive use of oil indicates wastefulness (Prov 21:17), while the saving of it is a characteristic of the wise (Prov 21:20). Oil was
carried into Egypt, i.e. a treaty was made with that country ( Hos 12:1).

OIL, ANOINTING (חֹקָר חֹקָר, shemen ha-miskhâkh): This holy oil, the composition of which is described in Ex 30:22-33, was designed for use in the anointing of the tabernacle, its furniture and vessels, the altar and laver, and the priest, that being thus consecrated, they might be "most holy." It was to be "a holy anointing oil" unto Jehovah throughout all generations (ver 31). On its uses, see Ex 37:29; Lev 8:12; 10:7; 21:10. The care of this holy oil was subsequentlyentrusted to Eleazar (Nu 4:16); in later times, it seems to have been prepared by the sons of the priests (1 Ch 9:30). There is a figurative allusion to the oil on Aaron's head in Ps 133:2. See OIL; ANOINTING. James Orr.

OIL, BEATEN (Ex 37:29; Lev 24:2; Nu 28:5). See OIL; GOLDEN CANDLESTICK.

OIL, HOLY. See OIL; ANOINTING.

OIL, OLIVE. See OIL; OLIVE TREE.

OIL PRESS. See OIL; WINE PRESS.

OIL-MAKING. See Crafts, II, 11.

OIL TREE, oil trê (עִלְיָה, 'eq shemen [Isa 41:19], m "oleaster," in Neh 8:15, tr' "wild olive," AV "pine"); תַּנָּא, 'eq shemen, in 1 K 6:23.31.32, tr' "olive wood"). The name "oleaster" used to be applied to the wild olive, but now belongs to another plant, the silver-berry, Elaeagnus hortensis (N.O. Elaeagnus) known in Arabic as Zei'ZFną. It is a pretty shrub with sweet-smelling white flowers and silver-grey-green leaves. It is difficult to see how all the three references can apply to this tree; it will suit the first two, but this small shrub would never supply wood for carpentry work such as that mentioned in 1 K, hence the tr "olive wood." On the other hand, in the reference in Neh 8:15, olive branches are mentioned just before, so the tr "wild olive" (the difference being too slight) is improbable. Post suggests the tr of "abonies" by Pine (q.v.), which if accepted would suit all the requirements. E. W. G. Masterman.

OINTMENT, oint'ment: The present use of the word "ointment" is to designate a thick unguent of buttery or tallow-like consistency. AV in frequent instances translates shemen or miskhâkh (see Ex 30:25) "ointment" where a perfumed oil seemed to be indicated. ARV has consequently substituted the word "oil" in most of the passages. Merkôbah is rendered "ointment" once in the OT (Job 41:31 [Heb 41:23]). The well-known power of oils and fats to absorb odors was made use of by the ancient perfumers. The composition of the holy anointing oil used in the tabernacle worship is mentioned in Ex 30:22-25; Olive oil formed the base. That was scented with "flowing myrrh . . . . sweet cinnamon . . . . sweet calamus . . . . and . . . . cassia." The oil was probably mixed with the above ingredients added in a powdered form and heated until the oil had absorbed their odors and then allowed to stand until the insoluble matter settled, when the oil could be decanted. Olive oil, being a non-drying oil which does not thicken readily, yielded an ointment of oily consistency. This is indicated by Ps 150:4, where it says that the precious oil ran down on Aaron’s beard and on the collar of his outer garment. Anyone attempting to make the holy anointing oil would be cut off from his people (Ex 30:33). The scented oils or ointments were kept in jars or vials (not boxes) made of alabaster. These jars are frequently found as part of the equipment of ancient tombs.

The word tr' "ointment" in the NT is ἁρώπ, μύρον, "myrrh." This would indicate that myrrh, an aromatic gum resin, was the substance commonly added to the oil to give it odor. In Lk 7:46 both kinds of oil are mentioned, and the verse might be paraphrased thus: My head with common oil thou didst not anoint; but she hath anointed my feet with costly scented oil.

For the uses of scented oils or ointments see ANOINTING; OIL. James A. Patch.

OLAMUS, ol'a-mus (אָלָמוֹס, Ḥalamôś; One of the Israelites who had taken a "strange wife" (1 Fad 9:30) = "Meschullam" of Exr 10:29.

OLD, old. See Age, Old.

OLD GATE. See Jerusalem.

OLD MAN (םילאוס, palaios, "old; "ancient"): A term thrice used by Paul (Rom 1:6; Eph 4:22; Col 3:9) to signify the unregenerated man, the natural man in the corruption of sin, i.e. sinful human nature before conversion and regeneration. It is theologically synonymous with "flesh" (Rom 8:7-9), which is a term, not for bodily organism, but for the whole nature of man (body and soul) turned away from God and devoted to self and earthy things.

The old man is "in the flesh": the new man "in the Spirit." In the former "the works of the flesh" (Gal 5:19-21) are manifest; in the latter "the fruit of the Spirit" (vs 22-23). One is "corrupt according to the deceitful lusts"; the other "created in righteousness and true holiness" (Eph 4:22-24 AV). See also MAN, NATURAL; MAN, NEW.

Dwight M. Pratt.

OLD PROPHET, THE (711 פַּדְעַל, nôbîh, ֶהַדָּה זַקֵּן; "an old prophet" [1 K 13:11], פַּדְעַל ֶה, ha-nôbîh 'ha-zákên, "the old

1. The "prophet" (ver 29): The narrative of Narrative 1 K 13:11-32, in which the old prophet is mentioned, is part of a larger account telling of a visit paid to Bethel by "a man of God" from Judah. The Juedaic prophet uttered a curse upon the altar erected there by Jeroboam I. When the king attempted to use force against him, the prophet was saved by the prophet's intervention; the king then invited him to receive royal hospitality, but he refused because of a command of God to him not to eat or drink there. The Juedaic then departed (vs 1-10). An old prophet who lived in Bethel heard of the stranger's words, and went after him and offered him hospitality. This offer too was refused. But when the old prophet resorted to falsehood and pleaded a Divine command on the subject, the Juedaic returned with him. While at the table the old prophet is given a message to declare that death will follow the southerner's disobedience to the first command. A lion kills him on his way home. The old prophet hears of the death and explains it as due to disobedience to God; he then buries the dead body in his own grave and expresses a wish that he also at death should be buried in the same sepulcher.

There are several difficulties in the text. In ver 11, AV reads "his sons came" instead of one of his sons came." and tr ver 120: "And his sons showed the way the man of God went." There is a gap in the MT after the word "tahal" in ver 20, and ver 29 should be tr'. "And it came to pass after he had eaten bread and drunk water, that he saddled for himself the ass, and departed ass." (following LXX, B with W. B. Stevenson, H.D.B. III, 594a, n.).

2. Critical

The critical question in the text is whether the old prophet was "Meschullam" of Ex 10:29. Several interpretations have been put forward. If not Meschullam, then he was "an old prophet" (fr. 1), or "an old man" (fr. 2). The latter view is probably the correct one. The text is not clear. The Juedaic literally says: "And he showed him the way of the man of God went." The word "the way of the man of God went" was expressed variously in the MT and Targum, and the text is apparently corrupt. The Juedaic translator takes the LXX reading, which is also the reading of the LXX and Targum. The text is corrupt and requires emendation. The interpretation is thus: "And he showed him the way of the man of God went." There is a gap in the MT after the word "tahal" in ver 20, and ver 29 should be tr'. "And it came to pass after he had eaten bread and drunk water, that he saddled for himself the ass, and departed ass." (following LXX, B with W. B. Stevenson, H.D.B. III, 594a, n.).
Benzerger ("Die Bücher der Könige," Kurz. Hand-Komm. zum AT, 91) holds that we have here an example of a midrash, i.e. according to LOT, 529, "an imaginative development of a thought or theme suggested by Scripture, esp. a didactic or homiletic one or an edifying religious story." 2 Ch 24:27 refers to a "midhrash of the book of the kings," and 2 Ch 13:22 to a "midrash of the prophet Iddo." In 2 Ch 9:29 we have a reference to "the visions of Iddo the seer concerning Jeroboam the son of Nebat." Jos names the Judaean prophet Jadon (Ant., VIII, viii, 5), and some would trace this narrative to the midrash of Iddo, which would be a late Jewish work. There is a trace of late Heb in ver 3, and evidence in several places of a later editing of the original narrative. Ketzer and Renzinger think it possible that the section may be based on a historical incident. If the narrative is historical in the main, the mention of Josiah by name in ver 2 may be a later insertion; if not historical, the prophecy there is ex eventu, and the whole section a midrash on 2 K 22 13-20.

(1) Several questions are suggested by the narrative, but in putting as well as in answering these questions, it must be remembered that the old prophet himself, as has been pointed out, is not the chief character of the piece. Hence it is a little pointless to ask what became of the old prophet, or whether he was not punished for his falsehood.

The passage should be studied, like the parables of Jesus, with an eye on the great central truth, which is, here, that God punishes disobedience even in "a man of God." It is not inconsistent with this to regard the old prophet as an example of "Satan fashioning himself into an angel of light" (2 Cor 11:14), or of the beast which "had two horns like unto a lamb" (Rev 13:11).

(2) It must also be remembered that the false prophets of the OT are called prophets in spite of their false prophecies. So here the old prophet in spite of his former lie is given a Divine message to declare that with death will follow the other's disobedience.

(3) One other question suggests itself, and demands an answer. Why did the old prophet make the request that at death he should be buried in the same grave as the Judaean (ver 31)? The answer is implied in ver 32, and is more fully given in 2 K 23:15-20, where King Josiah defiles the graves of the prophets at Bethel. On seeing a "monument-stone by the graves" he inquires what it is, and is told that it marks the grave of the prophet from Judah. Thereupon he orders that his bones be not disturbed. With these the bones of the old prophet escape. Perhaps no clearer instance of a certain kind of meanness exists in the OT. The very man who has been the cause of another's downfall and ruin is base enough to plan his own escape under cover of the virtues of his victim. And the parallels in modern life are many.

David Francis Roberts

OLD TESTAMENT. See Text of the OT.

OLD TESTAMENT CANON. See Canon of the OT.

OLD TESTAMENT LANGUAGES. See Languages of the OT.

OLEASTER, 6-le-ast'ar (Isa 41:19 RVm). See Oil Tree.

OLIVE. See Olive Tree.

OLIVE BERRIES, ber'iz. See Olive Tree.

OLIVE, GRAFTED. See Olive Tree.

OLIVE TREE, ol'iv tre' (C77), zayith, a word occurring also in Aram., Ethiopic and Arab.; in the last it means "olive oil," and zaitun, "the olive tree". Aata, elain: The olive tree has all through history been one of the most characteristic, most valued and most useful of trees in Pal.

1. The Olive Tree. It is only right that it is the first named. Olive Tree "king" of the trees (Jgs 9:8,9). When the children of Israel came to the land they acquired olive trees which they planted not (Dt 6:11; cf Josh 24:13). The cultivation of the olive goes back to the earliest times in Canaan. The frequent references in the Bible to evidence (see 4 below) from archaeology and the important place the product of this tree has held in the history of the inhabitants of Syria make it highly probable that this land is the actual home of the cultivated olive. The wild olive is indigenous there. The most fruitful trees among the product of bare and rocky ground (cf Dt 33:13) situated preferably at a great distance from the sea. The terraced hills of Pal, where the earth lies never many inches above the limestone rocks, the long rainless summer of unbroken sunshine, and the heavy "dews" of the autumn afford conditions which are extraordinarily favorable to at least the indigenous olive.

The olive, Olea Europaea (N.O. Oleaceae), is a slow-growing tree, requiring years of patient labor before reaching full fruitfulness. Its growth implies a certain degree of settlement and peace, for a hostile army can in a few days destroy the patient work of two generations. Possibly this may have something to do with its being the emblem of peace. Enemies of a village could not easily carry out revenge by cutting away a ring of branches from the trunks of the olives, thus killing the trees in a few months. The beauty of this tree is referred to in Jer 11:16; Hos 14:6, and its fruitfulness in Ps 128:3. The characteristic olive-green of its foliage, frosted silver below and the twisted and gnarled trunks—often hollow in the center—are some of the most picturesque and constant signs of settled habitations. In some parts of the land large plantations occur: the famous olive grove near Be'erith is 5 miles square; there are also fine, ancient trees in great numbers near Bethlehem.

In starting an oliveyard the fellah not infrequently plants young wild olive trees which grow plentifully over many parts of the land, or he may grow from cuttings. When the young trees are 3 years old they are grafted from a choice stock and after another three or four years they may commence to bear fruit, but they take quite a decade more before reaching full fruitition. Much attention is, however, required. The soil around the trees must be frequently plowed and broken up; water must be conducted to the roots from the earliest rain, and the soil must be freely enriched with a kind of manure known in Aram. as hawwârâh. If neglected, the older trees soon send up a great many shoots from the roots all around the parent stem (perhaps the

Typical Grove of Olive Trees at Jerusalem.
idea in Ps 128 3); these must be pruned away, although, should the parent stem decay, some of these may be capable of taking its place. Being, however, from the root, below the original point of grafting, they are of the wild olive type—with smaller, stiffer leaves and prickly stem—and need grafting before they are of use. The olive tree furnishes a wood valuable for many forms of carpentry, and in modern Pal is extensively burnt as fuel.

The olive is in flower about May; it produces clusters of small white flowers, springing from the axile of the leaves, which fall as showers to the ground (Job 15 33).

2. The Fruit

The first olives mature as early as September in some places, but, in the mountain districts, the olive harvest is not till November or even December. Much of the earliest fruit falls to the ground and is left by the owner un-gathered until the harvest. The trees are beaten with long sticks (Dt 24 20), the young folks often climbing into the branches to reach the highest fruit, while the women and older girls gather up the fruit from the ground. The immature fruit left after such an ingathering is described graphically in Isa 17 6: "There shall be left therein gleanings, as the shaking [in "beating"] of an olive-tree, two or three berries in the top of the uppermost bough, four or five in the outmost branches of a fruitful tree." Such gleanings belonged to the poor (Dt 24 20), as is the case today. Modern villages in Pal allow the poor of even extreme poverty to glean the olives. The yield of an olive tree is very uncertain; a year of great fruitfulness may be followed by a very scanty crop or by a succession of such.

The olive is an important article of diet in Pal. Some are gathered green and pickled in brine, after slight bruising, and others, the "black" olives, are gathered quite ripe and are either packed in salt or in brine. In both cases the salt modifies the bitter taste. They are eaten with bread.

More important commercially is the oil. This is sometimes extracted in a primitive way by crushing a few berries by hand in the hollow of a stone (cf Ex 27 20), from which a shallow channel runs for the oil. It is an old custom to Gem the them by foot (Mic 6 15). Oil is obtained

3. Olive Oil

3. Olive Oil on a larger scale in one of the many varieties of oil mills. The berries are carried in baskets, by donkeys, to the mill, and they are crushed by heavy weights. A better class of oil can be obtained by collecting the first oil to come off separately, but not much attention is given to this in Pal, and usually the berries are crushed, stones and all, by a circular millstone revolving on upright round central pivot. Pleasant harvest of oil was looked upon as one of God's blessings (Job 2 24; 3 13). That the "labor of the olive" should fail was one of the trials to faith in Jch (Hab 3 17). Olive oil is extensively used as food, as bread being dipped into it in eating; also medicinally (Lk 10 34; Jas 5 14). In ancient times it was greatly used for anointing the person (Ps 23 5; Mt 6 17). In Rome's days of luxury it was a common maxim that a long and pleasant life depended upon two fluids—"wine within and oil without." In modern times this use of oil for the person is replaced by the employment of soap, which in Pal is made from olive. In all ages this oil has been used for illumination (Mt 25 3).

Comparatively plentiful as olive trees are today in Pal, there is abundant evidence that the cultivation was once much more extensive.

4. Greater Plenty of Olive Trees in Ancient Times

The countless rock-cut oil- and wine-presses, both within and without the walls of the city of Gezer), show that the cultivation of the olive and vine was of much greater importance than it is anywhere in Pal today. Excessive taxation has made olive culture unprofitable ("Mem," PEF, 11, 23). A further evidence of this is seen today in many now deserted sites which are covered with wild olive trees, descendants of large plantations of the cultivated tree which have quite disappeared. Many of these spring from the fallen drupes. Isolated trees scattered over many parts of the land, esp. in Galilee, are sown by the birds. As a rule the wild olive is but a shrub, with small leaves, a stem more or less prickly, and a small, hard drupe with but little or no oil. That a wild olive branch should be grafted into a fruitful tree would be a proceeding useless and contrary to Nature (Rom 11 17 24). On the mention of "branches of wild olive" in Neh 8 15, see Ol. Tree. For "olives" as in the Greek Testament, see E. W. G. Maspero.

OLIVE, WILD: Figuratively used in Rom 11 17 24 for the Gentiles, grafted into "the good olive tree" of Israel. See Olive Tree.

OLIVE YARD, ol'iv yard. See Olive Tree.

OLIVES, ol'ivz, MOUNT OF ( chai'ad), har ha-zethim [Zec 14 4], מַעְלֶה הַזָּהָתִים, "the ascent of the mount of Olives" [2 S 15 30, AV "the ascent (of mount) Olives"]; το ὁπά τῶν θαλαίων, τῶ ὁπά τὰ κλαίνα, "the Mount of Olives" [Mt 21 1; 24 3; 26 30; Mk 11 1; 13 3; 14 26; Lk 19 37; 21 37; 22 39; Jn 8 1]; το ὁπά τῶν καλωσύνων θαλαίων, τῷ ὁπά το καλούμενον κλαίνα, "the mount that is called Olivet" [Lk 19 29; 21 37; in both references in AV "the mount called (the mount of) Olives"]; τῶν θαλαίων, το θαλάνα [Acts 1 12, EV "Olives" lit. "olive garden"]; 1. Names

2. Situation and Extent

3. OT Associations

1. David's Escape from Absalom (1)
2. The Vision of Ezekiel
3. The Vision of Zechariah
Olivet comes to us through the Vulg *Olivetum*, “an oliveyard.”

Jos frequently uses the expression “Mount of Olives” (e.g. Ant, VII, ix, 2; XX, xvii, 6; BJ, V, ii, 3; xii, 2), but later Jewish

1. Names writings give the name Ḥar ha-mishḥah, “Mount of Oil”; this occurs in some MSS in 2 K 23:13, and the common reading Ḥar ha-mishabbeth, “Mount of Corruption,” in “destruction,” may possibly be a deliberate alteration (see below). In later ages the Mount was termed “the mountain of lights,” because here there used to be kindled at one time the first beacon light to announce throughtout Jewry the approach of the new moon.

To the natives of Pal today it is usually known as Jebel et Tūr (“mount of the elevation,” or “tower”), or, less commonly, as Jebel Tūr ez zait (“mountain of the elevation of oil”). The name Jebel ez-zawāt ("Mount of Olives") is also well known. Early Arab. writers use the term Tūr Zait, “Mount of Oil.”

The mountain ridge which lies E. of Jerus leaves the central range near the valley of *Shephath* and runs for about 2 miles due S. After descrdinating in the mountain mass on which lies the “Church of the Ascension,” it may be considered as giving off two branches: one lower one, which runs S.S.W., forming the southern side of the Kidron valley, terminating at the Rd of the Nea, and another, higher one, which slopes eastward and terminates a little beyond el-'Aziziyeh (modern Bethany). The main ridge is considerably higher than the site of ancient Jerus, and still retains a thick cap of the soft chalky limestone, mixed with flint, known variously as *Nārī* and *Ka'bāl*, which has been entirely denuded over the Jerus site (see Jerusalem, II, 1). The flints were the cause of a large settlement of paleolitic man which occurred in prehistoric times on the northern end of the ridge, while the soft chalky stone breaks down and forms a soil suitable for the cultivation of olives and other trees and shrubs. The one drawback to arboriculture upon this ridge is the strong northwest wind which permanently bends most trees toward the S.E., but affords the soft olive less, so that the quince is the growing pine. The eastern slopes are more sheltered. In respect of wind the Mount of Olives is far more exposed than the site of old Jerus.

The lofty ridge of Olivet is visible from far, a fact now emphasized by the high Russian tower which can be seen for many scores of miles on the E. of the Jordan. The range presents, from such a point of view particularly, a succession of summits. Taking as the northern limit the dip which is crossed by the ancient Anathoth (‘anatād) road, the most northerly summit is that now crowned by the house and garden of Sir John Gray Hill, 2,690 ft. above sea-level. This is sometimes incorrectly pointed out as Scopus, which lay farther to the N.W. A second sharp dip in the ridge separates this northern summit from the last, a broad plateau now occupied by the great Kaiserin Augusta Victoria Stiftung and gardens. The road makes a sharp descent into a valley which is traversed from W. to E. by an important and ancient road from Jerus, which runs eastward along the Rd of the Nea. W.S. of the last dip lies the main mass of the mountain, that known characteristically as the Olivet of ecclesiastical tradition. This mass consists of two principal

summits and two subsidiary spurs. The northern of the two main summits is that known as *Karem ṣeat Binyād, the vineyard of the hunter,* and also as “Galilee,” or, more correctly, as *Viri Galilaei* (see below, 7). It reaches a height of 2,793 ft. above the Mediterranean and is separated from the southern summit by a narrow neck traversed today by the carriage road. The southern summit, of practically the same elevation, is the traditional “Mount of the Ascension,” and for several years has been distinguished by a lofty, though somewhat inarticulate, tower erected by the Russians. The two subsidiary spurs referred to above are: (1) a somewhat broken ridge running S.E., upon which lies the squall village of el-'Aziziyeh—Bethany; (2) a small spur running S., covered with grass, which is known as “the Prophets,” on account of a remarkable 4th-c. Christian tomb found there, which is known as “the tomb of the Prophets”—a spot much venerated by modern Jews.

A further extension of the ridge as *Batin el-Hawa,* “the belly of the wind,” or traditionally as “the Mount of Offence” (cf 1 K 11:7; 2 K 23:13), is usually included in the Mount of Olives, but its lower altitude—it is on a level with the temple-platform—and its position S. of the city mark it off as practically a distinct hill. Upon its lower slopes are clustered the houses of Sī‘ām (Siloam).

The notices of the Mount of Olives in the OT are, considering its nearness to Jerus, remarkably scanty.

(1) David fleeing before his rebellious son Absalom (2 S 15:16) crossed the Kidron and “went up by the ascent of the mount of the house of Olives, and wept as he went up; and Associations he had his head covered, and went barefoot: and all the people that were with him covered every man his head, and they went up, weeping as they went” (ver 30). . . . And it came to pass, that, when David was come to the top of the ascent, behold, Ziba the servant of Mephibosheth met him, with a couple of asses saddled, and upon them two hundred loaves of bread, and a hundred clusters of raisins, and a hundred of summer fruits, and a bottle of wine” (16 1).

It is highly probable that David’s route to the wilderness was neither by the much-trodden Anathoth road nor over the summit of the Mount of Olives but by the path running N.E. from the city, which runs between the Viri Galilaei hill and that supporting the German Sanatorium and descends into the wilderness by Wādy er Rawdah. See Barurim.

(2) Ezekiel in a vision (11:23) saw the glory of Jehovah go up from the midst of the city and stand “upon the mountain which is on the east side of the city” (cf 43:2). In connection with this the Rabbi Janna records the tradition that the *shāikhnut* (leader) stood 91 years upon Olivet, and preached, saying, “Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near”—a strange story to come from a Jewish source, suggesting some overt reference to Christ.

(3) In Zec 14:4 the prophet sees Jehovah in that day stand upon the Mount of Olives, and “the Mount of Olives shall be cleft in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley; and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half of it toward the south.”

In addition to these direct references, Jewish tradition associates with this mount—this “mount of Corruption”—the rite of the red heifer (Nu 19); and many authorities consider that this is also the
mount referred to in Neh 8 15, whence the people are directed to fetch olive branches, branches of wild olive, myrtle branches, palm branches and branches of thick trees to make their booths.

It is hardly possible that a spot with such a wide outlook—especially the marvelous view of the Jordan valley and Dead Sea to the lands of Ammon and Moab—should have been neglected in the days when Scm religion crowned such spots with their sanctuaries. There is no evidence that there was a "high place" here. In the account of David's flight mention is made of the spot on the summit "where he was wont to worship God" (2 Sam 15 32 m). This is certainly a reference to a sanctuary, and there are strong reasons for believing that this place may have been Nob (q.v.) (see 1 Sam 21; 2 Sam 11.19; Neh 11 32; but esp. Is 10 32). This last reference seems to imply a site more commanding in its outlook over the ancient city than Ras el Musharif proposed by Driver, one at least as far S. as the Anathoth road, or even that from Wady er Raveabi. But besides this we have the definite statement (1 K 11 7): "Then did Solomon build a high place for Chemosh in the mount that is before [i.e. E. of] Jerus, and for Moloch the abomination of the children of Ammon," and the further account that the "high places that were before [E. of] Jerus, which were on the right hand [S.] of the mount of corruption [i.e. "destruction"], which Solomon the king of Israel had built for Asherah the abomination of the Sidonians, and for Chemosh the abomination of Moab, and for Milcom the abomination of the children of Ammon, did the king [Joshiah] defile" (2 K 23 13). That these high places were somewhere upon what is generally recognized as the mount of Olives, seems clear, and the most probable site is the main mass where are today the Christian sanctuaries, though Graets and Dean Stanley favor the summit known as Virc Galloaet. It is the recognition of this which has kept alive the Jewish name "Mount of Corruption" for this mount to the day. The term Mons offendionis, given to the southeastern extension, S. of the city, is merely an ecclesiastical tradition going back to Quaresimus in the 17th cent., which is repeated by Burchard (see 3 AD).

More important to us are the NT associations of this sacred spot. In those days the mountain must have been far different from its condition today. Titus in his siege of Jerus destroyed all the timber here and elsewhere in the environs, but before this the hillsides must have been clothed with verdure—oliveyards, fig orchards and palm groves, with myrtle and other shrubs. Here in the fresh breezes and among the thick foliage, Jesus, the country-bred Galiliean, must gladly have taken Himself from the noise and closeness of the over-crowded city. It is to the Passion Week, with the exception of Jn 8 1, that all the incidents belong which are repeatedly mentioned occurring on the Mount of Olives; while there would be a special reason at this time in the densely packed city, it is probable that on other occasions also Our Lord preferred to stay outside the walls. Bethany would indeed appear to have been His home in Judæa as Capernaum was in Galilee. Here we read of Him as staying with Mary and Martha (Lk 10 38-42); again He comes to Bethany from the wilderness road from Jericho for the raising of Lazarus (Jn 11), and later He is at a feast, six days before He was raised on the mount of Olives (Lk 12 13). The Mount of Olives is expressly mentioned in many of the events of the Passion Week. He approached Jerus, "unto Bethphage and Bethany, at the mount of Olives" (Mk 11 1; Mt 21 1; Lk 19 29); over a shoulder of this mount—very probably by the route of the present Jericho carriage road—He made His triumphal entry to the city (Mt 21; Mk 11; Lk 19), and on this road, when probably the full night of the city first burst into view, He

**Mount of Olives from the Golden Gate.**

Wept over Jerus (Lk 19 41). During all that week "every day he was teaching in the temple; and every night he went out, and lodged in the mount that is called Olivet" (Lk 21 37)—the special part of the mount being Bethany (Mt 21 17; Mk 11 11). It was on the road from Bethany that He gave the sign of the withering, colourless fig tree (Mt 21 17-19; Mk 11 12-14.20-24), and "as he sat on the mount of Olives" (Mt 24 3; Mk 13 3) Jesus gave His memorable sermon with the doomed city lying below Him.

On the lower slopes of Olivet, in the Garden of Gethsemane (q.v.), Jesus endured His agony, the betrayal and arrest, while upon one of its higher points—not, as tradition has it, on the inhabited highest summit, but on the secluded eastern slopes "over against Bethany" (Lk 24 50-52)—He took leave of His disciples (Acts 1 12).

The view of Jerus from the Mount of Olives must ever be one of the most striking impressions which any visitor to Jerus carries away with him. It has been described countless times. It is today as then, when view is taken from Olivet a modern writer with historic imagination has thus graphically sketched the salient features of that sight:

"We are standing on the road from Bethany as it breaks round the Mount of Olives and on looking north-west this is what we see. . . . There spreads a vast stone stage, almost continuous, some 400 yds. N. and S. by 300 E. and W., held up above Ophel and the Kidron valley by a high and massive wall, from 50 to 150 ft. and more in height, according to the levels of the rock from which it rises. Deep cloisters surround this platform on the inside of the walls. . . . Every gate has its watch and other guards patrol the courts. The crowds, which pour through the south gates upon the platform for the most part keep to the right; the exceptions, turning westward, are excommunicated or in mourning. But the crowd are not all Israelites. Numbers of Gentiles mingle with them; there are costumes and colors from all lands. In the cloisters sit teachers with groups of disciples about them. On the open pavement stand the booths of hucksters and money changers; and from the N. sheep and bullocks are being driven toward the inner sanctuary. This lies not in the center of the great platform, but in the northwest corner. It is a separate and fortified, oval-shaped building with its 9 gates rising from a narrow terrace at a slight elevation above the platform and the terrace enclo-
Olivé, Mount of

The Mount of Olives is a hill on the southeastern outskirts of Jerusalem, on which stands a large hotel with a NT examination made there in 1859. The Mount was once covered with olive trees, hence its name. The Mount of Olives is one of the sacred places of the NT and has been the scene of many events associated with Jesus. It is also a place of importance in the Jewish and Christian traditions.


OLIVÉT, OFI.-VET. See Olives, Mount of.

OLYMPSAS, LIMPIAS (Olympaian, Olympia): The name of a Rom Christian to whom Paul sent greetings (Rom 16:15). Olympia is an abbreviated form of Olympiadorus. The joining in one salutation of the Christians mentioned in ver 15 suggests that they formed by themselves a small community in the earliest Rom Church.

OLYMPIUS, LIMPIUS (Olympios): An epithet of Jupiter or Zeus (q.v.) from Mt. Olympus in Thessaly, where the gods held court presided over by Zeus. Antiocbus Ephipanes, "who on God's altars danced," insulted the Jewish religion by dedicating the temple of Zeus to Jupiter Olympius, 108 BC (2 Mac 6:2; 1 Mac 5:48)

OMAERUS, OMAA-TOUS: AV-RV "Isaureus" (1 Esd 9:34).

OMAR, OMAAR (OMAR, OMAAR, connected perhaps with 'amar, 'speak'; LXX Ἄμαρ, Ὄμνα, or Ὄμηρος, Ὅμηρος): Grandson of Esau and son of Eliphaz in Gen 36:11; 1 Ch 1:50; given the title "duke" or "chief" in Gen 36:15.

OMEGA, OMEGA (OME-GA, OME-GA, OME-GA): See Alpha and Omega.

OMENS, O'MEN. See AUGURY; DIVINATION.

OMER, O'MER (OMER, O'MER): A dry measure, the tenth of an ephah, equal to about 73 pints. See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

OMNIPOTENCE, OMNI-POT'ENCE: The noun "omnipotence" is not found in the Eng. Bible, nor any noun exactly corresponding to it in the original Heb or Gr.

1. Terms and Usage

The adj. "omnipotent" occurs in Rev 19:6 AV; the Gr for this, παντοκράτωρ, παρθένος, occurs also in 2 Cor 4:18; Rev 1:10; 2:10; 14:19; 19:16; 21:22 (in all of which AV and RV render "omnipotent"). It is also found frequently in LXX, esp. in the rendering of the Divine names Jehovah (יְהוֹה), and (El Shaddai, שדָּדַי, "the name of authority," "sovereignty," "side by side with that of power," makes itself more distinctly felt than it does to the modern reader of "omnipotent," though it is means to be included in the latter also. Cf further δυνάμει, ὁ δυνατός, in Lk 1:46.

The formal concept of omnipotence was worked out in theology does not occur in the OT. The substance of the idea is conveyed in the

2. Inherent variety of indirect ways. The notion of "strength" is inherent in the OT concept of God from the beginning, being already represented in one of the two Divine names inherited by Israel from ancient Sem religion, the name "El. According to one etymology it is also inherent in the other, the name "Elohim", and in this case the pl. form, by bringing out the fullness of power in God, would mark an approach to the idea of omnipotence. See God, NAMES OF.

In the patriarchal religion the conception of "might" occupies a prominent place, as is indicated by the name characteristic of this period, "El Shaddai," of Gen 17:1; 28:3; 35:11; 43:14; 45:3; 49:24-25; Ex 3:13. This name, however, designates the Divine power as standing in the service of His covenant-relationship to the patriarchs, as transcending Nature and overpowering it in the interests of redemption.

Another Divine name which signifies this attribute is Jehovah El, Jehovah of Hosts. This name, characteristic
of the prophetic period, describes God as the King surrounded and followed by the angelic hosts, and since the might of an omnipotent being is measured by the splendor of his repute, as of great, incomparable power, the King Omnipotent (Ps 24:10; Isa 2:12; 6:35; 8:13; Jer 46:18; Mal 1:11).

Still another name expressive of the same idea is Abinad. From Omnipotence compounded with Jacob or Israel (Gen 49:24; 32:33; 33:3; 45:5). Further, El Gabbah, "God-Hero" (Isa 9:6 of the Messianic period, Jer 20:8); and the figure of the designation of God as "Ref.," occurring esp. in the address to God in the Psalm (Ps 23:1). "Mighty One," "Most High," "Omnipotent" are the names with which the Divine nature operates. See also the name El Bes, "Living God," which God bears over against the ailments of man (Ex 15:25; Ps 22:16; Jer 23:36; Dn 6:20; 26). An anthropomorphic description of the power of God is in the figure of his "hand," "his arm," his "finger." See God.

Some of the attributes of Jeh have an intimate connection with omnipotence. Under this head esp. God's nature as Spirit and His holiness come under consideration.

3. Other Modes of Expression of God as Spirit in the OT does not primarily refer to the incorporeality of the Divine nature, but to its inherent power. The physical element underlying the conception of Spirit is that of air in music. The Hebrew word at first not its visibility, but the force forms the point of comparison. The opposite of "Spirit" in this sense is "flesh," which expresses the weakness and impotence of the creature over against God (Isa 2:22; 31:3).

The holiness of God in its essence is the widest sense of restriction to the ethical sphere, designates the most specific, distinctive character of the Holy One, that which each other kind of holiness may be compared to. It is not a single attribute, but a peculiar aspect under which all the attributes can be viewed, that which renders the holy God to be distinct from all created beings. Hence the creation (1 S 2:2; Hos 11:9). In this way holiness becomes closely associated with the power of God, for the power of God is seen in the holiness of his people, and in the holiness of his name becomes synonymous with Divine power—omnipotence (Ex 16:11; Nu 20:12), and esp. in Exk, where God's "holy name" is often equivalent to his renown for power, hence interchangeable with his "great name" (Exk 36:20-24). The objective Spirit as a distinct hypostasis and the executive of the Godhead on its one side also represents the Divine power (Isa 32:15; Mk 14:28; Lk 1:36; Jn 4:14; Acts 10:38; Rom 15:10; 1 Cor 2:4).

In all these forms of expression a great and specifically Divine power is predicated of God. State-ments like Ps 46:5, "The Lord is in his holy temple. He is the King above all the gods. Who may stand in the presence of his face?" It is to him alone (Ps 50:6) that may be said, "The heavens are his throne, and the earth his footstool. Who will stand when he passes by? For he is like a fire that devours all things. His name is holy. His power is great."

4. Unlimited Extent affirmed are rare. The reason, however, lies not in any actual restriction placed on this power, but in the conception of a specific religious thing, which prevents abstract formulation of the principle. The point to be noticed is that no statement anywhere makes any exception aught from the reach of Divine power. Nearest to a general formula come such statements as nothing is "too hard for Jehovah" (Gen 18:14; Jer 32:17); or "I know that thou canst do everything," or "God . . . hath done whatever he pleased" (Ps 115:3; 136:6); or, negatively, no one can "hide" God's affairs in which the power of God is concerned (Ps 138:13) or God's hand is not "waxed short" (Nu 21:23); in the NT: "With God all things are possible" (Mt 19:26; Mk 10:27; Lk 18:27); "Nothing is impossible with God" (Rev 3:20) . "No word from God shall be void of power," (Lk 1:37). Indirectly omnipotence is the effect ascribed to faith (Mt 17:20; "Nothing shall be impossible unto you"); Mk 9:23; "All things are possible to him that believeth"), because faith puts the Divine power at the disposal of the believer. On its subject side, the principle is reciprocated and faith finds expression in Isa 40:28: God is not subject to weariness. Because God is conscious of the unlimited extent of his resources nothing is marvelous in his eyes (Zec 8:6).

It is chiefly through its forms of manifestation that the distinctive quality of the Divine power, which renders it omnipotent becomes

5. Forms of apparent. The Divine power operates not merely in single concrete acts, but is comprehensively manifested to the world by power. Both in Nature and history, in creation and in redemption, it produces and directs everything that comes to pass. Nothing in the realm of actual or conceivable things is withdrawn from it (Am 9:23; Dn 4:35); even to the minutest and most negligible causes and effect it extends and masters all details of reality (Mt 10:30; Lk 12:7). There is no accident (I S 6:9; cf. with ver 12; Prov 16:33). It need not operate through second causes; it itself underlies all second causes and makes what they are.

It is creative power producing its effects through a mere word (Gen 1:3 f.; Dt 8:3; Ps 33:9; Rom 4:17; He 1:3; 11:30). Among the prophets, esp. Isaiah emphasizes this manner of the working of the Divine power in its immediacy and suddenness (Isa 9:8; 17:13; 18:1-4; 29:5). All the processes of God's sovereign will are presented as the castration of Jeh (Job 5:9 f.; 9:5 f.; chs 38 and 41), the operation of Jehovah as the one "living God" (Isa 40:12 f.; Ps 22:16; 43:5; 5 S 27; Jer 23:36; Dn 6:20). A comprehensible instance is the creation of heaven and earth (Gen 1:1-2:4), whether the heaven is named as of illustrative this (Ps 65:7; 104:9; Isa 52:2; Jer 2:32; 33:5). The OT seldom says "it rains" (Ezr 4:7), but "the rain of the Lord." (Lev 26:4; Dt 11:17; 1 S 12:17; Job 36:27; Ps 29:29 and 65:5; Acts 14:7; Mal 4:7). The same is true of the processes of history. God sovereignly disperses, not merely of Israel, but of all other nations, even of the most powerful, e.g., the Assyrians, as His instruments for the accomplishment of His purpose (Am 1:1-3; 9:7; Isa 10:5.15; 28:2; 46:1; Jer 26:9; 27:6; 43:10).

The prophet ascribed to Jeh not merely relatively greater power than to the gods of the nations, but His power extends into the sphere of the nations, and the heathen gods are ignorant in the estimate put upon His might (Isa 31:3).

More even than the sphere of Nature and history, that of redemption reveals the Divine omnipotence, from the point of view of the supernatural and miraculous. Thus Ex 15 celebrates the power of Jehovah in the wonders of the exodus. It is God's exclusive prerogative to do wonders (Job 5:9; 9:10; Ps 72:18). All things come under the category of a "new thing" (Nu 16:30; Isa 43:19; Jer 31:22). In the NT the great emblem of this redemptive omnipotence is the resurrection of believers (Mt 22:29; Mk 12:24) and specifically the resurrection of Christ (Col 3:1; 1 Thes 4:16; 1 Cor 15:19 f.); but it is evidenced in the whole process of redemption (Mt 19:26; Mk 10:27; Rom 8:31; Eph 1:3; 1 Pet 1:5; Rev 11:17).

The signification of the idea may be traced among two distinct lines. On the one hand the Divine omnipotence appears as a support of faith. On the other hand it is productive of that specifically religious Biblical Religion state of consciousness which Scripture calls "the fear of Jehovah." Omnipotence in God is that to which human faith addresses itself. It lies in the ground for assurance that He is able to save, as in His love that He is willing to save (Ps 65:5; 78:18; 118:14-16; Eph 3:20).

As to the other aspect of its significance, the Divine omnipotence in itself, and not merely for soteriological reasons, evokes a specific religious response. This is true, not only of the OT, where the element of the fear of God stands comparatively in the foreground, but remains true also of the NT. Even in our Lord's teaching the promissive given to the fatherhood and love of God does not preclude that the transcendent majesty of the Divine nature, including omnipotence, is kept in full view and
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made a potent factor in the cultivation of the religious mind (Mt 6:1). The beauty of Jesus' teaching on the nature of God consists in this, that He knows all things, in every place and at every time, and His loving condescension toward the creature in perfect equilibrium and makes them mutually frustrated by each other. Religion is more than the inclusion of God in the general altruistic movement of the human mind; it is a devotion at every point colored by the consciousness of that Divine omnipresence in which God's omnipresence occupies a foremost place.

LITERATURE.—Oehler, Theologie des AT 31, 159 ff.; Richter, alttestamentl. Theologie, 477 ff.; DiYEGT, Handbuch der alttestamentlichen Theologie, 244; Davidson, OT Theology, 48 ff. For the relation of the OT to the NT, see Deissmor, Die alttestamentlichen Religion, 127, 135 ff, 391, 475.

GEBHARD VON

OMNIPRESENCE, om-ni-pres'en-s: Neither the noun 'omnipresence' nor adj. 'omnipresent' occurs in Scripture, but the idea that God is everywhere present is throughout presupposed and sometimes explicitly formulated. God's omnipresence is closely related to His omnipotence and omniscience: that He is everywhere enables Him to act everywhere and to know all things, and, conversely, through omnipotent action and omniscient knowledge He has access to all places and all things (cf. Acts 17:27; 2 Tim 3:15; Ps 3; 49; 100; 115; Ps 20; 26; 8; 46; 3; Isa 8:18; Joel 3:16,21; Am 1:21; in the Holy Land 1:28; Hosea 9:3; in Christ John 11:1,12; 2 Cor 1:19; the Church Eph 2:20; Rom 8:11; 1 Cor 3:16; 6:19; Eph 2:21-22; 1:11; 2 Tim 3:15; Heb 10:21; 1 Pet 5:1); in the ecclesiastical assembly of His people (Rev 21:3). In the light of the same principle must be interpreted the presence of God in heaven. This also is manifestly an ontological presence, but, as a presence of specific democratic manifestation (1 K 8:10; 20:18); 2 Sam 6:12; 13ff.; 104b; 111; 18:15; 66:1; Hab 2:13; Nm 3:34; 6:9; Acts 7:45; 18:21; Eph 1:1; Heb 1:3). How little the word 'presence' is meant to imply a literal or terrestrial presence of God elsewhere may be seen from the fact that the two representations, that of God's self-manifestation in heaven and in the partial sanctuary, and that of God's self-manifestation on earth (1 K 8:26-53; Ps 20:2-6; Am 9:6). It has been alleged that the term 'presence' had a comparatively late attainment in the religion of Israel, of which in the pre-prophetic period no trace can as yet be discovered (see Stade, Bibl. Theol. des AT, 1:103, 184). There are, however, a number of passages in the Pentateuch which refer to the existence of this belief (Gen 11:1-9; 19:24; 21:17; 22:11; 25:12). JeB comes, according to this belief of the earliest period, with the clouds (Ex 14:19; 20:18; Nu 11:24-25). That even in the opinion of the people JeB's local presence in an earthly sanctuary need not have excluded Him from heaven follows also from the unhesitating belief in His simultaneous presence in a plurality of sanctuaries. This was not a question of a comparatively circumscribed presence as between sanctuary and sanctuary, it needed to have been a presence as between earth and heaven (cf. Gunsol, Gen. 157).

Both from a generally religious and from a specifically soteriological point of view the omnipresence of God is of great practical importance. 6. Religious for the religious life. In the former significance it means the guaranty that the actual nearness of a person of communion with Him may be enjoyed everywhere, even apart from the places hallowed for such purpose by a specific gracious self-manifestation (Ps 139:5-10). In the other respect the Divine omnipresence assures the believer that God is at hand.
OMNISCIENCE, om-nish·e·ns: The term does not occur in Scripture, either in its nominal or in its adjectival form.

In the OT it is expressed in connection with such words as ἔφη, de·ia·ē, ἡ·με·ρ·ē, θη·κα·θ, etc. hok·hm·ah; also "seeing" and "hearing." "the eye" and "the ear" occur as figures of knowledge of God, as "arm," "hand," "finger" to serve his power. In the NT are found ἴδ·ει·ν, γνή·δο·κεί·ν, γνώ·蕊·τα, εἰπ·εί·ν, ὁ·π divides.

Scripture everywhere teaches the absolute universality of the Divine knowledge. In the historical books, although there is no abstract formula, and occasional allusions to the omniscience of the doings of man, about the hearing of prayer, the disclosing of the future (1 S 16 7; 23 9-12; 1 K 8 39; 2 Ch 16 9). Explicit affirmation of the principle is made in the Psalter, the Prophets, the bookmahah literature, and in the NT. This is due to the increased internalizing of reality, by which its hidden side, to which the Divine omniscience corresponds, receives greater emphasis (Job 26 6; 28 24; 34 22; Ps 139 12; 147 4; Prov 16 31; 1 S 15; Isa 40 18; Acts 1 24; Rev 4 11; 12 2). This absolute universality is affirmed with reference to the various categories that comprise within themselves all that is possible or actual.

It extends to God's own being, to all as well as to what exists outside of Him, in the created world. God has perfect possession in consciousness of His own being. The unconscious finds no place in Him (Acts 15 18; 1 Jn 1 5). Next to Himself God knows nothing of its totality. His knowledge extends to small as well as to great affairs (Mt 6 8.32; 10 30); to the hidden heart and mind of man as well as to that which is open and manifest (Job 11 11; Ps 14 21; 17 6f; 33 13-15; 40 4; 51 5; Jer 17 10; Am 4 13; Lk 16 15; Acts 1 24; 1 Thess 2 4; Heb 4 13; Rev 2 23). It extends to all the divisions of time, the past, present and future alike (Job 14 17; Ps 68 15; Isa 41 22-24; 44 6-8; Jer 1 5; Hos 13 12; Mal 3 16). It embraces that which is contingent from the human viewpoint as well as that which is certain (1 S 23 9-12; Mt 11 22.23).

Scripture brings God's knowledge into connection with His omnipresence, and the clearest expression of this. Omniscience is the knowledge of that which is to be actual, is not identical with such knowledge or with the purpose on which such knowledge rests, for in God, as well as in man, the intellect and the will are distinct faculties. In the last analysis, God's knowledge of the world has its source in His self-knowledge. The world is a revelation of God that is actual or possible in it therefore is a reflection in created form of what exists uncreated in God, and thus the knowledge of the one becomes a reproduction of the knowledge of the other (Acts 17 27; Rom 1 20).

The Divine knowledge of the world also partakes of the quality of the Divine self-knowledge in that respect, that it is never dormant. God does not depend for embracing the multitude and complexity of the existing world on such mental processes as abstraction and generalization.

The Bible nowhere represents Him as attaining to knowledge by reasoning, but everywhere as simply knowing. From what has been said about the immanent sources of the Divine knowledge, it follows that the latter is not a posteriori derived from its objects, as all human knowledge based on experience is, but is exercised without receptivity or dependence. In knowing, as well as in all other activities of His nature, God is sovereign and self-sufficient. The act of knowing is not a process of He needs not wait upon the things, but draws His knowledge directly from the basis of reality as it lies in Himself. While the two are thus closely connected it is nevertheless of importance to distinguish between God's knowledge of Himself and God's knowledge of the world, and also between His knowledge of the actual and His knowledge of the possible. These distinctions mark off the theistic conception of omniscience from the pantheistic idea regarding God. God is not bound to His life with the world in such a sense as to have no scope of activity beyond it.

Since Scripture includes in the objects of the Divine knowledge also the issue of the exercise of freewill on the part of man, the problem arises, how the contingent character of such decisions and the certainty of the Divine knowledge can coexist. It is true that the knowledge of God is perfect and the possibility and actuality are distinct, and that not the former but the latter determines the certainty of the outcome. Consequently the Divine omniscience in such cases adds or detracts nothing in regard to the certainty of the Divine purpose (Isa 44 6; Isa 51 15). It is impossible for God to produce but presupposes the certainty by which the problem is raised. At the same time, precisely because omniscience presupposes certainty, it appears to exclude every conception of contingency in the free acts of man, such as would render the latter in their very essence undetermined. The knowledge of the issue must have a fixed point of certainty to terminate upon, if it is to be knowledge at all. These who make the essence of freedom an absolute index of the purpose must, therefore, except in this class of events from the scope of the Divine omniscience. But this is contrary to all the testimony of Scripture, which distinctly makes God's absolute knowledge extend to such acts (Acts 2 23).

It has been attempted to construe a peculiar form of the Divine knowledge, which would relate to this class of acts specifically, the so-called scientia media, to be distinguished from the scientia necessaria, which has for its object God Himself, and the scientia libera which terminates upon the certainties of the world, outside of God's absolute knowledge.

This scientia media would then be based on God's foresight of the outcome of the free choice of man. It would involve a knowledge of receptivity, a contribution to the sum total of what God
knows derived from observation on His part of the world-process. That is to say, it would be knowledge a posteriori in essence, although not in point of fact. It is, however, difficult to see how divine knowledge can be possible in God, when the outcome is psychologically undetermined and indeterminate. The knowledge could originate no sooner than the determination originates through the free decision of man. It would, therefore, necessarily become an a posteriori knowledge in time as well as in essence. The appeal to God's eternity as bringing Him equally near to the future as to the present and enabling Him to see the future decisions of man's free will as though they were present cannot remove this difficulty, for when once the observation and knowledge of God are made dependent on any temporal issue, the Divine eternity itself is thereby virtually denied. Nothing remains but to recognize that God's eternal knowledge of the outcome of the free will choices of man implies that there enters into these choices, notwithstanding their free character, an element of predetermination, to which the knowledge of God can attach itself.

The Divine omniscience is most important for the religious life. The very essence of religion as communion with God depends on His 6. Religious all-comprehensive cognizance of the Importance of man at every moment. Hence it is characteristic of the religions to deny the omniscience of God (Ps 10 11.12; 94 7–9; Isa 29 15; Jer 23 23; Ezk 8 12; 9 9). Esp. among the three lines this fundamental religious importance reveals itself: (a) it lends support and comfort when the pious suffer from the misunderstanding and misrepresentation of men; (b) it acts as a deterrent to those tempted by sin, esp. secret sin, and becomes a judging principle to all hypocrisy and false security; (c) it furnishes the source from which man's desire for self-knowledge can obtain satisfaction (Ps 19 12; 51 6; 139 23.24).

LITERATURE—Oehler, Theologie des AT; 876; Riehm, Alttestamentliche Theologie, 263; Dillmann, Handbuch der alltestamentlichen Theologie, 249; Davidson, OT Theology, 180 ff.

GEERHARDUS VOS

OMRI, omri ("Omri", Omri; LXX "Aµpµ; Ambrí; Assyř "Humri" and "Humria"):

1. The 6th king of Northern Israel, and founder of the 11th Dynasty which reigned for nearly 50 years. Omri reigned 12 years, c 857–876 BC. The historical sources of his reign are contained in 1 K 16:16–29; 2 K 9:1–11; 2 Chr 16:1. Vos, A. S. Assyriological, Assyria, and its Dependencies, in the published accounts of recent excavations in Samaria. In spite of the brief passage given to Omri in the OT, he was one of the most important of the military kings of Northern Israel.

O. is first mention as an officer in the army of Elah, which was engaged in the siege of the Philii town of Gibbethon. While O. was thus engaged, Zimri, another officer of Elah's army, conspired against the king, whom he assassinated in a drunken debauch, exterminating at the same time the remnant of the house of Baasha. The conspiracy evidently lacked the support of the people, for the report that Zimri had usurped the throne no sooner reached the army at Gibbethon, than the people proclaimed O., the more powerful military leader, king over Israel. O. lost not a moment, but leaving Gibbethon in the hands of the Philis, he marched to Tirzah, which he besieged and captured, while Zimri perished in the flames of the palace to which he had set fire with his own hands (1 K 16:1–18). O., however, had still another opponent in Tibni the son of Ginath, who laid claim to the throne, and who was supported in his claims by his brother Joram (1 K 16:22 LXX) and by a large number of the people. Civil war followed this rivalry for the throne, which seems to have lasted for a period of 29 years. It is, however, difficult to date accurately how many years elapsed, because we have only the Biblical record as a basis for our observations. By an easy conquest of Tirzah, the former capital. Accordingly, he purchased the hill Shomeron of Shemer for two talents of silver, about $3,500.00 in American money. The conical hill, which rose from the surrounding plain to the height of 400 ft., and on the top of which there was room for a large city, was capable of easy defense.

The superior strategic importance of Samaria is evidenced by the sieges it endured repeatedly by the Assyrians and Babylonians.

2. The palace was finally taken by Sargon in 722.

Founding of Samaria That the Northern Kingdom endured as long as it did was due largely to the strength of its capital. With the fall of Samaria, the nation fell.

Palace of Omri and Abab at Samaria.

Recent excavations in Samaria under the direction of Harvard University throw new light upon the ancient capital of Israel. The first results were the uncovering of massive foundation walls of a large building, including a stairway 80 ft. wide. This building, which is Rom in architecture, is supposed to have been a temple, the work of Herod. Under this Rom building was recovered a part of a massive Heb structure, believed to be the palace of O. and Abab. During the year 1910 the explorations revealed a building covering 14 acres of ground. Four periods of construction were recognized, which, on archaeological grounds, were tentatively assigned to the reigns of O., Ahab, Jehu, and Joash. See Samaria and articles by David G. Lyon in Harvard Theological Review, IV, 1911; JBL, V, xxx, Part I, 1911; PEPIS, 1911, 79–83.

Concerning O.'s foreign policy the OT is silent beyond a single hint contained in 1 K 20:34.

Here we learn that he had to bow before the stronger power of Syria. It is probable that Ben-hadad 1 besieged Samaria shortly after it was built, for he forced O. to make "streets" in the city for the Syrians. It is probable, too, that at this time Ramoth-gilead was lost to the Syrians. Evidently O. was weakened in his foreign policy at the beginning of his reign by the civil conflict engendered by his accession. However, he showed strength of character in his dealings with foreign powers. At least he regained control over the northern part of his territory as we learn from the M S. Lines 4–8 tell us that "Omri was king of Israel and afflicted Moab many days because Chemosh was angry with his land; . . . Omri obtained possession of the land of Medebah and dwelt therein during his days and half the days of his son, forty years." O. was the first king of Israel to pay tribute to the Assyrians under their king Asurnasirpal III.
in 876 BC. From the days of Shalmaneser II (860 BC) down to the time of Sargon (722 BC), Northern Israel was known to the Assyrians as "the land of the house of Omri." On Shalmaneser's black obelisk, Jehu, who overthrew the dynasty of O., is called "J'ba aabat 'huwmri," "Jehu son of Omri.", by the marriage of his son Ahaz to Jezebel, daughter of Ethbaal, king of the Sidonians. This may have been done as protection against the powers from the East, and as such would have seemed to be a wise political move, but it was one fraught with evil for Israel.

Although O. laid the foundation of a strong kingdom, he failed to impart to it the vitalizing and rejuvenating force of a healthy spiritual religion. The testimony of

4. His Religious Influence and Death

and Death coupled with the reference to "the statutes of Omri" in Mic 6 16, indicates that he may have had a share in substituting foreign religions for the worship of Jehovah, and therefore, he may have had a part in the downfall of the house of Omri. Upon his death, O. was succeeded upon the throne by his son Ahab, to whom was left the task of shaking off the Syrian yoke, and who went beyond his father in making the Phoenican influence more prevalent in Israel, thus leading the nation into the paths that hastened its downfall.

(2) A Benjamite, son of Becher (1 Ch 7 8).
(3) A Judahite, descendant of Perez, who lived at Jerus (1 Ch 9 4).
(4) A prince of Issachar in the time of David (1 Ch 27 18).

On, on (Tn, 'on; Egy. An, 'Ant, 'Annâ, probably pronounced Ân only, as this is often all that is written, a "stone" or "stone pillars"); Later called Heliopolis. The name On occurs only in Gen 41 45; 46 20. It occurs in one other place in Ex X (Ex X 11), where On is mentioned with Pithom and Raamses as strong cities which the Israelites built. Heb slaves may have worked upon fortifications here, but certainly did not build the city. On is possibly referred to as ышXJ, in Isa 19 18 (see R-TH-HEBRAICS). On may also be mentioned by Jeremiah (43 13) under the name Beth-shemesh. Ezekiel speaks of an Ave (ышXJ, 'âven) (Ezk 30 17), where it is mentioned with Besebas (Bubastis). Avein this passage is almost certainly the same as On in Gen 41 45; 46 20, as the letters of both words are the same in the Heb. Only the placing of the vowel-points makes any difference. If there is a mistake, it is a mistake of the Massoretes, not of the Heb writer.

There were two Ons in Egypt: one in Upper Egypt, An-resh (Herresh); the other in Lower Egypt, An-Mcheet (Brugsch, Geogr. Egypt, AN-CHET). The latter is the On referred to in the Bible. It lay about 20 miles N. of the site of old Memphis, about 10 miles N.W. of the location of modern Cairo. It has left until this time about 4 sq. miles of ruins within the old walls. Little or nothing remains outside the walls.

On was built at the edge of the desert, which has now retroflected some 3 or 4 miles eastward, the result of the rising of the bed of the Nile by sediment from the inundation, and the broadening of the area of infiltration which now carries the water of the Nile that much to the E. The land around On has risen about 10 ft., and the waters of infiltration at the time of lowest Nile are now about 1½ ft. above the floor-level of the temple.

The history of On is very obscure, yet its very great importance is in no doubt. No clear description of the ancient city or sanctuary has come down to us, but there are so many incidental references, and so much is implied in ancient records, that it stands out as of the very first importance, both as capital and sanctuary. The city comes from the 1st Dynasty, when it was the seat of government, and indeed must have been founded by the 1st Dynasty or have come down to it from prehistoric time. From the 11th to the 8th Dynasty the seat of government was shifted from On to Memphis, and in the XIIth Dynasty to Dendopolis. Throughout these changes On retained its religious importance. It had been the great sanctuary in the time of the Pyramid Texts, the oldest religious texts of Egypt, and judging from the evident great development of the temple of On at the time of the writing of the texts, the city must have anticipated them by considerable time (Budge, Hist of Egypt, II, 83, 84, 108; Breasted, Development of Religion and Thought in Egypt, chs i, ii). The myth of Osiris makes even the charge against Set for the murder of Osiris to have been preferred at Heliopolis (Breasted, op. cit., 34). This certainly implies a very great age for the sanctuary at On. It contained a temple of the sun under the name Ra, the sun, and also Atum, the setting sun, or the sun of the Underworld. There was also a Phoenix Hall and a sacred object called a ben, probably a stone, and the origin of the name An, a "stone" or "pillar" (cf Breasted, op. cit., 76, 11, and 71). Though the XIIth Dynasty removed the capital to Dendopolis, Usertsen I (Sneferu) of that Dynasty erected a great obelisk at On in front of the entrance to the temple. The situation of this obelisk in the temple area indicates that the great temple was already more than a half-mile in length as early as the XIIth Dynasty. The mate of this obelisk on the opposite side of the entrance seems not to have been
erected until the XVIIIth Dynasty. Its foundations were discovered in 1912 by Petrie. Some scraps of the granite of the obelisk bear inscriptions of Thothmes III. A great Hyksos wall, also discovered by Petrie in 1912, exactly similar to that of the fortified camp at Tel el Yehudiyeh, 4 miles N., makes it quite certain that these usurpers between the Old Empire and the New fortified On as the capital once more. The manifest suberviency of the priests of On in the story of Joseph makes it most probable that the old capital at On had already been subjugated in Joseph's time, and that within this old fortification still existing Joseph ruled as prime minister of Egypt. Merenptah in his 5th year began to fortify On. Sheshonk III called himself "divine prince of Annu," and seems to have made On one of the greatest sanctuaries of his long reign. On still figured in Egypt history in the rebellion against Ashurbanipal. The city has been deserted since the Pers invasion of 525 BC. Tradition makes the dwelling-place of Joseph and Mary with the child Jesus, while in Egypt, to have been near Heliopolis.

The exploration of On was attempted by Schiaparelli, but was not carried out, and his work has not been published. In 1912 Petrie began a systematic work of excavation which, it is expected, will continue until the whole city has been examined. The only great discovery of the first season was the Hyksos wall of fortification. Its full import can only be determined by the continuance of the exploration.

M. G. Kyle

ON (חנ, ḥn; Αν, Ανώ): A Reubenite, son of Peleth, who took part with Dathan and Abiram in their revolt against Moses (Nu 16 1).

ONAM, 6 nam (חנ, ḥnam, "vigorous"); cf ONAN:

1. "Son" of Shobal "son" of Seir the Horite (Gen 36 23; 1 Ch 1 40).

2. "Son" of Jerahmeel by Atarah; perhaps the name is connected with Onan son of Judah (1 Ch 2 26 28).

ONAN, 6 nam (חנ, ḥnam, "vigorous"); cf ONAN: A "son" of Judah (Gen 38 4 8-10; 46 12; Nu 26 19; 1 Ch 2 3). The story of the untimely death of Onan implies that two of the ancient clans of Judah early disappeared" (Curtis, Chron, 84). See Skinner, Gen 45, where it is pointed out that in Gen 38 11 Judah plainly attributes the death of his sons in some way to Tamar herself. The name is allied to Onam.

ONE, wun. See NUMBER.

ONESIMUS, ὁ νεισιμος (Oνησιμος, Onesimos, lit. "profitable", "helpful" [Col 4 9; Phil. ver 10]): Onesimus was a slave (Phil. ver 16).

1. With belonging to Philemon who was a Paul in wealthy citizen of Colossae, and a prominent member of the church there. O. was still a heathen when he defrauded his master and ran off from Colossae. He found his way to Rome, where evil men tended to flock as to a common center, as Tacitus tells us they did at that period. In Rome he came into contact with Paul, who was then in his own hired house, in military custody, dying.

What brought him into contact with Paul we do not know. It may have been hunger; it may have been the pangs of conscience. He could not forget that his master was the name where the Christians met in their weekly assemblies for the worship of Christ. Neither could he forget how Philemon had many a time spoken of Paul, to whom he owed his conversion. Now that O. was in Rome—what a strange coincidence—Paul also was in Rome.

The result of their meeting was that O. was converted to Christ, through the instrumentality of the apostle, and he was at once delivered to his master ("Gave place to me in your heart," Phil. ver 10). His services had been very acceptable to Paul, who would gladly have kept O. with him; but as he could not do this without the knowledge and consent of Philemon, he sent O. back to Colossae to his master there.

At the same time Paul wrote Jesus to Philemon on other matters, and he intrusted the Ep. to the Col to the joint care of 2. Paul's Tychicus and O. The apostle recom- mends O. to the brethren in Colossae, Colossae as a "faithful and beloved brother, and to whose one is of you," and he goes on to Philemon to say that Tychicus and O. will make known to them all things that have happened to Paul in Rome. Such a commendation would greatly facilitate O.'s return to Colossae.

But Paul does more. He furnishes O. with a letter written by himself to Philemon. Returning to a city where it was well known that he had been neither a Christian nor even an honest man, he needed someone to vouch for the reality of the change which had taken place in his life, and Paul does this for him both in the Ep. to the Col and in that to Philemon.

With what exquisite delicacy is O. introduced. "Receive him," says the apostle, "for he is my own very heart" (Phil. ver 12). The man whom the Colossians had only known hitherto, if they knew him at all, as a worthless runaway slave, is thus commended to them, as no more a slave but a brother, no more dishonest and faithless but trustworthy; no more an object of contempt but of "love" (Lightfoot's Comm. on Col, 335).

(1) Onesimus profitable.—The apostle accordingly begs Philemon to give O. the same reception as he would rejoice to give to himself. The past history of O. had been such as to belittle the meaning of his name. He had not been "profitable"—far from it. But already his consistent conduct in Rome and his willing service to Paul there have changed all that; he has been profitable to Paul, and he will be profitable to Philemon too.

(2) Paul guarantees.—O. had evidently stolen his master's goods before leaving Colossae, but in regard to this the apostle says that if he has defrauded Philemon in anything, he has become his surety. Philemon can regard Paul's handwriting as a bond guaranteeing payment: "Put that to mine account," are his words, "I will repay it." Had Philemon not been a Christian, and had Paul not written this most beautiful letter, O. might well have been afraid to return. In the Roman empire slaves were constantly crucified for smaller offences than those of which he had been guilty. A thief and a runaway had nothing but torture or death to expect.

(3) The change which Christ makes.—But now under the sway of Christ all is changed. The master who has been defrauded now owns allegiance to Jesus. The letter, which is delivered to him by his slave, is written by a bound "prisoner of Jesus Christ." The slave too is now a brother in Christ, beloved by Paul: surely he will be beloved by Philemon also. Then Paul intimates that he hopes soon to be set free, and then he will come and visit them in Colossae. Will Philemon receive him into his house as his guest?

(4) The result.—It cannot be imagined that this appeal in behalf of O. was in vain. Philemon would do more than Paul asked; and on the apostle's visit to Colossae he would find the warmest welcome, both from Philemon and from Onesimus.

John Rutherford
ONESIPHORUS, δ'ησ'ήφος ('Ονησιφόρος, Onēsipōros, lit. "profit bringer" [2 Tim 1:6; 5:19]): Onesiphorus was a friend of the apostle Paul, who mentions him twice when writing to Timothy. He was the former of the two passages where his name occurs, his conduct is contrasted with that of Phygellus and Hermogenes and others—all of whom, like O. himself, were of the province of Asia—from whom Paul might well have expected to receive sympathy and help. These persons had “turned away” from him. O. acted in a different way, for “he oft refreshed me, and was not ashamed of my chain; but, when he was in Rome, he sought me diligently, and found me.”

O. was one of the Christians of the church in Ephesus; and the second passage, where his name is found, merely sends a message of greeting from Paul, which Timothy in Ephesus is requested to deliver to “the household of O.” (AV).

O. then had come from Ephesus to Rome. It was to Paul that the church at Ephesus owed its origin, and it was to him therefore that Rome O. gratefully remembered these facts. But Paul in his arrival arrived in Rome, and learned that Paul was in prison, “he very diligently” sought for the apostle. But to do this, though it was only his duty, involved much personal danger at that particular time. For the persecution, inaugurated by Nero against the Christians, had raged bitterly; its fury was not yet abated, and this made the profession of the Christian name a matter which involved very great risk of persecution and of death.

Paul was not the man to think lightly of what his Ephesian friend had done. He remembered too, “in how many things he ministered at Ephesus.” And, writing to Timothy, he reminded him that O.’s kindly ministrations at Ephesus were already well known to him, from his residence in Ephesus, and from his position, as minister of the church there. It should be observed that the ministration of O. at Ephesus was not, as AV gives it, “to me,” that is, to Paul himself. “To me” is omitted in RV. What O. had done there was a wide Christian ministration of kindness; it embraced many things which were too well known—for such is the force of the word—to Timothy to require repetition.

The visits which O. paid to Paul in his Roman prison were intensely “refreshing.” And it was not once or twice that he thus visited the chained prisoner, but he did so oftentimes.

Though O. had come to Rome, his household had remained in Ephesus; and a last salutation is sent to them by Paul. He could not write again, as he was nowready to be offered, to the Lord in that day. It is not clear whether O. was living, or whether he had died, before Paul wrote this ep. Different opinions have been held on the subject.

The way in which Paul refers twice to “the household” (RV “house”) of Onesiphorus, makes it possible that O. himself had died. If this is so—but certainty is impossible—the apostle’s words in regard to him would be a pious wish, which has nothing in common with the abuses which have gathered round the subject of prayers for the dead, a practice which has no foundation in Scripture.

John Rutherford

ONIARES, δ’ηναρές, δ’ηναρέα: 1 Mac 12:19 AV = RV Areus (Q.v.).

ONIAS, δ’ηνας (Onias, Oinas): There were 3 high priests of the name of Onias, and a 4th Onias who did not become a high priest but was known as the builder of the temple of Leontopolis (Jos, Ant, XIII, iii, 5). Only two versions of the name are mentioned in the Apoc—Onias I and Onias III.

(1) Onias I, according to Jos (Ant, XI, viii, 7), the son of Jaddua and father of Simon the Just (ib, XII, ii, 5; Sir 50), and, according to 1 Mac 12 7-20, a contemporary of Areus (Arius), king of Sparta, who reigned 309-265 BC (Diod. xx.29). This Onias was the recipient of a friendly letter from Areus of Sparta (1 Mac 12 7; see MSS readings here, and 12 20). Jos (Ant, XII, iv, 10) represents this letter as written to Onias III, which is an error, for only two Areus are known, and Areus II reigned about 255 BC and died a child of 8 years (Paus. iii.6.6). The letter—it genuine—exists in two copies (Jos, Ant, XII, iv, 10, and 1 Mac 12 20 f) (see Schürer, History of the Jewish People, 4th ed., I, 182 and 237).

(2) Onias III, son of Simon II (Jos, Ant, XII, iv, 10), whom he succeeded, and a contemporary of Seleucus IV and Antiochus Epiphanes (2 Mac 1:1-4 7). O. was the son of Onias II. He had been sent to Rome for his godliness and zeal for the law, yet was on such friendly terms with the Seleucids that Seleucus IV Philopator defrayed the cost of the “services of the sacrifices.” He quarreled with Simon the Benjamite, guardian of the temple, about the temple buildings (Greek edifice). Being unable to get the better of Onias and thirsting for revenge, Simon went to Apollonius, governor of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia, and informed him of the “untold sums of money” lodged in the treasury of the temple. The governor told the king, and Seleucus dispatched his chancellor, Heliodorus, to remove the money. Onias remonstrated in vain, pleading for the “deposits of widows and orphans.” Heliodorus persisted in the object of his mission. The high priest and the people were in the greatest distress. But when Heliodorus had already entered the temple, “the Sovereign of spirits, and of all authority caused a great apparition,” a horse with a terrible rider accompanied by two strong men who scourged and wounded Heliodorus. At the intercession of Onias, his life was spared. Heliodorus advised the king to send on the same errand any enemy or conspirator whom he wished punished. Simon then slandered Onias, and the jealousy having caused bloodshed between their followers, Onias decided to repair in person to the king to intercede for his country. Apparently before a decision was given, Seleucus was assassinated and Epiphanes succeeded (175 BC). Jason, the brother of Onias, having offered the king larger revenues, secured the priesthood, which he held until he himself was similarly supplanted by Menelaus, Simon’s brother (2 Mac 4:23; Jos, Ant, XII, v, 1, says Jason’s brother). Menelaus, having stolen golden vessels belonging to the temple to meet his promises made to the king, was sharply reproved by Onias. Menelaus took revenge by persecuting Andronicus, the king’s deputy, to entice Onias by false promises of friendship from his sanctuary at Duphne and by treacherously slaying him—an act which caused indignation among both the Jews and the Greeks (2 Mac 4 34 ff). Jos (Ant, XII, v, 1) says that “on the death of Onias the high priest, Antiochus gave the high-priesthood to his brother Jesus [Jason],” but the account of 2 Mac given
ONIONS, 
un-yun ('οινά, b'q'ditan, kró'menos), one of the delicacies of Egypt for which the children of Israel pined in the wilderness (Nu 11 5). The onion, allium cepa (N.O. Liliaceae), is known of Him only consciously cultivated all over Syria and Egypt; it appears to be as much a favorite in the Orient today as ever.

ONLY BEGOTTEN, ὃνλίᾳ βεγητὸν (μονογενῆς, monogenēs). Although the Eng. words are found only in the NT, the Gr word appears 9 times, and often in the LXX. It is used literally of an only child: "the only son of his mother" (Lk 7 12); "an only daughter" (8 42); "one only child" (9 38); "Isaac . . . his only begotten" (He 11 17). In all other places in the NT it refers to Jesus Christ as "the only begotten Son of God" (Jn 1 14 18; 3 16 18; 1 Jn 4 9). In these passages, too, it might be tē as "the only son of God"; for the emphasis seems to be on His uniqueness, rather than on His sonship, though both ideas are certainly present. He is the son of God in a sense in which no others are. "Monogenēs describes the absolutely unique relation of the Son to the Father in His Divine nature; it describes the relation of the Risen Christ in His glorified humanity to man" (Westcott in Heb 1 6). Christ's uniqueness as it appears in the above passages consists of two things: (a) He reveals the Father: "No man hath seen God at any time; but the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him" (Jn 1 18). Men therefore behold His glory, "glory of the only begotten from the Father" (1 14). (b) He is the mediator of salvation: God hath sent His only begotten Son into the world that we might live through him" (1 Jn 4 9; Jn 3 16); "He that believeth not [on him] hath been judged already" (Jn 3 18). Other elements in His uniqueness may be gathered from other passages, as His sinlessness, His authority to forgive sins, His unconquered companionship with the Father, and His unique knowledge of Him. To say that it is a uniqueness of nature or essence carries thought no farther, for these terms still need definition, and they can be defined only in terms of Him; His sonship is therefore a revelation of God, and esp. of His intimate union as Son with the Father (see also Begotten; Person of Christ; Son of God).

The reading "God only begotten" in Jn 1 18 RVm, though it has strong textual support, is improbable, and can well be explained as due to orthodox zeal, in opposition to adoptionism. See Grimm-Thayer, Lexicon; Westcott, ad loc.

ONO, ò'ños (Onos), ò'ños. See Oinoch."}

ONYX, ò'niks, ò'niks. See Stones, Precious.

OPEN, ò'p'n: In the OT represents chiefly ἀνοίγω, pathēhath, but also other words, as ὑπάρξειν, ἄνοιγμα, "to uncover"; of the opening of the eyes in vision, etc (thus Balsam, Nu 22 31; 24 4; cf Job 33 16; 36 10; Ps 119 18; Jer 32 11 14). In the NT the usual term is ἀνοίγω, ἀνοίγμα (of operator of mouth, eyes, heavens, doors, etc). A peculiar word, ἀνοίχθω, ἀνοίχθων (lit. to have the neck bent, to be laid bare), is used for "laid open" before God in He 4 13.

OPEN PLACE: (1) The "open place" of Gen 38 14 AV, in which Tamar sat, has come from a misunderstanding of the Heb, the translators having taken b'vephērēn ἀνοίγειν to mean "in an opening publicly," instead of "in an opening [i.e. a gate] of Enaim" (cf Prov 1 21 in the Heb). RV has corrected; see Enaim. (2) In 1 K 22 10 [2 Ch 18 9 RV relates that Ahab and Jehoshaphat sat each on his throne, arrayed in their robes, in an open place [in "Heb a threshing-floor," AV "a void place"] at the entrance of the gate of Samaria." The Heb here is awkward, and neither the LXX nor the Syr seems to have read the present text in 1 K 22 10, the former having "in arms," at the gate of the son of Hatturim, and the latter "in all colored garments." Consequently various attempts have been made to emend the text, of which the simplest is the omission of b'shērēn, "in an open place." If, however, the text is right—as is not impossible—the operator of the threshing-floor close to the gate. See the commentaries.

BURLTON SCOTT EASTON

OPERATION, op-ér-a'shun (-appointed, ma'āsaleh, "work"); ἐνέργεια, energēia, ἐνέργεια, ἐνέργεια, "energy"); Twice used in the OT of God's creative work (Ps 28 4; Isa 5 12). The Holy Spirit's inscribing and power are manifest in the bestowment of spiritual gifts on individuals and on the church (1 Cor 12 6 AV), and in the resurrection of Jesus Christ, through which energy or operation of God those dead in sins are, through faith, raised to newness of life (Col 2 12 AV).

OPHEL, ò'fel (appointed, ha'-ophel [2 Ch 27 3; 33 14; Neh 3 6; 11 21]; and without article, Isa 32 14 and Mic 4 8; also 2 K 5 24): There has been considerable divergence of opinion with regard to the meaning of this word, and all the references given above with the art., also "onyx," laished RV has simply "Opel," but RV in "the tower"; in Isa 32 14, "the hill" with m. "Opel," but AV "the forte in the Mic 4 8; also 2 K 5 24). 1. Meaning of Name

ONYCHA, on-k'ka (appointed, skh'eloth; of Arab. ò'nsk'hal, "filings," "husks"): "Onycha" is a transmutation of the LXX ὀνχα, onoucha, acc. of ὀνος, onux, which means "nail," "hoof," and also "onyx," of Semitic origin. The form "onycha" was perhaps chosen to avoid confusion with "onyx," the stone. The Heb skh'eloth occurs only in Ex 30 34 as an ingredient of the sacred incense. It is supposed to denote the horned operculum found in certain species of naticid molluscs. The operculum is a disk attached to the upper side of the hinder part of the "foot" of the mollusc. When the animal draws itself into its shell, the hinder part of the foot comes last, and the operculum seals the breach of the shell, a portion of which may be horned or stony, is absent in some species. The horned opercula when burned emit a peculiar odor, and are still used in combination with other perfumes by the Arab women of Upper Egypt and Nubia. (See Sir S. Baker, The Nile Tribes of Abyssinia, cited by EB, s.v. "Onycha.")

ONYS, ò'ños. See Stones, Precious.
m "Heb Ophel," but AV "the tower," m "secret place." It is true that "tower" occurs in other occurrences, but the word in Gen 10:11, "Zevun, 'ophir", is in order of the sons of Joktan (Gen 10:29). Ophir is the name of a land or city somewhere to the S. or S.E. of Pal for which Solomon's ships are said to have found out from Ezion-geber at the head of the Gulf of Akabah, returning with great stores of gold, precious stones and "almug"-wood (1 K 9:28; 10:11; 2 Ch 9:10; 1 K 22:48; 2 Ch 8:18). We get a fuller list of the wares and also the time taken by the voyage if we assume that the same vessels were referred to in 1 K 10:22, "Once every three years came the navy of Tarshish, bringing gold, and silver, ivory, and apes, and peacocks." The other products may not have been native to the land of Ophir, but it is certain that the gold at least was produced there. This gold was proverbial for its purity, as is witnessed by many references in the OT (Ps 45:9; Job 28:16; Isa 13:12; 1 Ch 29:4), and, in Job 22:24, Ophir is used for fine gold itself. In fact, the above list of Ophir's wares has been subjected to much discussion, in some cases the name occurs also in two passages under the form "Uphaz" (Jer 10:9; Dn 10:5).

At all times the geographical position of Ophir has been a subject of dispute, the claims of three different regions being principally geographical. The name is a Persian term meaning "far east," and the Arabic word for "sandal-wood." Ophir was the name of a region of the Arabian coast, and the mention of "sandal-wood" is suggestive of it being a sandal-wood producing district. The term "Ophir" is also used for a district of the Arabian coast which is not specified. The word is sometimes used as a proper noun, and in that case it is associated with "Punt," a country in the desert between the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean. This country was a source of ivory, gold, and other precious metals and stones. The word "Ophir" is also used to refer to the city of Ophir, which was the capital of the kingdom of Ophir. The city was a center of commerce and was known for its wealth. The word "Ophir" is also used to refer to the mountain of Ophir, which was the location of the temple of Solomon. The temple was built on the mountain of Ophir and was considered to be a place of great importance. The word "Ophir" is also used to refer to the river Ophir, which was a river that flowed through the land of Ophir. The river was considered to be a source of gold and other precious metals and stones. The word "Ophir" is also used to refer to the city of Ophir, which was the capital of the kingdom of Ophir. The city was a center of commerce and was known for its wealth.
ably brought there from more distant lands, and thence conveyed by Solomon's merchants to Ezion-geber. If the duration of the voyage (3 years) be used as evidence, it favors this location of Ophir as much as that on the east coast of Africa. It seems therefore the least assumable view that Ophir was on the Persian Gulf in Southwest ern Arabia and served in old time as an emporium of trade between the East and West.

A. S. FULTON

OPHNI, of n (02677, hā-ophnî, Ḥaphni, Ḥaphnî): A place in the territory of Benjamin (Josh 18:24). The Orbs is here called Shechemah, and without marauding bands, one easternward, down the valley of Sheboim toward the wilderness; the third "turned out the way that leadeth to Ophrah, unto the land of Shual. This road must have run northward, as Jeh, who commanded the passage to the S. Onom places it 5 Rom miles E. of Bethel. A site which comes near to fulfilling these conditions is et-Taiyebeh, which stands on a conical hill some 5 miles N.E. of Beita. This is possibly identical with "Ephron" (2 Ch 13:19), and "Ephraim" (Jn 11:54).

(A city in the tribal lot of Manasseh W. of Jordan. It is mentioned only in connection with Gideon, whose native place it was, and with his son Abimelech (Jgs 6:11, etc.). It was, indeed, family property, belonging to Joash the Abiezrite, the father of Gideon. It was apparently not far from the plain of Esdraelon (vs 33 f), so that Gideon and his kinsmen understood under the near presence of the oppressing Midianites Manasseh, of course, as bordering on the southern edge of the plain, was in close touch with the invaders. At Ophrah, Gideon reared his altar to Jah, and made thorough cleansing of the instruments of idolatry. After his great victory, he set up here the golden glob made from the spoils of the enemy, which proved a snare to himself and to his house (8:27). Here he was finally laid to rest. It was at Ophrah that Abimelech, aspiring to the kingdom, put to death upon one stone three score and ten of his brethren, as possible rivals, Jotham alone escaping alive (9:5). Apparently the mother of Abimelech belonged to Shechem; this established a relationship with that town, his connection with which does not therefore mean that Ophrah was his native place. A quite satisfactory identification has yet been suggested. Conder (PEFS, 1876, 197) quotes the Samaritan Chronicle as identifying Ferata, which is 6 miles W. of Nablus, with an ancient Ophra, "and the one that suggests itself as most probably identical is Ophrah of the Abiezrite." But this seems too far to the S.

(3) A man of the tribe of Judah, son of Me monothai (1 Ch 4:14).

W. EWING

OPINION, of pain (27, dê, דֵּין, g'rîppim): "Opinion" occurs only 5 times in Job (32:6, 10, 17) as the tr of dê, "knowledge," "opinion" (in the address of Elihu), and once of g'rîppim, from gâ'aph, "to divide or branch out," hence division or party, unsettled opinion (in the memorable appeal of Elijâh, "How long halt ye between two opinions?"

1 K 18:21, ARV "How long go ye limping between the two sides?"). In Ecclus 3:24, we have, "For many are deceived by their own vain opinion" (hapusôsis, "a taking up," "a hasty judgment"), RV "The conceit of many hath led them astray."

W. L. WALKER

OPOBALSAMUM, op-o-bal-sa-mum: RVm in Ex 30:34. See Stacte.

OPPRESSION, o-presh'un: Used in AV to translate a variety of Heb words, all of which, however, agree in the general sense of wrong done by violence or force, in either case, the who are wronged is to the oppression of Israel by foreigners, as by their Egypt masters (Ex 3:9; Dt 26:7), or by Syria (2 K 13:4), or by an unmentioned nation (Isa 30:20 AVm). In all these cases the Heb original is פָּדָה, lâhâq. But in the vast number of cases the reference is to social oppression of one kind or another within Israel's own body. It is frequently the theme of psalmist and prophet and wise man. The poor and weak must have suffered greatly at the hands of the stronger and more fortunate. The word lâhâq, various forms of the וַפַּדְתַּה, ăshâk, and other words are used by the writers and prophets to express the sorrow and indignation over the wrongs of their afflicted brethren. In his own sorrow, Job remembers the suffering of the oppressed (Job 35:9; 36:15); it is a frequent subject of song in the Ps (Ps 12:5; 46:2; 45:2; 44; 65:5; 119:134); the preacher observes and reflects upon its prevalence (Eccl 4:1; 5:8; 7:17 AV); the prophets Amos (3:9), Isaiah (5:7; 59:13), Jeremiah (6:6; 22:17) and Ezekiel (22:7,29) thundered against it. It was exercised toward strangers and also toward the Israelites themselves, and was never wholly overcome. In Jas 2:2, "oppress" is the rendering of ἀπατοῦσατε, ἀπατοῦσατε, "to exercise harsh control over one," "to use one's power against one."

WILLIAM JOSEPH McGLOTHLIN

OR, or: The word is used once for either (1 S 26:10), and is still in poetic use in this sense; as in, "Without or wave or wind" (Coleridge); "Or the bakke or some bone he broketh in his southe" (Pier a Plowman [B], VII, 93; cf Merchant of Venice, III, ii, 65). It is also used with "for" for (Ps 9:18; Ecclus 19:10) and ARV substitutes in Ecclus 12:6 (cf vs 12:2); Cant 6:12; Dan 6:24.

ORACLE, or-a-k'l: (1) A Divine utterance delivered to man, usually in answer to a request for guidance. So in 2 S 16:23 for נִשְׁבַּה, dibbah ("word," as in RVm). The use in this passage seems to indicate that at an early period oracular utterances were sought from Jah by the Israelites, but the practice certainly fell into disuse at the rise of prophecy and there are no illustrations of the means employed (1 S 18:19,36-42, etc, belong rather to Divinatio [q.v.]). In RVm of such passages as Isa 13:1, "oracle" is used in the titles of certain special prophecies as a substitute for Bruchon (q.v.) (בְּרֵעֶון, massad), with considerable advantage (esp. Gen 1:22, etc., in Rom 1:1), and in temples "oracle" was used for the chamber in which the utterances were delivered (naturally a most sacred part of the structure). This usage, coupled with a mistake in Heb philology (connecting נִשְׁבַּה, dibbah, "hinder part," with נֵבְאָה, "prophet," caused RV to give the title "oracle" to the Most Holy Place of the Temple, in 1 K 5:5, etc, following the example of Aquila, Symmachus and Vulg. But the title is very unfortunate, as the Most Holy Place had nothing to do with the delivery of oracles, and RV should have corrected (cf Ps 28:2).
ORACLES, EBULLINE, sib'il-in, -lin. See Apoc- 
alyptic Literature, v.

ORATOR, or'a-tér, ORATION, or'a-shun; The word “orator” occurs twice: (1) As AV rendering of ἐκβολή, labash; only Isa 3 3, “the eloquent orator,” AVm “skilful of speech,” where RV rightly substi- 
tutes “the skilful enchanter.” The word labash is probability a mimetic word meaning “a hiss,” “a whisper,” and is used in the sense of “incantation,” “charm.” The word ἐκβολή is “skilful of incantation,” “expert in magic.” See Divina- 

tion; Enchantment. (2) As the rendering of ὁρατός, ὁράτης, the title applied to Tertullus, who appeared as the advocate of the Jewish accusers of Paul (Acts 24 1). The proceedings, as was generally the case in the provincial Rom courts, would probably be conducted in Lat, and under Rom modes of procedure, in which the parties would not be well versed; hence the need of a pro- 

fessional advocate. ὁράτης is here the equivalent of the older Gr συκόπος, “the prosecuting counsel,” as opposed to the συνδίκος, “the defendant’s advoca- 

te.”

Ordination occurs only in Acts 12 21: “Herod . . . . made an oration unto them” (ἐκβολή, ἐκβολήν ὁρατοῦ, ἐκβολήν ὁρατῆς σύκοποῦ). The vb. ἐκβολῆν, “to speak in an assembly” from διόμα, “people,” ὁμογένες, “to harangue”), is often found in classical Gr, generally in a bad sense (Lat conscionare); here only in the N.T.

D. MIALL EDWARDS

ORCHARD, or'chard; (1) ὠρχήσις, porclies, from Old Pers, “a walled-in enclosure”; ἱπατία, παραίδευσις, a word in classical Gr applied to the garden of Babylon (Diodorus Siculus xi.10) and to a game park, as in Acts 19 21. See Neh 3 15, “forests”; in “park”; Cant 4 13, “orchard,” “in- 

"paradise” (of pomegranates); Ecc 2 5, “park,” AV “orchards”; see Paradise. (2) κήπος, képos, “garden” or “orchard”: “a white thorn in an orchard” (Bar 6 71).

ORDAIN, or-dān’ ORDER, or'di-nā'shun (Lat ordinare, “to set in order,” “to arrange”; in post-Augustan Lat “to appoint to office”; from ordo, gen. ordinis, “order,” “arrangement”). In AV the vb. “to ordain” renders as many as 85 different words (11 Heb words in the OT, 21 Gr words in Apoc and the NT, and 3 Lat words in Apoc). This is due to the fact that the Eng. word has many shades of meaning (esp. as used in the text of AV was made), of which the following are the chief: (1) To set in order, arrange, prepare: “All things that we ordained festival. Turn from their office to black funeral.” —Shakespeare, Romeo and Juliet, IV, v, 84.

This meaning is now obsolete. It is found in AV of Ps 133 17; Isa 50 33; He 9 6 (in each of which case RV or mss substitute “appointed” or “set apart”); 2 Esd 17 9 (RV “appoint”); Ps 7 13 (RV “milketh”); Hab 1 12 also RV). (2) To establish, institute, bring into being: “When first this order [i.e. the Garter] was ordained, my Lord [Shakespeare, Son in K 12 22, “i.e. ‘ordained; or ordained in the sixteenth month” (ver 33); Nu 28 6; Ps 8 3 2; Isa 26 12; 2 Esd 6 49 AV (RV “preserve”); Sir 7 15; Gal 3 19. (3) To decree, give orders, prescribe: “And doth the power that man adores Ordain their doom?” —Byron.

So Est 9 27, “The Jews ordained . . . . that they would keep these two days according to the writing thereof”: 1 Esd 6 34; 2 Esd 7 17; 8 14 AV; 2 Esd 1 6; 8 7 17 (RV “commandment”); 1 Mac 4 59; 7 49; Acts 15 4; Rom 7 10 AV; 1 Cor 7 3; 7 17; 9 14; Eph 2 10 AV. (4) To set apart for an office or duty, appoint, destine: “Being ordained his special governor” (Shakespeare). Fre- 
quent in EV. When AV has “ordain” in this sense, RV generally substitutes “appoint”; e.g. “He [Jesus] appointed [AV ‘ordained’] twelve, that they might be with him” (Mk 3 14). So 2 Ch 11 15; Jer 1 5; Dn 2 1; 1 Esd 8 49; 1 Mac 3 55; 10 20; 15 16; Acts 14 20; 1 Tim 2 7; Tit 1 5; 1 Tim 1 8; 1 8; 3 8. 3 RV substitutes “forbade” for Lk 9 2; “recorded” in Sir 48 10, “become” in Acts 1 22, “written of” (n. ‘set forth’) in Jude ver 4, but retains “ordain” in the sense of “appoint,” “set apart,” in Mk 2 5; 1 Ch 27 22; 1 Esd 8 23; Ad Est 13 6; Acts 10 42; 13 2; 17 31; Rom 13 1. (5) To appoint ceremonially to the minis- 
terial or priestly office, to confer holy orders on. This later technical or ecclesiastical sense is never found in EV. The nearest approach is (4) above, but the idea of “formal or ceremonial setting apart” to office (prominent in its modern usage) is never implied in the word.

Ordination: The act of arranging in regular order, esp. the act of investing with ministerial or succes- 
sional rank (ordo), the setting-apart for an office in the Christian ministry. The word does not occur in EV. The NT throws but little light on the origin of the later ecclesiastical rite of ordination. The 12 disciples were not set apart by any formal act on the part of Jesus. In Mk 3 14; Jn 15 16, the AV rendering “ordain” is, in view of its modern usage, misleading; nothing more is implied than an appointment or election. In Jn 20 21-23, we have indeed a symbolic act of consecration: “He breathed on them” (ἐνθάνετο, “to breathe”), “a quies act is described as one and not repeated. The gift was once for all, not to individuals but to the abid- 

ing body” (Westcott, ad loc.). In the Apostolic age there is no trace of the doctrine of an outward rite conferring inward grace, though the in- 

stances of the formal appointment or recognition of those who had already given proof of their spiritual qualification. (1) The Seven were chosen by the brethren as men already “full of the Spirit and of wisdom,” and were then "appointed by the Twelve, who prayed and laid their hands upon them (Acts 1 6). (2) The call of Barnabas and Saul came direct from God (Acts 13 2, “the work whereunto I have called them”; ver 4, they were ‘sent forth by the Holy Spirit’). Yet certain prophets and teachers were instructed by the Holy Spirit to “separate” them (i.e. publicly) for their work, which they did by fasting and praying and laying on of hands (ver 5). But it was utterly foreign to Paul’s point of view to regard the church’s act as constituting him an apostle (of Gal I 1). (3) Barnabas and Paul are said to have “ordained,” RV “appointed” (ἐκπο-

τομάσαν, cheirotonéssan, “elect,” “appoint,” without indicating the particular kind of appoint- 

ment). Elder-presbyters in every city with prayers and fasting (Acts 14 23). So Titus was in- 

structed by Paul to “appoint elders in every
city" in Cretan (Tit 1:5). (4) The gift of Timothy for evangelistic work seems to have been formally recognized in two ways: (a) by the laying on of hands of the presbytery (1 Tim 4:14), (b) by the laying on of hands of the local elders (2 Tim 4:9-15). The words "lay hands hastily on no man" (1 Tim 5:22) do not refer to an act of ordination, but probably to the restoration of the penitent.

The reference in He 6:2 is not exclusively to ordination, but to all occasions of laying on of hands (see Hands, I. Postion of). From the few instances mentioned above (the only ones found in the NT), we infer that it was regarded as advisable that persons holding high office in the church should be publicly recognized in some way, as by laying on of hands, fasting, and public prayer. But no great emphasis was laid on this rite, hence "it can hardly be likely that any essential principle was held to be involved in it." (Hort, The Christian Ecclesia, 216.) It was regarded as an outward act of approval, a symbolic offering of intercessory prayer, and an emblem of the solidarity of the Christian community, rather than an indispensable channel of grace for the work of the ministry. (For a fuller discussion of the liturgical doctrine and practice see Edin Hatch's valuable art. on "Ordination" in the Catholic Antiquity.)

D. Miall Edwards

ORDER, őrder (777, ἀραχή, "to arrange"); ὁράσω, ἀρασήν (ἀποδιασεῖν, ἄρας, ἀργυμ:); "Order" in Heb phrases may indicate (1) arrangement in rows, (2) sequence in time, (3) classification and organization, (4) likeness or manner, (5) regulation, direction or command, or (6) the declaring of a will. In many passages it is difficult if not impossible to determine from the context to which of these senses the word is used.

The fundamental idea suggested by the Heb, Gr and Eng. words is that of arrangement in rows. Thus "order" is used in the Bible of arranging wood for an altar (Lev 7:1; 1 Ken in 18:33; cf Heb Gen 22:9; Isa 30:33); Rows of laying out flux-stalks for drying (Josh 2:6); of preparing offerings (Lev 1:8-12; cf. 6:6, 7:6); of arranging lamps (Ex 27:21; 39:37; Lev 24:3-4); of Ps 139:17); of placing the swhebread on the table (Ex 40:43; Lev 6:12; 24:8; 2 Ch 13:11); of drawing up the battle array (1 Ch 12:38; Heb 39, "a CENTAUR"); and of arranging weapons in order for battle (Jer 46:3; ARV "prepare") as in Zech, "to order" in the older VSS usually has the obsolete sense "to arrange" and not the more usual Eng. meanings, "to demand" or "to direct." Thus: "In the tent of meeting shall Aaron order it" (Lev 24:4, ARV "keep in order"); "Order ye the buckler and shield" (Jer 46:3; cf Ps 119:133; Job 23:4, ARV "set in order"); Jth 2:16; Wsd 1:15; 15:1, 16:1; Eccles 2:6). The Heb pa'arn (lit. "hoof-beat, occurrence," "repetition") in the plural conveys the idea of an architectural plan (Ezk 41:6). Another word, šālahb, lit. "to join," in connection with the tabernacle, has in some VSS been tr as including the idea of orderly arrangement (Ex 26:17). The word "order" standing by itself may mean orderly or proper arrangement (1 Esd 1:10; Wsd 7:29; 1 Macc 6:40; Col 2:5). Akin to the idea of arranging things in a row is that of arranging words (Job 33:5; 37:19; Ps 5:3), of recounting things in order (Isa 44:7; Lk 1:1 AV [diatassein]; In Ps 19:14; Lk 11:40 AV [‘ ordinate]). A legal case (Job 23:4; 13:18; cf Ps 50:21). From the idea of ranging in order for the purpose of comparison the Heb ἀραχή acquires the meaning "to compare" (Isa 40:18; Ps 89:7). This is clearly the meaning of "ἐν ἀραχή διδότης" (Ps 1:5 [Heb 6:1]), where "They cannot be set in order unto thee." must be interpreted to mean "There is nothing that can be compared unto thee."

As the fundamental meaning of ἀραχή is arrangement in space, that of σόδαρ is order or sequence in time. (The LXX ἐφανε[ρών] signifies, in the place of ἀραχή, a word for "light," possibly σολο[μαί].) In the NT we find "order" used of time in connection with the resurrection of the dead (1 Cor 15:23 [katakēchē]; the phrase "in order unto" (Ps 119:35) expresses causal sequence and hence purpose.

The idea of classification is present in the Heb tākan, tr as "set in order," with reference to a collection of proverbs (Eccl 12:9). The same stem is used with reference to the fiction and arrangement of songs before the altar (Heb Eccles 47:9). The classification of priests according to their service is known from Lev 16 (cf. 1 Ch 24 3:19, Heb ἀρακά). Next to the high priests ranked priests of the second order (mishnehes, 2 K 23:4; cf 25 16; Jer 52:24). The related concept of organization is present where the Heb kūn (lit. "to establish") is used (Isa 52:37). "To the second ("to the other") (Ps 119:33; Ps 2 Ch 29:35; cf 1 Macc 16:14). A similar use of the term "order" is found in the NT in connection with the organization of the affairs of the church (1 Cor 16:1 [diatassein]; Tit 15:epiôrētēs); 1 Cor 11:2). "Order," in the sense of likeness or manner, is used in the phrase "after the order of Melchizedek" to translate the Heb al dīkērāth (or rather)

4. Likeness the archaic form al dīkērāth (Ps 110 or Manner 4), which in other passages is tr as "be- cause of" (cf Ecc 3:18; 7:14; 8:2). This well-known phrase is rendered in LXX kathē tēn ἀραξίαν, a tr adopted in He 6:6; 10:19; 7:11,17, where the passage from Ps is made the basis of an extended argument, in the course of which "order" is taken in the sense of "likeness" (He 7:16).

In the sense of regulation, we find "order" as a tr of mishnaḥ (which is lit. "the ruling of a shophēl," whether as a judicial decree or legislative actative act) in connection with the constitution of the Levitical priestly group (Lev 21:17; 2 Ch 20:16; cf Lk 1:8; 1:11). With reference to the Nazirite regulations in the story of Samson (Jgs 13:12, RV "manner"), church services (1 Cor 14:40) and, in the older Eng. VSS, with reference to other ritual matters (1 Ch 15:13; 23:31; 2 Ch 18:14, ARV "ordinance"). The phrase "al yadh, lit. "according to the hand of," tr as Ex 10:10; 1 Ch 25:29,3:6 bia in various ways, means "under the direction of," or "under the order of," as tr in the last instance. The modern sense of "command" is suggested here and in several other instances (1 Ch 8:10; 1 Macc 9:55). He "that ordereth his conversation aright" (sām derēk, Ps 60:23) is probably one who chooses the right path and directs his steps along it. "Who shall order the battle?" (1 K 20:14) is corrected in ARV: "Who shall begin the battle?" (cf Ch 13:3, Heb ṭaqar, lit. "to bind," hence "to join" or "begin"); of paradin contraining fort, tr as in the legal case (Job 23:4; 13:18; cf Ps 50:21). From the idea of ranging in order for the purpose of comparison the Heb ἀραχή acquires the meaning "to compare" (Isa 40:18; Ps 89:7). This is clearly the meaning of "ἐν ἀραχή διδότης" (Ps 1:5 [Heb 6:1]), where "They cannot be set in order unto thee."

The phrase "to set one's house in order" (Isa 38 1:2 K 20:1; 2 S 17:23), used of Hezekiah and Ahithophel, in contemplation of death, means to give final instructions to one's household or to make one's will. The Heb ἀρακά used in this phrase is found in the later Heb

Order Ornament THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA 2200
ORDB, 6\d\d, 9, "r\d\m-nte:" in common with all the Orientals, the Hebrews were very fond of wearing ornaments, and their tendency to extravagance of this kind often met with stern prophetic rebuke (Isa 3 16-24; Ezek 13 18-20). On this subject, little is said in the NT apart from James’ Lk 7 25; 12 23 and James’s (2 2) invectives against meretricious estimates of man’s character. Yet the employment of attractive attire receives sanction in the Divine example of Ezek 16 10-14.

Ornaments in general would include finely embroidered or decorated fabrics, such as the priest’s dress or the high-priestly attire, and the richly wrought veil, girdle and turban used by the wealthier class. But the term may be limited here to the various rings, bracelets and chains made of precious metals and more or less jeweled (cf Jer 2 32).

These latter, described in detail under their own particular names, may be summarized here as finger-rings, particularly prize as seal-rings (Gen 38 16-25; Jer 22 24); arm-rings or bracelets (Gen 24 22; 2 S 1 10); earrings (Gen 35 4; Ex 32 2); nose-rings (Gen 24 47; Ezek 16 12); anklets or anklet-chains (Isa 3 16,18); head-bands or fillets or curls (referred to in Isa 3 18 only), and necklaces or neck-chains (Gen 41 42; Ezek 16 11).

Figureative: The universal devotion to ornament among the Orientals is the occasion for frequent Bib. allusions to the beauty and splendor of personal jewelry and attire. But everywhere, in Divine injunctions, the emphasis of value is placed upon the beauty of holiness as an inward grace rather than on the acquisitions of outward ornament (Job
Moreover, the ospray was not numerous as were other hawks and eagles. It was a bird that lived almost wholly on fish, and these were not plentiful in the waters of Pal. This would tend to make it a marked bird, so no doubt the tr is correct as it stands, as any hawk that lived on fish would have been barred as an article of diet (see Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, 182; also Studer, *Birds of North America*, p. and pl. 16).

**Gene Stratton-Porter**

**OSSIFRAGE,** os'-fräg (ἡ ἀνὰθη; τομή; ὑπία; γέφυρα; Lat. *Ossifraga*): The great bearded vulture known as the lammer-goat (Lev 11:13; Dt 14:11 AV “gier-eagle”). The Heb name periq means “to break.” Lat. osisis, “bone,” and frangere, “to break,” indicate the most noticeable habit of the bird. It is the largest of the vulture family, being 3 ft. in length and 10 in sweep. It has a white head, black beard on the chin, and the part of the eye commonly called the “white” in most animals, which is visible in but few birds, in this family is pronounced and of a deep angry red, thus giving the bird a formidable appearance. Its head is grayish black, the feathers finely penciled, the shaft being white, the median line tawny. The under parts are tawny white and the feet and talons powerful. It differs from the vulture in that it is not a consistent carrion feeder, but prefers to take prey by the size captured of the largest eagles. It took its name from the fact that after smaller vultures and eagles had stripped a carcass to the last shred of muscle, the lammer-goat then carried the skeleton aloft and dropped it repeatedly until the marrow and the bone could be eaten. It is also very fond of totoise, the meat of which it secures in the same manner. As this bird frequents Southern Europe, it is thought to be the one that stook the bald head of Aeschylos, the poet, for a stone and let fall on it the totoise that caused his death. This bird also attacks living prey of the size of lambs, kids and hares. It is not numerous and does not flock, but pairs live in deep gorges and rocky crevices. It builds an enormous nest, deposits one pinkish or yellowish egg, and the young is black. It requires two years to develop the red eyes, finely penciled plumage and white head of the adult bird. It was included among the abominations because of its diet of carrion. **Gene Stratton-Porter**

**OSTRACA,** os'tra-ka: The word *osrocon* (“potsherd,” Heb *heres*) occurs in Joh 2:8 (LXX), *kai elaben *eprrakwa *ei *ostraka, “he took him a potsherd.” Earthen vessels were in general use in antiquity (they are twice mentioned in the NT: *sekyn *eprrakwa, seek *ostrakina [2 Cor 4:7; 2 Tim 2:20]), and the broken fragments of them, which could be picked up almost anywhere, were made to serve various purposes. Upon the smoothest of these pieces of unglazed pottery the poorest might write in ink his memoranda, receipts, letters or texts.

A fortunate discovery at Samaria (1910), made among the ruins of Ahab’s palace, has brought to light 75 Heb ostraca inscribed with ink, 1. **Hebrew** in the Phoen character, with accounts Ostraca and memoranda relating to private matters and dating probably from the time of Ahab. Their historical contribution, aside from the mention of many places not mentioned in the NT, is slender, but for ancient Heb writing and to a less extent for Heb words and forms they are of value, while the fact that in them we possess documents actually penned in Israel in the 9th BC gives them extraordinary value. The nature of ostraca tends to their preservation under conditions which would quickly destroy parchment,
skin or papyrus, and this discovery in Pal encourages the hope of further and more significant finds.

Gr ostraca in large quantities have been found in Egypt, preserving documents of many kinds, chiefly tax receipts. The texts of some 2,000 of these have been published, principally by Wilcken (Griechische Ostraka, 2 vols, 1899), and serve to illustrate in unexpected ways the everyday Gr speech of the common people of Egypt through the Ptolemaic, Rom and Byzantine periods. Like the papyri, they help to throw light on NT syntax and lexicography, as well as on ancient life in general.

It is said that Cleaneines the Stoic, being too poor to buy papyrus, used to write on ostraca, but no remains of classical lit. have been found on the ostraca thus far discovered. In some instances, however, Christian literary texts are preserved upon ostraca. Some years ago Bou- riant bought in Upper Egypt 20 ostraca, probably of the 7th cent., inscribed with the Gr text of parts of the Gospels. The ostraca are of different sizes, and preserve any others one long continuous passage (Lk 22 40-71), which runs over 10 of the pieces. The ostraca contain from 2 to 9 verses each, and cover Mt 27 31-32; Mk 5 40-41 (9 3); 9 17.18.22; 15 21; Lk 12 15-16; 22 40-71; Jn 1 1-9; 1 14-17; 18 10-25; 19 15-17. The texts are in different hands, and attest the interest of the poor in the gospel in the century of the Arab conquest. Another late ostraca has a rough drawing labeled "St. Peter the evangelist," perhaps in allusion to the Gospel of Peter.

Coptic ostraca, too, are numerous, esp. from the Byzantine period, and of even more interest for Christian history than the Greek. A Coptic ostraca preserves the pericope on the woman taken in adultery (Jn 7 53-8 11), which is otherwise unattested in the Sa'idi NT. A Christian hymn to Mary, akin to the catenies of Luke, and some Christian letters have been found. The work of W. E. Crum on the Coptic ostraca is of especial importance. See, further, Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, 1910; Lyon, Harvard Theol. Review, January, 1911. EDGAR J. GOODPEED

OSTRICH, os'trich (נָעֲרִית, yānāth; στροβύλος, strōvulōs; Lat. Struthio camelus); The largest bird now living. The Heb words yānāth, which means "greediness," and both ha-yānāth, "daughter of greediness," are made to refer to the indiscriminate diet of the ostrich, to which bird they apply; and again to the owl, with no applicability. The owl at times has a struggle to swallow whole prey it has taken, but the mere fact that it is a night hunter forever shuts it from the class of greedy and promiscuous feeders. The bodies of owls are proverbially lean like eagles. Neither did the owl frequent several places where older versions of Jer and Isa place it; so the tr are now correctly rendered "ostrich." These birds came into the Bible because of their desert life, the companions they lived among there, and because of their night cries that were guttural, terrifying groans, like the roar- ing of lions. The birds were brought into many pictures of desolation, because people dreaded their fearful voices. They homed on the trackless deserts that were dreaded by travelers, and when they came feeding on the fringe of the wilderness, they fell into company with vulture, eagle, lion, jackal and adder, and joined their voices with the night hawks and owls. For these reasons no birds were more suitable for drawing strong comparisons from.

They attained a height ranging from 6 to 8 ft., and weighed from 200 to 300 lbs. The head was small with large eyes having powerful vision, and protected by lashes. The Peculiarities neck was long, covered with down, and the windpipe showed, while large bites could be seen to slide down the gullet. The legs were bare, long, and the muscles like steel from the long distances covered in desert travel. The foot was much like the cloven hoof of a beast. The inner toe was 7 in long, with a clawlike hoof, the outer, smaller with no claw. With its length and strength of leg and the weight of foot it could strike a blow that saved it from attack by beasts smaller than a leopard. The wings were small, the muscles soft and pliable. They would not bear the weight of the bird, but the habit of lifting and beating them proved that this assisted in attaining speed in running (cf Xen. Anab. 1.5.2, 3). The body was covered with soft flexible feathers, the wings and tail growing long plumes, for which the bird has been pursued since the beginning of time. These exquisite feathers were first used to decorate the headdress and shields of desert chieftains, then as decorations for royalty, and later for hat and hair ornaments. The badge of the Prince of Wales is three white ostrich plumes. The females are smaller, the colors gray and white, the males a glossy black, the wing and tail plumes white. The ostrich has three physical peculiarities that stagger scientists. It has eyelashes, developed no doubt to protect the eyes from the dust and sand of desert life. On the wings are two plumless shafts like large porcupine quills. These may be used in resisting attack. It also has a bladder like a
mammal, that collects urine acid, the rarest organ ever developed in a feathered creature.

"These birds hemed on the deserts of Arabia and at the lower end of the great Sina. Here the ostrich left her eggs on the earth and
2. Eggs warmed them in the sand. That young care to the fact that they were covered for protection during the day and brooded through the cooler nights. The eggs average 3 lbs. weight. They have been used for food in the haunts of the ostrich since the records of history began, and their stout shells for drinking-vessels. It is the custom of the birds, after laying a nest to take a long stick and draw out an egg. If incubation has advanced enough to spoil the eggs for use, the nest is carefully covered and left; if fresh, they are eaten, one egg being sufficient for a small family. No doubt these were the eggs to which Job referred as being tasteless without salt (Job 6 6). The number of eggs in the nest was due to the fact that the birds were polygamous, one male leading from 2 to 7 females, all of which deposited their eggs in a common nest. When several females wanted to use the nest at the same time, the first one to reach it deposited her egg in it, and the others on the sand close beside. This accounts for the careless habits of the ostrich as to her young. In the same manner, containing from 2 to 3 dozen eggs, it is impossible for the mother bird to know which of the young is hers. So all of them united in laying the eggs and allowing the father to look after the nest and the young. The bird first appears among the ruins of Solomon in Lev 11 16 RV, AV "owl"; Dt 14 16, RV "little owl" AV "owl." This must have referred to the toughness of grown specimens, since there was no other offensive in the bird's diet to taint its flesh and the young tender ones were delicious meat. In his agony, Job felt so much an outcast that he cried:

"I am a brother to jackals, And a companion to ostriches" (Job 30 29).

Again he records that the Almighty disconcerted to him of the ostrich in the following manner:

"The wings of the ostrich wave proudly, But are they the plumes and plumage of love" (Isa 13 15).

The ostrich history previously given explains all this passage save the last two verses, the first of which is a reference to the fact that the Arabs thought the ostrich a stupid bird, because, while it traveled to exhaustion, it bid its head and thought its body safe, and because some of its eggs were found outside the nest. The second was due to a well-known fact that, given a straight course, the ostrich could outrun a horse. The birds could attain and keep up a speed of 60 miles an hour for the greater part of half a day and even longer, hence it was possible to take them only by a system of relay riders (Xen, op. cit.) When Isaiah predicted the fall of Babylon, he used these words: "But wild beasts of the desert shall be there; and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures; and ostriches shall dwell there, and wild goats shall dance there" (Isa 13 21). Because this was to be the destruction of a great city, located on the Euphrates River and built by the fertility and prosperity of the country surrounding it, and the ruins those of homes, the bird indicated by every natural condition would be the owl. The wild goats clambering over the ruins would be natural companions and the sneaking wolves—but the big bird of sometime tribe shall hunt desert habitation, accustomed to constant pursuit for its plumage. Exactly the same argument applies to the next reference by the same writer

(34 13). "And the wild beasts of the desert shall meet with the wolves, and the wild goat shall cry unto him, O thou foremost of the flock; what art thou here, and shall find her a place of rest" (34 14). "The beasts of the field shall honor me, the jackals and the ostriches; because I give waters in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert, to give drink to my people, my chosen" (45 20). Hence, and the ostrich in its natural location, surrounded by creatures that were its daily companions. The next reference also places the bird at home and in customary company: "Therefore the wild beasts of the desert shall honour me; the jackals, and the ostriches shall stand upon their habitations; and I will set them in their habitation, and they shall dwell in their own places" (Jer 50 9).

"Even the jackals draw out the breast, they give suck their young ones; The daughter of my people is become cruel, like the ostriches in the wilderness" (Lam 4 3).

This reference is made to the supposed cruelty of the ostrich in not raising its young.

GENE STRATTON-PORTEER

OTHELI, oth'ni-el (Οθηλ), oth'ni-el, meaning unknown): A son of Shemariah, a Korahite Levite (1 Ch 26 7).

OTHEIEL, oth'ni-el (Οθηλ), oth'ni-el): A hero in Israel, son of Kenaz, Caleb's younger brother. He conquered Kiriath-sepher, later known as Debir, in the territory of Judah in the days of Joshua, and was given the daughter of Caleb, Achsah, as a reward (Josh 15 17 Jgs 1 13). He later smote Cushan-rishathaim, king of Mosopotam, whom the children of Israel had served 8 years, and thus not only saved the Israelites, but by reviving national sentiment among them (cf Am, V, iv, 3), and re-establishing government became the first of those hero-rulers known as "judges." The effects of his victory lasted an entire generation (40 years, Jgs 3 9-11). He had a son named Hathath (1 Ch 4 13) and probably another named Meonoath (cf LXX, ad loc.). In the days of David we find a family-bearing the name of Othniel, from which came Heldai the Metophathite, captain of the twelfth month (1 Ch 27 15).

ANTHAN ISAACS

OTHOMIAS, oth-o-mi'as (Οθομαίος, Othomias): One of those who had taken "strange wives" (1 Eed 9 28) = "Mattaniah" of Ezr 10 27.

OUCHES, ouch'ez, -ez (ὕπέρθον, miah'roth [Ex 28 11.13.14.25; Ex 29.16.18.19]; ARV "settings," but in Ex 39 13, "inclosures"). The secondary meaning of this now archaic word is the gold or silver setting of a precious stone. In Ez, where it occurs 8 x, it is clear that the gold settings of the engraved stones forming the breast-plate of the high priest are intended; the onyx stones forming the fibula or brooch for holding together the two sides of the breast-plate being said to be "inclosed in ouches [settings] of gold" (Ex 39 6). Not only are these onyx or beryl stones so set, but the 12 stones forming the front of the breast-plate were "inclosed in gold in their settings" (Ex 39 20). The same word occurs in Ps 45 13, where the king's daughter is said to have her clothing "inwrought with gold," i.e. embroidered with gold thread or wire. Ex 39 3 tells us how this wire was produced. From this fact it may be inferred that the settings of the breast-plate were not solid pieces of gold, but were formed of woven wire wrought round the stones, in a sort of filigree. See also STONES, PRECIOUS.

W. SHAW CALDECOTT

OUTCAST, out'kast: Represents some form of כִּבְשָׁן, ḫâshân, or כִּבִּשׁ, ḫâshâb, both meaning "thrust
OUTGOING, out'g-ing: In Ps 65 8, "Thou makest the outgoings of the morning and evening to rejoice," the Heb is נָּכֹד, nacôd. The word (from יָכֹד, "to go forth") refers to the "going forth" of the sun, and so means "east" (as in Ps 75 6). The connection of nacôd with "evening" is therefore zeugmatic, but the meaning is clear and there are extra-Bib. parallels (cf. "the two Orientes"). In Josh 17 18, AV uses "outgoings" for the Heb נָּכֹד, na'ad (also from יָכֹד), where the meaning in "extremity" (RV "goings out," as in Nu 34 5, etc.). "Outwent" occurs in Mk 6 33. BURTON SCOTT EASTON

OUTLANDISH, out-land'ish (Neh 12 26, AV "Him did outlandish women cause to sin"): "Outlandish" in modern Eng. is colloquial only and with the sense "utterly extraordinary," but AV uses it in the lit. meaning "out of the land," "foreign," ERV "outlandish women," ARV "foreign women," Heb נָּכֹד, nacôd, "foreign.

OUTRAGE, out'raj. OUTRAGEOUS, out-rä'jus: The noun (from the Fr. outrage, "that which goes beyond") only in the heading to Ps 10 AV; the adj. in Prov 27 4, AV and ERV, for וַעַלְגָּה, 'agalô, "hated," "hated." "Anger is overwhelming" (ARV), is much better.

OUTROADS, out'rôdz (אָדוֹלָה, edolô, "to go forth, "to make a military expedition"; AV and RV in 1 Mac 15 41, "horsemen . . . , that they might make outroads upon the ways of Judah"); 1 Esd 4 23, RV "goeth forth to make outroads"); "Outroads" is obsolete, but its opposite, "inroads," is still good Eng.

OUTWARD, out'wîrd. MAN (גֶּפֶן, ge'fen, "outside", "without", "out of doors"): The body, subject to decay and death, in distinction from the inner man, the imperishable spiritual life which "is renewed day by day" (2 Cor 4 16); also the body as the object of worldly thought and pride in external dress and adornment (1 Pet 3 3). See Man, Natural; Man, New.

OVEN, uv"n. See Bread; Furnace.

OVERCHARGE, ֹוַרְשְׁרֵי. Lk 21 34, "lest haply your hearts be overcharged with drunkenness" (בְּשָׁנֶה, bashôneh, "burden," here with the force "be occupied with"); 2 Cor 2 5, AV "that I may not overcharge you" (בָּשָׁנֶה, epibashône, "overload"), RV "that I press not too heavily." See Charges.

OVERPASS, ֹוַרְפָּס. A special tr. of the very common vb. ֹוַרְפָּס, 'abar, "to pass over," found in EV of Ps 57 1 and Isa 26 20 in the sense "to pass by," and in Jer 5 28 with the meaning "to overflow."

OVERPLUS, ֹוַרְפָּס. Lev 25 27, for ֹוַרְפָּס, 'adarph, "excess."
ruins, that lay mostly in the heart of rich farming lands, where prosperous cities had been built and then destroyed by enemies. Near these locations the ostrich was pursued for its plumage, and its nesting conditions did not prevail. The location was strictly the owl's chosen haunt, and it had the voice to fit all the requirements of the text. In the lists of abominations, the original Heb yansākî ḫ (derived from a root meaning twilight, is tr̄ “great owl” (see Lev 11 17 and Dt 14 16). It is probable that this was a bird about 2 ft. in length, called the eagle-owl. In the same lists the word kōs (ve-sou̇lou̇s, nuktidōra) refers to ruins, and the bird indicated is specified as the “little owl,” that is, smaller than the great owl—about the size of our barn owl. This bird is referred to as the “mother of ruins,” and the tr̄ that place it in deserted towns and cities is beyond all doubt correct. Kūp̄k p̄ (kēōs, echōs) occurs once (Isa 34 15), and is tr̄ “great owl” in former versions; lately (in ARV) it is changed to “dart-snake” (ERV “arrow-snake”). In this same description lūth (bokēstaios, oukōntauroi), “a specter of night,” was formerly screech-owl, now it reads “night monster,” which is more confusing and less suggestive. The owls in the lists of abominations (Lev 11 17 18; Dt 14 16) are the little owl, the great owl and the horned owl. The only other owl of this group that is recorded such impressions of description in the Books of Isa, Jer, Job and Mic is referred to in Ps 102 6: “I am like a pelican of the wilderness: I am become as an owl of the waste places.” Here it would appear that the bird habitual to the wilderness and the waste places, that certainly would be desert, would be the ostrich—while in any quotation referring to ruins, the owl would be the bird indicated by natural conditions.

GENE STRATTON-PORTErr

OWL, GREAT (יוֹנָשׁ), yansākî ḫ; LXX ἱφα, ἴθι, or ἰφα, ἴθι: A member of the Pal species of the family Strigidae. The great owl mentioned in the Bible was no doubt their largest specimen of the family, a bird fully 2 ft. in length, fully feathered, with unusually large head and long ear tufts. It was a formidable and noble-appearing bird, with resounding voice. It was abundant among the ruins of temples, the tombs of Carmel, the caves of Gennesaret, and among the ruined cities of Southern Judah. It is included in the abomination lists of Lev 11 17 and Dt 14 16. See OWL.

GENE STRATTON-PORTErr

OWL, LITTLE (יוֹנָת), kōs; νυκτικόρας, nuktidōra; Lat Athene meridionalis: A night bird of prey distinguished by a round head, and extremely large eyes. The little owl is left in RV only in the lists of abominations (see Lev 11 17; Dt 14 16). See Owl.

OWL, SCREECH. See NIGHT MONSTER.

OWNER, οὖντερ. See SHIPS AND BOATS, III, 2.

OX. See ANTELOPE; CATTLE; WILD OX.

OX, οὐκ: One of the ancestors of Judith (Jth 8 1). The name is not Heb. Perhaps the Itala Ozi and the Syr 'Uz point to the Heb 'Uzzi.

OX-GOAD, οὐκ' γόδ. See GOAD.

OZEM, οζεμ (יוֹצֵם, 'ōzem, meaning unknown): (1) The 6th son of David (1 Ch 2 15). LXX ('Arous, 'Āsôm) and Vulg suggest that the name should be pointed 'Ως, 'āzōm. (2) A “son” of Jerahmeel (1 Ch 2 25).

OZIAS, οζ'ιας: (1) ('Ωζιας, Oziel, 'Ôzias, Ozi, Oias, B a b): The son of Micah, a Simeonite, one of the 3 rulers of Bethulia in the days of Judith (Jth 6 15 16; 7 25; 8 9 f; 10 6). (2) ('Ωζιας, Oziel, B and Sweet; Av Ezias [1 Esd 8 2], following A, 'Ezias, Ezias): An ancestor of Ezra (1 Esd 8 2; 2 Esd 1 2) = "Uzzi" of Ex 7 4; 1 Ch 6 51. (3) Head of a family of temple-servants who returned with Zerubbabel (1 Esd 8 51) = "Uzza" of Ex 2 49; Neh 7 51. (4) Gr form of Uzziah (q.v.) in Mt 1 8 9 AV. A king of Judah. 

S. ANGUS

OZIEL, οζ'ιελ (Ὁζίελ, Oziel): An ancestor of Judith (Jth 8 1); another form of the OT name "Uziel."

OZNI, οζ'νι (יוֹנָת, "Oznî, "Oznî, "my hearing," or "my ear"): A "son" of Gad (Nu 26 16) = "Ezbon" of Gen 46 16 (cf 1 Ch 7 7).

OZNITES, οζ'νῖτες (with the art. 'יוֹנָת, hā-oznî [collective], “the Oznites”): Of the clan of Ozn (Nu 26 16). See OZNI.

OZORA, οζ'ωρα. See EZORA.

PADDAN, pad'ân (Gen 48 7; AV Padan, pā- dan). See next article.

PADDAN-ARAM, pad'an-ārām or p-ārām (יוֹנָת-אָרָם, pōdān 'āram; LXX Μεσοποταμία τῆς Συρίας, Mesopotamia tē Syriās; Av Padan-aram): In Gen 46 7, Paddan stands alone, but as the LXX, Sam, and Pesh read "Arām" also, it must in this verse have dropped out of the MT. In the time of Abraham, pōdān occurred the Bab contract-tablets as a land measure, to which we may compare the Arab. fddān or "ox-gang." In the Assyr syllabaries it is the equivalent of ḫitu, "a field," so that Paddan-aram would mean "the field of Arām," and with this we may compare Hos 12 12 (Heb 12 13) and the use of the Heb sōdeh in connection with Moab and Edom (Jgs 5 4; Ruth 1 6).
Furthermore, *padanu* and *harranu* are given as synonyms with the meaning of "rood." *Paddan-aram* occurs only in the PC, but it corresponds to the "Haran" of the older documents. The versions agree in translating both as Mesopotamia, and identify with the home of the patriarchs, and the scene of the domestic strife of the district of Haran to the E. of the Upper Euphrates valley. More in harmony with the length of Jacob's flight, as indicated by the time given (Gen 31:22-25), is Haran-el-Awamid, an ancient site 10 miles to the E. of Damascus, which satisfies all the demands of history. See *ARAM*.

W. M. CHRISTIE

**PADDLE**, paddl (תֶּבֶל, yathôdkh): Dt 23:13 (Heb 14), RVm "shovel."

**PADON**, pâ'dôn (תָּפָדָה, "redemption"): One of the Nethinim (see *NETHINIM*) who returned with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:44; Neh 7:47), the "Phaleas" of 1 Esd 5:29 (m "Paddon").

**PAGIEL**, pâ'gi-el, pâ'gi-el, pa'giel (נפתיל, "God's intervention"): Son of Ocran, of the tribe of Asher, among those enrolled by Moses at the numbering of Israel (Nu 1:3; 2:27). When the tabernacle was set up, the heads of the families of Israel "brought their offerings" in rotation and these priests and the sons of Aaron, were members of the 11th day (Nu 7:72). Nu 7:72-77 describes his offering. In the journeys of Israel he was "over the host of the tribe of the children of Asher" (Nu 10:26), and possibly standard-bearer (cf Nu 10:14,22,25).

**HENRY WALLACE**

**PAHATH-MOAB**, pâ'hath-mô'âb (פַּחַת-מֹעָב, "sheik of Moab"): in 1 Esd 5:11; 8:31, "Phaath Moab"): A Jewish clan probably named after an ancestor of the above title. Part of the clan returned with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:6; cf Neh 7:11) under two family names, Jesusu and Joab; and a part came back with Ezra (Ezr 8:4). Hashub, a "son of Pahath-moab," is named among the repairers of both the wall and the "tower of the furnaces" at Jerus (Neh 3:11). It is the name of one of the signatories "sealing" the "sure covenant" of Neh 9:38 (Neh 10:14). Some of the sons of this name had taken "strange wives" (Ezr 10:30).

**HENRY WALLACE**

**PAI**, pâi (פָּאִ, pâ'î; פָּם, Pâm): The royal city of Hadad or Hadar, king of Edom (1 Ch 1:50). The name is given as "Pau" (פָּאִ, pâ'î) in Gen 36:39. There is no indication of its position. It is not identified.

**PAIN**, pân (פָּן, bàn, bâh, bôh, bôh, hôbel, הָלָה, hâlah, hôlahth, hôlah, kâ'hôb, kâ'ñâ, kâ'b'hôb, kôb'hôb, mîgâr, hâlah, mak'hôb, hàbb, hâ'môl, הַזָּה, hâzâ, קְצֵר, kôṣer, hîshô, hânâ, nôsô, pôsô, pânôs, ôôî, ôdâs): These words signifying various forms of bodily or mental suffering are generally tr "pain": 28 out of the 34 passages in which the word is used are in the poetical or prophetical books and refer to conditions of mental disquiet or disharmony due to the punishment of personal or national sin. In one instance only is the word used as a historic record of personal physical pain: the case of the wife of Phinehas (1 S 4:19), but the same verb is used figuratively in Isa 15:8; 21:5; 30:16, and tr "pangs" or "sorrows." In other passages where we have the same comparison of consternation in the presence of God's judgments to the pangs of childbirth, the word used is hîbel, as in Isa 66:7; Jer 13:21; 22:23; 49:24. In some of these and similar passages several synonyms are used in the one verse to intensify the impression, and are tr "pain," "pangs," and "sorrows," as in Isa 15:8.

The word most commonly used by the prophets is some form of פָּן or פָּה, sometimes with the addition as of a word of addition, פָּה, etc.

"Deborah" (Jdg 4:14, 16, 19, 21, 22); Jer 6:34; 22:23; Mic 4:10. This pain is referred to the heart (Ps 109:4) or to the head (Ps 25:6 E). In Ezk 30:4, it is the physical affliction of Ethiopia, and in ver 16 AV "Sin [Tanis] shall have great pain" (RV "anguish"); in Ezk 33:5 E. Ezekiel's words are quoted in the news of the fall of Tyre. Before the invading host of Tyre encircled the city, Ezekiel prophesies much pain in the sense of toil and trouble in Jer 12:13 in the tr of hâlah, a word more frequently rendered grieving or sickness, as in 1 K 8:14; Ps 32:8; Jer 2:5; Jer 5:3. The reduplicated form hâlahh is esp. used of a twisting pain usually referred to the loins (Isa 21:3; Ezek 39:7).

Pain in the original meaning of the word (as it has come down to us through the Old Fr., from the Lait poëme) as a penalty inflicted for personal sin is expressed by the words kâeb'h or kâ'b'h in Job 14:12; 15:20, and in the questioning complaint of the prophet (Jer 15:18). As a judgment on personal sin pain is also expressed by makh'ôb in Job 3:19; Jer 51:8, but this word is used in the sense of infliction in Is. 13:15 (the restoration of "man of sorrows." The Psalms (Ps 25:18) praying for deliverance from the afflictions which he experienced on his lip; in Ps 27:16, as expressing Asaph's disquiet due to his misunderstanding of the word of Providence (Is. 39:6), or of the word of God (Ps 116:3 AV), which Götz hold of the Psalms in his sickness, is the rendering of the word môçה: the same word is tr "distress" in Ps 116:3. The words have a primary meaning of physical twisting, or constriction.

In the NT Ôdîn is tr "pain" (of death, RV "pang") in Acts 2:24. This word is used to express any sort of pain, such as physical (as in Aschyleus, Chôephoti, 211) the pain of intense apprehension. The vb. from this, Ódêndêmai, is used by the Rich Man in the parable to describe his torment (RV "anguish") (Lk 16:24). The related vb. sunodînôb is used in Rom 8:22 and is tr "travailing in pain together." In much the same sense the word is used by Euripides (Helen, 727).

In Rev 12:2 the woman clothed with the sun (bassaniômenë) was in pain to be delivered; the vb. (bassanizô) which means "to torture" is used both in Mt 8:6 in the account of the grievously tormented centurion's servant, and in the description of the laboring of the apostles' boat on the stormy Sea of Galilee (Mt 14:24). It seems to have been a case of spinal meningitis. This vb. occurs in Thucydides vii.86 (viii.92), where it means "being put to torture." In the two passages in Rev where pain is mentioned the word is pônos, the pain which affected those on whom the fifth vial was poured (16:10), and in the description of the City of God where there is no more pain (21:4). The primary meaning of this word seems to be "toil," as in 1 Thess 5:25, but it is used by Hippocrates to express disease (Aphorism. iv.44).

**ALEX. MACALISTER**

**PAINFULNESS**, pân'fôl-nës (πάθος, môchhtos): In the summary of his missionary labors in 2 Cor 11:27 AV, St. Paul uses this word. RV renders it "travail," which probably now expresses its meaning most closely, as in Mt 12:38 ("painfulness") is usually restricted to the condition of actual soreness or suffering, although we still use "painstaking" in the sense of careful labor. The Gr word is used for toil or excessive anxiety, as in Euripides (Medea. 136), where it refers to that care for her children which she had lost in her madness. Tindal uses "painfulness" in 1 Jn 4:18 as the tr of xôbaras, katônas, which AV renders "torment" and RV "punishment."

**ALEX. MACALISTER**
PAINT, pānt (from Old Fr. peintre, frequentative of peindre, Lat. pingō, “to paint”): (1) From Heb. בְּנָה, masheb, “to smear,” “to anoint,” “to paint,” describing the painting of interiors with vermilion, perhaps resembling lacquer: “smiled with cedar, and painted with vermilion” (Jer 22 14). The shields of the Ninevite soldiers were red, presumably painted (Nah 2 3). (2) From noun פָּקָה, pākā, “paint,” “antimony,” “stibium,” “black mineral powder,” used as a cosmetic, to lend artificial size and fancied beauty to the eye, always spoken of as a meretricious device, indicating light or unworthy character. Jezebel “painted her eyes, and attired her head” (2 K 9 30), lit. “put pākā into her eyes”). To the bront city Jerusalem, Jeremiah (4 30) says, “deceast thee . . . en- largest thine eyes with paint” (pākā). AV renders “rentest thy face,” as if the stain were a cut, or the enlarging done by violence. (3) From vb. בָּנָה, kābāl, “to smear,” “to paint.” Ezekiel says to Oholah-Oholibah (Judah-Israel),“disted wash thyself, paint [kābāl] thine eyes,” as the adulteress prepares herself for her paramour (Ezk 23 40). The antimony, in an extremely fine powder (Arab. kuhul, from kābāl), is placed in the eye by means of a very fine rod, bodkin, or probe, drawn between the edges of the eyelids. This distends the eye, and also increases its apparent size, the effect being increased by a line of stain drawn from the corner, and by a similar line prolonging the eyebrow. See EYEPaint; Color. PHILIP WENDELL CRANNELL

PAINTING, pānt-ing. See Crafts, II, 12.

PAIR, pār: The m of Cant 4 2 (but not of the l 6 6) reads, “which are all of them in pairs,” while the text has, “whereof every one hath twins. The Heb. בַּיִל, bēyil, is from a פַּלְא, ‘palal, “double,” and is perhaps susceptible of either meaning. But the description is of sheep, and the m gives no comprehensible figure, while the text points to the exceedingly sleek and healthy appearance. “Pairs” seems to result from confusing the figure with the thing figured—the teeth, where each upper is paired with the corresponding lower.

PALACE, pal’ās: In Heb chiefly בַּיִלְת, ’armôn, in RV text tr* “castle” in 1 K 16 18; 2 K 15 25; בַּיִלְת, bēyilt, the same word often rendered “court,” in RV “courtyard” (Mt 26 35.56.89; Mk 14 54.66; Lk 11 21; Jn 18 15). On the other hand, “palace” takes the place in RV of AV “common hall” or “judgment hall” (παροικίαν, Mt 27 27; Jn 18 28. 30; 19 9; Acts 23 35). See JUDGMENT, HALL OF. A description of Solomon’s palace is given in 1 K 7 1–12 (see TEMPLE). Archaeology has brought to light the remains of great palaces in Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria (Sargon, Sennacherib, Assur-banipal, etc), Syria, etc. See HOUSE.

JAMES OHN

PALAESTRA, PALESTRA, pal-éstra. See Games, II, 3, (6).

PALAL, pālāl (פַּלְא, pālāl, “judge”): Sea of Uzal, and one of the repairers of the wall (Neh 3 25).

PALANQUIN, pal-an-kān: In Cant 3 9 occurs פָּרָקָן, parāqān, a word that has no Sem cognates and is of dubious meaning. In form, however, it resembles the Gr. φαράκων, parakōn, both of which mean “litter bed.” Hence RV “palanquin” (ultimately derived from φαράκων). The m “ear of state” and AV “chariot” are mere guesses.

PALESTINA, pal-es-ti’na (Ῥωμαία, p'leseth): Ex 15 14; Isa 14 29.31 AV; changed in RV to Philistia (q.v.).

PALESTINE, pal-es-tin (Ῥωμαία, p'leseth; Φυλιστία, Phailstia, Ἀλλοφήλης, Allophuloi; AV Joel 3 4 [RV “Philistia”], “Palestine”; AV Ex 15 14; Isa 14 29.31; cf Ps 60 8; 83 7; 87 4; 108 9): I. PHYSICAL CONDITIONS

1. General Geographic Features
2. Water-Supply
3. Geological Conditions
4. Fauna and Flora
5. Climate
6. Rainfall
7. Drought and Famine
II. PALESTINE IN THE PERSIAN PERIOD
1. Places Visited by Abraham
2. Places Visited by Isaac
3. Places Visited by Jacob
4. Mentioned in Connection with Judah
5. Review of Geography of Genes
6. Exodus and Levitic
7. Numbers
8. Deutonomy
III. PALESTINE IN THE HISTORIC BOOKS OF THE OT
1. Book of Joshua
2. Book of Judges
3. Book of Ruth
4. Book of Samuel
5. Books of Kings
6. Post-exilic Historical Books
IV. PALESTINE IN THE POETIC BOOKS OF THE OT
1. Book of Job
2. Book of Psalms
3. Book of Proverbs
4. Song of Songs
V. PALESTINE IN THE PROPHETS
1. Isaiah
2. Jeremiah
3. Ezekiel
4. Minor Prophets
VI. PALESTINE IN THE APOCALYPSE
1. Book of John
2. Book of Revelation
3. 1 Maccabees
4. 2 Maccabees
VII. PALESTINE IN THE NT
1. Synoptic Gospels
2. Fourth Gospel

LITERATURE

The word properly means “Philistia,” but appears to be first used in the extended sense, as meaning all the “Land of Israel” or “Holy Land” (Zec 2 12), by Philo and by Ovid and later Rom authors (Reland, Pal Illustr., I, 38–42).

I. Physical Conditions.—The Bible in general may be said to breathe the air of Pal; and it is here intended to show how important for our social consideration is the consideration of its geography, and of the numerous incidental allusions to the natural features, fauna, flora, cultivation, and climate of the land in which most of the Bible books were written. With the later history and topography of Pal, after 70 AD, we are not here concerned, but a short account of its present physical and geological conditions is needed for our purpose.

Pal W. of the Jordan, between Dan and Beersheba, has an area of about 6,000 sq. miles, the length from Hermon southward being nearly 150 miles, and the width gradually increasing from 20 miles on the N. to 60 miles on the S. It is thus about the size of Wales, and the height of the Palestinian mountains is about the same as that of the Welsh. E. of the Jordan an area of about 4,000 sq. miles was included in the land of Israel. The general geographical features are familiar to all.

1. General miles, and the width gradually increasing from 20 miles on the N. to 60 miles on the S. It is thus about the size of Wales, and the height of the Palestinian mountains is about the same as that of the Welsh. E. of the Jordan an area of about 4,000 sq. miles was included in the land of Israel. The general geographical features are familiar to all.

(1) The land is divided by the deep chasm of the Jordan valley, an ancient geological fault continuing in the Dead Sea, where its depth (at the
bottom of the lake) is 2,600 ft. below the Mediterranean.

(2) W. of the valley the mountain ridge, which is a continuation of Lebanon, has very steep slopes on the E. and gentle on the S. Its present level during the Pleistocene and Pluvial periods, after which—its peculiar fauna, having developed there in the long ages before the appearance of man. The bed upheaved include: (1) the Nubian Sandstone (of the Green sand period), which was sheared along the line of the Jordan fault E. of the river, and which only appears on the western slopes of Lebanon, (2) the limestone of Upper Pal, and, (3) the soft Eocene limestone, which appears chiefly on the western spurs and in the foothills, the angle of upheaval being less steep than that of the older main formation. On the shores of the Mediterranean a yet later sandy limestone forms the low cliffs of Sharon. See GEOLOGY OF PALESTINE.

As regards fauna, flora and cultivation, it is sufficient here to say that they are still practically the same as described throughout the Bible. The lion and the wild bull and Flora (Box primigenius) were exterminated within historic times, but have left their bones and tracks in Jordan gravel and flint. The bear has gradually retreated to Hermon and Lebanon. The buffalo has been introduced since the Moslem conquest. Among trees the apple has fallen out of cultivation since the Middle Ages, and the cactus has been introduced in the land of corn, wine and oil, and famous for its fruits. Its trees, shrubs and plants are those noticed in the Bible. Its woods have been thinned in Lower Galilee and Northern Sharon, but on the other hand the groves have often grown up in former vineyards and villages, and there is no reason to think that any general desiccation has occurred within the last 40 centuries, such as would affect the rainfall.

The climate of Pal is similar to that of other Mediterranean lands, such as Cyprus, Sicily or Southern Italy; and, in spite of the Delta in Egypt, or of Mesopotamia, the summer heat is oppressive only for a few days at a time, when (esp. in May) the dry wind—deficient in ozone—blows from the eastern desert. For most of the season a moisture-laden sea breeze, rising abo the River, blows at AM, blows throughout all the western slopes of the mountains. In the bare deserts the difference between 90 F. by day and 40 F. by night gives a refreshing cold. With the east wind the temperature rises to 105 F., and the nights are oppressively warm. In autumn, the shade temperature reaches 120 F. In this season mists cover the mountains and swell the grapes. In winter the snow sometimes lies for several days on the watershed ridge and on the summit mountain even Hermon is sometimes quite snowless at 9,000 ft. above the sea. There is perhaps no country in which such a range of climate can be found, from the Alpine to the tropical, and none in which the range of fauna and flora is consequently so large, from the European to the African.

The rainfall of Pal is between 20 and 30 in. annually, and the rainy season is the same as in other Mediterranean countries. The "former rains" begin with the thunderstorms of November, and the "latter rains" cease with April showers. From December to February—except in years of drought—the rains are heavy. In most years the supply is quite sufficient for purposes of cultivation, which begins in autumn, and the corn is rarely spoiled by storms in summer. The fruits ripen in autumn

2. Water-Supply. Pal is abundant, except in the desert regions above noticed, which include the N. and the S. and the E. of the area. The Jordan runs into the Dead Sea, which has no outlet and which maintains its level solely by evaporation, being consequently very salt; the surface is nearly 1,300 ft. below the Mediterranean, whereas the Sea of Galilee (650 ft. below sea-level) is sweet and full of fish. The Jordan is fed, not only by the snows of Hermon, but by many affluent streams from both sides. There are several streams also in Sharon, including the Crocodile River under Carmel. In the mountains, where the hard dolomite limestone is on the surface, perennial springs are numerous. In the lower hills, where this limestone is covered by a softer chalky stone, the supply depends on wells and cisterns. In the Beersheba plains the water, running under the surface, is reached by scooping shallow pits—esp. those near Gerar, to be noticed later.

The fertility and cultivation of any country depends mainly on its geological conditions. Those are favorable for crops as in Pal, and have undergone no change since the age when man first appeared, or since the days of the Hebrew patriarchs. The country was first upheaved from the ocean in the Eocene age, and settled in Miocene age, the great crack in the earth's surface occurred, which formed a narrow gulf stretching from that of the 'Ababah on the
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4. Fauna Bible. The lion and the wild bull and Flora (Box primigenius) were exterminated within historic times, but have left their bones and tracks in Jordan gravel and flint. The bear has gradually retreated to Hermon and Lebanon. The buffalo has been introduced since the Moslem conquest. Among trees the apple has fallen out of cultivation since the Middle Ages, and the cactus has been introduced in the land of corn, wine and oil, and famous for its fruits. Its trees, shrubs and plants are those noticed in the Bible. Its woods have been thinned in Lower Galilee and Northern Sharon, but on the other hand the groves have often grown up in former vineyards and villages, and there is no reason to think that any general desiccation has occurred within the last 40 centuries, such as would affect the rainfall.

The climate of Pal is similar to that of other Mediterranean lands, such as Cyprus, Sicily or Southern Italy; and, in spite of the Delta in Egypt, or of Mesopotamia, the summer heat is oppressive only for a few days at a time, when (esp. in May) the dry wind—deficient in ozone—blows from the eastern desert. For most of the season a moisture-laden sea breeze, rising abo the River, blows at AM, blows throughout all the western slopes of the mountains. In the bare deserts the difference between 90 F. by day and 40 F. by night gives a refreshing cold. With the east wind the temperature rises to 105 F., and the nights are oppressively warm. In autumn, the shade temperature reaches 120 F. In this season mists cover the mountains and swell the grapes. In winter the snow sometimes lies for several days on the watershed ridge and on the summit mountain even Hermon is sometimes quite snowless at 9,000 ft. above the sea. There is perhaps no country in which such a range of climate can be found, from the Alpine to the tropical, and none in which the range of fauna and flora is consequently so large, from the European to the African.

The rainfall of Pal is between 20 and 30 in. annually, and the rainy season is the same as in other Mediterranean countries. The "former rains" begin with the thunderstorms of November, and the "latter rains" cease with April showers. From December to February—except in years of drought—the rains are heavy. In most years the supply is quite sufficient for purposes of cultivation, which begins in autumn, and the corn is rarely spoiled by storms in summer. The fruits ripen in autumn
and suffer only from the occasional appearance of locust swarms. There appears to be no reason to suppose that rainfall has undergone any change since the times of the Bible; and a consideration of Bible allusions confirms this view.

Thus the occurrence of drought, and of consequent famine, is mentioned in the OT as occasional in all times (Gen 12:10; 26:2; 41:50; 7:26; 8:35; 1 K 8:35; and Isa 5:6; Jer 14:1; Joel 1:10-12; Hag 1:11; Zec 14:17), and droughts are also noticed in the Mish (Tal. Kid. 1, 4-7) as occurring even lasting throughout the rainy season till spring. Good rains were a blessing from God, and drought was a sign of His displeasure, in Heb belief (Dt 11:14; Jer 5:24; Joel 2:23). A thunderstorm in harvest time (Nay) was most unusual (1 S 12:17;18), yet such a storm does still occur as a very exceptional phenomenon. By "snow in harvest" (Prov 25:13) we are not to understand a snowstorm, for it is likened to a "faithful messenger," and the reference is to the ice of snow for cooling wine, which is still usual at Damascus. The notice of fever on the shores of the Sea of Galilee (Mt 8:14) shows that this region was as unhealthy as it still is in summer. The decay of irrigation in Sharon may have rendered the land more fertile, but the identity of the Palestinian flora with that of the Bible indicates that the climate, generally speaking, is unchanged.

II. Palestine in the Pentateuch.—The Book of Gen is full of allusions to or connected with the memory of the Heb patriarchs. In the time of
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Abraham
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visited by tribes, mainly Sem, who came originally from Babylonia, including Canaanites ("greeners") between Sidon and Gaza, and in the Jordan valley, and Amorites ("highlanders") in the mountains (Gen 10:15-19; Nu 13:29). Their language was akin to Heb, and it is only in Egypt that we read of an interpreter being needed (Gen 42:23), while excavated remains of seal-cylinders, and other objects, show that the civilization of Pal was similar to that of Babylonia.

(1) Shechem.—The first place noticed is the shrine or " ALT. altar " (7 8) of Shechem, with the Elion Morch (LXX "high oak"), where Jacob afterward buried the idols of his wives, and where Joshua set up a stone by the "holy place" (Gen 12:6; 35:4; Josh 24:26). Sam tradition showed the site near "the foot of Il. Gerizim". The "Canaanite was then in the land" (in Abra-

ham's time), but was exterminated (Gen 34:25) by Jacob's sons. From Shechem Abraham journeyed southward and raised an altar between Bethel (Bethin) and Hai (Haydn), E. of the town of Luz, the name of which still survives hard-by at the spring of Loch (Gen 12:8; 13:3; 28:11;30:13; 35:2).

(2) The Negeb. —But, on his return from Egypt with large flocks (12:16), he settled in the pastoral region, between Beerseba and the western Kadesh (13:1; 20:1), called in Heb the negeb, "dry" country, on the edge of the cultivated lands. From E. of Bethel there is a fine view of the lower Jordan valley, and here Lot "lifted up his eyes" (13:10), and chose the rich grass lands of that valley for his flocks. The "cities of the Plain" (bikkâr) were clearly in this valley, and Sodom must have been near the river, since Lot's journey to Zoor (19:22) occupied only an hour or two (vs 15:23) through the plain to the foot of the Moab mountains. These cities were here mentioned by Hosea from near the Hebron; but, from the hilltop E. of the city, Abra-

ham could have seen "the smoke of the land" (19:28) rising up. The first land owned by him was the garden of Mamre (13:18; 19:1; 23:19), with the cave-womb which tradition still points out under the floor of the Hebron mosque. His tent was spread under the "oaks of Mamre" (18:1), where his mysterious guests rested "under the tree" (ver 8). One aged oak still survives in the flat ground W. of the city, but this tree was very near the mountains of Judah. In all these incidental touches we have evidence of the exact knowledge of Pal which distinguishes the story of the patriarchs.

(3) Campaign of Amraphel.—Pal appears to have been an outlying province of the empire of Hammurabi, king of Babylon in Abraham's time; and the campaign of Amraphel resembled those of later Assyr overlords exacting tribute of petty kings. The route (14:5-8) lay through Bashan, Gilgal and Moab to kadesh (probably at Petra), and the return through the desert of Judah to the plains of Jericho. Thus Hebron was not attacked (see ver 13), and the pursuit by Abraham and his Amorite allies led up the Jordan valley to Dan, and thence N. of Mount Etna. The Canaanites, whose king blessed Abraham on his return was thought by the Samaritans, and by Jerome, to be the city near the Jordan valley afterward visited by Jacob (14:13; 33:18), but see JERUSALEM.

4. Return to Canaan.—(4) Gerar. —In J. and Ne each of the desert plains, and "sojourned in Gerar" (20:1), now Umm J affar, 7 miles S. of Gaza. The wells which he dug in this valley (26:15) were no doubt shallow excavations like those from which the Arabs still obtain the water. And the surface in the same vicinity (SWP, III, 390), though that at Beersheba (21:25-32), to which Isaac added another (26:23-25), may have been more permanent. Three masonry wells now exist at Bir es Seba, but the masonry of "two men" at this place (21:33) is an interesting touch, since the tree is distinctive of the dry lowlands. From Beersheba Abraham journeyed to "the land of Moriah" (LXX "the high land") to sacrifice Isaac (22:2); and the mountain, according to Heb tradition (2 Ch 3:1), was at Jerus, but according to the Samaritans was Gerizim near the Elion Morch—a summit which could certainly have been seen "far off" (ver 4) on "the third day". Isaac, by Isaac, his father, a well-watered wilderness, at the western Kadesh (25:11) and at Gerar (26:2), suffered like his father in a year of drought, and had similar difficulties to those of the Arabs still obtain the water. In this vicinity we have no remains of such cultivation. Thence he retreated S.E. to Rehoboth (Rubheib), N. of Kadesh, where ancient wells like those at Beersheba still exist (26:22). To Beersheba he finally returned (26:23).

When Jacob fled to Haran from Beersheba (28:10) he slept at the "place" (or shrine) consecrated by Abraham's altar near Bethel, and—
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the Canaanites were exterminated (Gen 34:25) by Jacob's sons. From Shechem Abraham journeyed southward and raised an altar between Bethel (Bethin) and Hai (Haydn), E. of the town of Luz, the name of which still survives hard-by at the spring of Loch (Gen 12:8; 13:3; 28:11;30:13; 35:2).

(1) Haran to Succoth.—His return journey from Haran to Gilgal raises an interesting question. The distance is about 350 miles from Haran to the Galedor or "witness heap" (31:48) at Mizpah—probably Saf in North Gilead. This distance Laban is said to have covered in 7 days (31:23), which would be possible for a force mounted on riding camels. Abraham was turned to the south when he reached Laban on the 3rd day (ver 22), and some time would elapse before he could gather his "brethren." Jacob with his flocks and herds must
have needed 3 weeks for the journey. It is remarkable that the vicinity of Mizpah still presents ancient monuments like the “pillar” (ver 45) round which the “memorial cairn” (gô’ôhr-sâhâdôâhôth) was formed. From this place Jacob journeyed to Mahanaim (pâh-môh’nâ), S. of the Jabbok river—a place which afterward became the capital of South Gilead (Gen 32 1 f; 1 K 4 14); but, on hearing of the advance of Esau from Edom, he retreated across the river (Gen 32 22) and then reached Succoth (33 17), believed to be Tell Der’âla, N. of the stream.

(2) From the Jordan to Hebron.—Crossing the Jordan by one of several fords in this vicinity, Jacob approached Shechem by the perennial stream of Wûdî Fârîn, and camped at Shalem (Sâlîm) on the east side of the fertile plain which stretches thence to Shechem, and here he bought land of the Hivites (33 18-20). We are not told that he dug a well, but the necessity for digging one in a region full of springs can only be explained by Hivite jealousy of water rights, and the well still exists E. of Shechem (cf Jn 4 5 f), not far from the Elon Moreh where were buried the tê’ôphîm (Gen 35 4) or “spirits” (Assyr tarpû) from Haran (31 30) under the oak of Abraham. These no doubt were smallcists, such as are often encountered in Pal. The further progress of Jacob led by Bethel and Bethelhem to Hebron (35 6 19-27), but some of his elder sons seem to have remained at Shechem. Thus Joseph was sent later from Hebron (37 14) to visit his brethren there, but found them at Dothan.

(3) Dothan (37 17) lay in a plain on the main trade route from Egypt to Damascus, which crossed the low watershed at this point and led down the valley to Jezreel and over Jordan to Bashan. The “wood” of Dothan. (1 K 4 11) is still shown at Tell Dîthân, and the Isma‘illite, from Midian and Gilead, chose this easy caravan route (37 25-28) for camels laden with the Gilead balm and spices. The plain was fitted for feeding Jacob’s flocks. The products of Pal then included also honey, pistachio nuts, and almonds (43 11); and a few centuries later we find notice in a text of Thothmes III of honey and balsam, with oil, wine, wheat, spelt, barley and fruits, as rations of the Egyptian troops in the Delta (West Egypt, 21-22).

The episode of Judah and Tamar is connected with a region in the Seperâh, or low hills of Judaea.

4. Mentioned in the Bible—Judah, the latter being in a pastoral valley where with Judah Judah met his sheep shears.”

Tamar sat at “the entrance of Enaim” (of vs 14 22 ERV) or Enam (Josh 15 34), perhaps at Kefr ‘Ana, 6 miles N.W. of Timnah. She was mistaken for a kêtôshehâh, or vavty of Ashrethoth (Gen 38 15 21), and we know from Hammurabi’s laws that such votaries were already recognized. The mention of Judah’s signet and staff (ver 15) also reminds us of Bab customs as described by Herodotus (ibid), and signet-bearers of Babylon, and of early date, have been unearthed in Pal at Gezer and elsewhere (cf the “Bab garment,” Josh 7 21).

Generally speaking, the geography of Gen presents no difficulties, and shows an intimate knowledge of the country, while the allusions to natural products and to customs are in accord with the Bible. Only one difficulty needs notice, where Atad is mentioned (40 10) on the way from Egypt to Hebron, and is described as “beyond the Jordan.” In this case the Assyrian language perhaps helps us, for in that tongue the word “the” is omitted, and the reference may be to the Nile itself, which is called Yâ’ar in Heb (p’ôr) and Assyry alike.

Ex is concerned with Egypt and the Sinai desert, though it may be observed that its simple agricultural laws (chs 21-23), which so often recall those of Hammurabi, and which probably were already in use on the confines of Gilead and Bashan, before crossing the Jordan. In Lev (ch 11) we have a list of animals most of which belong to the desert—as for instance the “coney” or hyrax (Lev 11 5; Ps 104 18; Prov 30 20), but others—such as the swine (Lev 11 7), the stork and the heron (ver 19)—to the Aravab and the Jordan valley, while the hoopoe (AV “lapwing,” ver 19) lives in Gilead and in Western Pal. In Dt (ch 14) the fallow deer and the roe (ver 5) are now inhabitants of Tabor and Gilead, but the “wild goat” (ibex), “wild ox” (bubull), “pygarg” (addax) and “chamois” (wild sheep), are found in the Aravab and in the deserts. In Nu the conquest of Eastern Pal is described, and most of the towns mentioned are known (21 18-33); the notice of vineyards in

7. Numbers—Moab (ver 22) agrees with the discovery of ancient rock-cut wine presses near Heshbon (SEP, 1 221). The view of Israel, in camp at Shittim by Balak (22 41), standing on the top of Pisgah or Mt. Nebo, has become possible by the discovery of Jebel Neba, where also rude dolmens recalling Balak’s altars have been found (SEP, 1 202). The plateau of Moab (32 5) is described as a “land for cattle,” and still supports Arab flocks. The Israel left their cattle, women and children during the wars, for 6 months, stretched (33 49) from Beth-jeshimoth (Swâvinèm), near the northeastern corner of the Dead Sea over Abel-shittim (“the acacia meadow”—a name later been in use), and watered by several brooks, and having good herbage in spring.

(1) Physical allusions.—The description of the “good land” in Dt (8 7) applies in some details with special force to Mt. Gilead, which possesses more perennial streams than Western Pal throughout—“a land of brooks of water, of fountains and springs, flowing forth in valleys and hills.” A land also “of wheat and barley, and vines and fig-trees and pomegranates, a land of olive-trees and honey” is found in Gilead and Bashan. Pal itself is not a mining country, but the words (ver 9) “a land whose stones are iron and copper, and when thou mayest dig copper,” may be explained by the facts that iron mines existed near Beirût in the 10th cent. AD, and copper mines at Pusûn N. of Petra in the 4th cent. AD, as described by Jerome (Onom, e. v. Phîmûn). In Dt also (11 29; cf 27 4; Josh 8 30) Ebal and Gerizim are first noticed, as beside the “oaks of Moreh.” Ebal the mountain of curses (3,077 ft. above sea-level) and Gerizim the mountain of blessings (2,550 ft.) are the two highest tops in Samaria, and Shechem lies in a rich valley between them. The first sacred centre of Israel was thus established at the place where Abraham built his first altar and Jacob dug his well, where Joseph was buried and where Joshua recognized a holy place at the foot of Gerizim (Josh 20 26). The last chapters of Dt record the famous pilgrimage from Mt. Nebo (34 1-3), which answers in all respects to that from Jebel Neba, except as to Dan, and the utmost (or “western”) sea, neither of which is visible. Here we should probably read “toward” rather than “over” (cf. the very similar phraseology of the plains of Shittim whence a better view can be obtained of the Jordan valley, from Zoor to Jericho, of the watershed mountains as far N. as Gilboa and Tabor, and of the slopes of Gilead.

(2) Archaeology.—But besides these physical
Palestine
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allusions, the progress of exploration serves to illustrate the doctrine of Dt. Israel was com-
manded (12 3) to overthrow the Can. altars, to break the standing stones which were emblems of
superstition, to burn the 'ashêrah poles (or artificial
trees), and to hew down the graven images. That
these commands were obeyed is clear. The rude
altars and standing stones are now found only in
Moab, and in remote parts of Gilead, Bashan, and
Galilee, not reached by the power of reforming
kings of Judah. The 'ashêrah poles have dis-
appeared, the images are found, only deep under
the sand. The third (of Dt 27 17) pronounced
against the man who should dare to remove the
stone. (See illustration under NEBUCHADNEZZAR.)

III. Palestine in the Historic Books of the OT.—

Josh is the great geographical book of the OT; and
the large number of names of places, rivers and mountains
of Joshua in Pal mentioned in the Bible are to
be found in this book.

(1) Topographical accuracy.—About half of this
total of names were known, or were fixed by Dr.
Robinson, between 1838 and 1852, and about 150
new sites were discovered (1872-78, 1881-82) in
consequence of the 1-in. trigonometrical survey
of the country, and were identified by the present
work. The third period; sites have been added by M. Clermont-Ganneau (Adul-
ham and Gezer), by Rev A. Henderson (Kiriat-
jearim), by Rev. W. F. Birch (Zoar at Tell esh Shaphira), and by others. Thus more than three-
quarters of the sites have been fixed with more
or less certainty, most of them preserving their
ancient names. It is impossible to study this
topography without seeing that the Bible writers
had personal knowledge of the country; and it is
improbable that the Hob in Babylonia, could have possessed that intimate acquaint-
ance with all parts of the land which is manifest in the
geographical chapters of Josh. The towns
are enumerated in due order by districts; the
twelve lower natural Highlands and mountain
ridges—and the character of various regions is correctly indicated. Nor can we suppose
that this topography refers to conditions sub-
sequent to the return from captivity, for these were
quite different. Simeon had ceased to inhabit
the south by the time of David (1 Ch 4 24), and
the lot of Dan was colonized by men of Benjamin
after the captivity (8 12-13; Neh 11 34-35).
Tirzah is mentioned (Josh 12 24) in Samaria,
whereas the future capital of Omri is not. Ai is
said to have been made “a heap for ever” (8 28),
but was inhabited apparently in Isaiah’s time (10
28 = Aiath) and certainly after the captivity (Ezr
2 28; Neh 7 52; 11 31 = Aiha). At latest, the
topography seems to be that of Solomon’s age,
though it is remarkable that very few places in
Samaria are noticed in the Book of Josh.

(2) The passage of the Jordan.—Israel crossed
Jordan at the lowest ford E. of Jericho. The river
was in flood (Jer 43 1), and the melting snows of Her-
mon melted (Hos 3 15); the stoppage occurred 20 miles
farther up at Adam (Ed-damiêh), the chalky cliffs
at a narrow place being probably undermined and
falling in, thus damming the stream. A Modern
writer asserts that a similar stoppage occurred in
the 13th cent. AD near the same point. (See
JORDAN RIVER.) The first camp was established at Gilgal (Jîôgalîh), 3 miles E. of Jericho, and a
“circle” of 12 stones was erected. Jericho was not
at the mediavel site (er Riba) S. of Gilgal, or at
the Herodian site (er Riba, but farther W.), but at
“Ain es Sultân, close to the mountains to which the
spies escaped (2 16). The great mounds were
found by Sir C. Warren to consist of sun-dried
bricks, and further excavations (see Mittel, der
Deutschen Orient-Gesell, December, 1909, No. 41)
have revealed little but the remains of houses of
various dates.

(3) Joshua’s first campaign.—The first city in the
mountains attacked by Israel was Ai, near Hûsgân,
2 miles S. E. of Bethel. It has a deep valley to the N., as described (Josh 8 22). The fall of
Ai and Bethel (ver 17) seems to have resulted in the
peaceful occupation of the region between Gibeon and
Shechem (8 30—9 27); but while the Hivites
submitted, the Amorites of Jerus and of the S.
attacked Gilboa (10 10), and the Israelites were
thrown back in a steep pass of Beth-horon (Beit A’ar) to the plains (10 1—11). Joshua’s great raid, after this victory, proceeded through the plain to Makkedah, now
called el Mughdr, from the “cave” (of 10 17), and
was on the high road of the Tell el-Far’ah, thus
up to Hebron, and “turned” S. to Debir (edh Dâdhûrîyeh), thus subduing the shêphélāh of
Judah and the southern mountains, though the
capital at Jerus was not taken. It is now very
generally admitted that the six letters of the Amor-
ite king of Jerus included in Am Tab may refer to
this war. The ‘Abirî or Habirî are therein noticed
as a fierce people from Seir, who “destroyed all the
rulers,” and who attacked Ajalon, Lachish, Ash-
kelon, Keila, and Elah (the latter was reduced to Hebron) and other places (see EXONYS, THE

(4) The second campaign (11 1-14) was against
the nations of Galilee; and the Heb victory was
claimed as all the “waters of Meron” (ver 5). There
is no sound reason for placing these at the Hâlekh
lake; and the swampy Jordan valley was a very
unlike field of battle for the Can. chariots (ver 6).
The kings noticed are those of Madon (Madînîn),
Shimron (Semmûniw), Dor (possibly Tell Tharâh),
“the west,” and of Hazor (Hazûrî), all in Lower
Galilee. The success was also to the Styx (Sidôn (ver 8); and Merom may be identical with
Shimron-meron (12 20), now Semmûniw, in which case
the “waters” were those of the perennial
stream in Wadî el Melek, 3 miles to the N., which
flow W. to join the lower part of the Kishon.
Shimron-meron was one of the 31 royal cities of
Pal. W. of the Jordan (12 9—24).

The regions left unconquered by Josh (13 2-6)
were those afterward conquered by David and
Solomon, including the Phil. plains, and the Sidon-
ian coast from Meurrâ (el-Mujhârîyeh) northward
to Aphek (Af’âsî) in Lebanon, on the border of the
Amorite country which lay S. of the “land of the
Hittites” (1 4). Southern Lebanon, from Gebal (Jubâl) and the “entering into Hamath” (the
Eleutheros Valley) on the W. to Ras el-Bâsîlî (prob.
ably at ‘Aiûn Judeîdeh on the northwestern slope
of Hermon) was also included in the “land” by
David (2 8 6—10). But the whole of Eastern Pal (13
7-28), and of Western Pal, excepting the shore
atlands, was given to the sons of Joseph (Ephraim and Manasseh), being the strongest,
least, appear to have occupied the mountains and
the shêphélāh, as far N. as Lower Galilee, before the
final allotment.

Thus the lot of Simeon was within that inherited by
Judah (19 1—3) that of Joseph partly taken from Ephraim, since Joseph’s lot originally
reached to Gezer (16:3); but Benjamin appears to have remained active (cf. 15:1-3; 18:22-25). This lot was larger than that of Ephraim, and Benjamin was not then the "smallest of the tribes" (cf. Josh 19:49). The destruction of the tribe did not occur till after the death of Joshua and Eleazar (Josh 20:28).

The twelve tribes were distributed in various regions which may here briefly be described. Reuben held the Mountain (Waśhār) and Arnon (Wwšā'r) on the east of the Dead Sea. Gad had all the W. of Gilead, being separated from the Ammonites by the upper course of the Jordan. The W. of the Jordan valley E. of the river was included in this lot. Manasseh held Bashan, but later transferred to Gilead. Simeon had the Negeb plateau S. of Bocheth. Judah occupied the mountains S. of Jerusalem, with the mountains of Shechem, but this tribe occupied only the hills, and was unable to drive the Canaanites out of the plains (Josh 17:11-16). Ephraim also complained of the smallness of its lot (ver 15), which lay in rugged country between Bethel and Samaria, including, however, the corn plateau E. of the latter city, Issachar held Mount Tabor and Shechem, with the Jordan valley to the E., but soon became subject to the Canaanites. Zebulon had the hills of Lower Galilee, and all the S. coast from Acre to Tyre. Asher had the hills W. of Naphtali, and the narrow slopes from Acco to Tyre. Thus each tribe possessed a proportion of mountain land fit for cultivation of vines, olives and corn, and of arable land fit for cultivation. The areas of these tribes corresponded to the size and prosperity of the various regions which they were able to command.

The Levitical cities were fixed in the various tribes as centers for the teaching of Israel (Dt 33:10), but a Levite was not obliged to live in such a city, and was expected to go to his course annually to the sacred center, before they retreated to Jerusalem on the occasion of the conquest of the kingdom (2 Ch 11:14). The 48 cities (Josh 21:13-42) include 13 in Judah and Benjamin for the priests, among which Beth-shemesh (1 S 6:13-15) and Anathoth (1 K 2:6) are expressly named as Levitical. The other tribes had 3 or 4 such cities each, divided among Kohathites (10), Gershonites (13), and Merarites (12). The six cities of Refuge were included in the total, and were placed 3 each on the E. and W. of the Jordan, namely Hebron, Shechem and Kedesh on the W., and Bezer (unknown), Ramoth (Reinon) and Golan (probably Sukhem el Jaulan) on the E. of the river. Another less perfect list of these cities, with 4 on each side of the Jordan, and Abel-mizraim in the S., is given in 1 Ch 6:57-81. Each of these cities had "suburbs," or open spaces, extending (Nu 35:4) about a quarter-mile beyond the walls, while the fields, to about half a mile distance, also belonged to the Levites (2 K 25:34).

1. Early Wars.—In Jgs, the stories of the heroes who successively arose to save Israel from the heathen carry us to every part of the country. After the death of Joshua" (cf. Judges 1:1-2:12, 18:21-25), which occupied 15 years (of Josh 15:15-19) as lying in a "dry" (AV "south") region, yet with springs not far away. The actual site (edh Dāhēreš) is a village with ancient tombs 12 miles S.W. of Hebron; it has no springs, but about 7 miles to the N.E. there is a mountain stream with "upper and lower springs." As regards the Philistian cities (Jgs 1:18), the LXX reading seems preferable; for the Gr says that Jashub "did not take Gaza" nor Ashkelon nor Ekron, which agrees with the statement that the destruction of the tribe did not occur till after the death of Joshua and Eleazar (20:28).


And Canaanite enemies, or Even the Canaanites having "chariots of iron." The Can. chariots are often mentioned about this time in the Am Tab and Egypt accounts speak of their being plated with metals. Manasseh, Ephraim, Zebulun, Asher and Naphtali, were equally powerless against cities in the plains (vs 27-33); and Israel began to mingle with the Canaanites, while the tribe of Dan seems never to have really occupied its allotted region, and remained encamped in the borders of Judah till some, at least, of its warriors took refuge under Hormon (1:34; 18:1-30) in the time of Jonathan, the grandson of Moses.

(2) Defeat of Sisera.—The oppression of Israel by Jabin II of Hazor, in Lower Galilee, appears to have occurred in the time of Rameses II, who, in his 8th year, conquered Shalem (Sâlôm, N. of Tannach), Anem ('Anîm), Dapur (Debêrîâh, at the foot of Tabor), with Bethanath (Arînâtha) in Upper Galilee (Brugsch, Hist Egypt, II, 64). Sisera may have been a successor of E. as recorded in the time of Jabin (3:4); his victory occurred near the foot of Tabor (ver 14) to which he advanced E. from Harosheh (el Harâthîykh) on the edge of the sea plain. His host "perished at Endor" (Ps 83:9), and fled into the camp of the Philistines (Nu 21:32). The tale of the Kedesh in "the plain of swamps" (4:11) to which he fled is doubtful. Perhaps Kedesh of Issachar (1 Ch 6:72) is intended at Tell Kedès, 3 miles N. of Tannach, for the plain is here swampy in parts. The list of cities is thought to belong from Taanach to Megiddo (6:19), but the old identification of the latter city with the Rom town of Legio (Legiân) was a mere guess which does not fit with Egypt accounts placing Megiddo near the Jordan. The large site at Mâqatî's, in the Valley of Jezreel seems to be more suitable for all the OT as well as for the Egypt accounts (SWP, II, 90-99).

Gideon's Victory.—The subsequent oppression by Midianites and others would seem to have coincided with the troubles which occurred in the 8th year of Minuchesh (see EXOD. XIV) Gideon's home (Jgs 6:11) at Ophrah, in Manasseh, is placed by Sam tradition at Fe'ara, 6 miles W. of Shechem, but his victory was won in the Valley of Jezreel (7:1-22), the sites of Beth-shittah (She'âthâ) and Abiezer (Abîezér) to the E., and of the ravens' rock and "the wolf's hollow" (cf. 7:25, W. of the Jordan. It is remarkable (as pointed out by the present author in 1874) that, 3 miles N. of Jericho, a sharp peak is now called "the ravens' nest," and a ravine 4 miles farther is named "the wolf's hollows." These sites are rather farther S. than might be expected, unless the two chiefs were separated from the fugitives, who followed Zebah and Zalmunna to Gilead. In this episode "Mt. Gilead," (7:3) seems to be a clerical error for "Mt. Gilboa," unless the name survives in corrupt form at 'Ain Jâlûtâ (Goliath's spring), which is a large pool, usually supposed to be the spring of Harod (7:1), where Gideon camped, E. of Jezreel. The story of Abimelech takes us back to Shechem. He was made king by the "oak of the pillar" (9:6), which was no doubt Abraham's oak already noticed; it seems also to be called 'the enchanter's oak' (ver 57), probably from some superstition connected with the burial of the Teraphim under it by Jacob. The place called Beer, to which Jotham fled from Abimelech (ver 21), may have been
Bearoth (Birch) in the lot of Benjamin. Thebez, the town taken by the latter (ver 50), and where he met his death, is now the village Tūba, 10 miles N.E. of Shechem.

The Ammonite oppression of Israel in Gilead occurred about 300 years after the Heb conquest (11 26), and Jephthah the deliverer returned to Bethel (ver 28), which was probably the present village Sūf (already noticed), from his exile in the "land of Tob" (vs 36). This may have been near Yāsibeh, 9 miles S. of Gadarā, in the extreme N. of Gilead—a place notable for its ancient dolmens and huge stone monuments which occur also at Mizpah. Jephthah's dispute with the men of Ephraim (12 1) indicates the northern position of Mizpah. Aroer (11 33) is known, but lay near Rabbath-ammon (Josh 13 25; 2 S 54 5); it is to be distinguished from Aroer (Ar'ār) in the Arnon ravine, mentioned in Jgs 11 26.

The scene of Samson's exploits lies in the shāfēlah of Judah on the borders of Philistia. His home at Zorah (Sūrāh) was on the hills N. of the Valley of Sorek, and looked down on the camp of Dan (7 1), then pitched on a flat valley near Beth-shemesh. Eshtaol (Eshho'ā) was less than 2 miles E. of Zorah on the same ridge. Timnath (14 1) was only 2 miles W. of Beth-shemesh, at the present ruin Tūmeh. The region was one of vineyards, and the name Sorek (Makir) still survives at a ruin 2 miles W. of Zorah. Sorek signified a "choice vine," and a rock-cut wine press exists at the site (SWP, III, 126). These 5 places, all close together, were also close to the Philistine lands (15 5) in a region of vines and olives. Samson's place of refuge in the "left of the rock of Etam" (see 15 8) was probably at Beit 'Attāb, only 5 miles E. of Zorah, but rising with a high knob above the southern precipices of the gorge which opens into the Valley of Sorek. In this knob, under the village, is a rock passage now called "the well of refuge" (Bīr el Hāsūtāt), which may have been the "left" into which Samson "went down." Lehi (ver 9) was apparently in the valley beneath, and the name ("the jaw") may refer to the narrow mouth of the gorge whence, after conference with the Philis, the men of Judah "went down" (ver 11) to the "left of the rock of Etam" (SWP, III, 83, 137), which was a passage 250 ft. long leading down, under the tops of the cliffs (S 7?); it is still inhabited. It is connected with this one valley (for Dēllālah also lived in the "Valley of Sorek," 16 4) excepting his visit to Gaza, where he carried the gates to the "hill facing Hebron" (16 3), traditionally shown (SWP, III, 137), to prevent the enemy from the town where he died, and where his tomb is (wrongly) shown. Another tomb, close to Zorah, represents a more correct tradition (16 31), but the legends of Samson at this village are of modern Christian origin.

The appendix to Jgs includes two stories concerning Levites who both lived in the time of the 2d generation after the Heb conquest (18 30; 20 28), and who both "sojourned" in Bethelhem of Jehovah (17 5; 19 2), though their proper city was one in Mt. Ephraim. In the first case Jonathan, the grandson of Moses, founded a family of idolatrous priests, setting up Micah's image at Dan (Tell el Kāfī) beside the sources of the Jordan, where ancient dolmen altars still exist. This image may have been the cause why Jeroboam afterward established a calf-temple at the same place. It is said to have stood there till the "captivity of the ark" (St. Petersburg MS, Jgs 16 30), "all the time that the house of God was in Shiloh" (vs 14). From this narrative we learn that the tribe of Dan did not settle in its appointed lot (18 1), but pitched in the "camp of Dan," west of Kiriath-jearim (ver 12). This agrees with the former mention of the site (13 25) as being near Zorah; and the open valley near Beth-shemesh is visible, through the gorges of Lehi, from the site of Kiriath-jearim at 'Erma.

(4) Appendix: Defeat of Benjamin.—In the 2d episode we trace the journey of the Levites from Bethlehem past Jerus to Gibeath ('Je'ū'). From Ramah (er-Rām), a distance which could easily be traversed in an afternoon (cf 19 8-14), Gibeath was no doubt selected as a halting-place by the Levite, because it was a Levitical city. The story of the great crime of Gibeath and the known to Hosea (9 9). Israel gathered against them at Mizpah (Tell en Nāsbeh) on the watershed, 3 miles to the N.W., and the ark was brought by Phinehas to Bethel (cf 20 1 31; 16 25 27), 5 miles N.E. of Mizpah. The defeat of Benjamin occurred where the road to Gibeath leaves the main north road to Bethel (ver 31), W. of Ramah. The survivors fled to the rock Ramrôn (Rummān), 3 1/2 miles E. of Bethel, on the edge of the "wilderness" which stretches from this rugged hill toward the Jordan valley. The position of Shiloh, 9 miles N. of this rock, is very accurately described (21 19) as being N. of Bethel (Be'tūn), and E. of the main road, thence to Shechem which passed Lebonah (Lābūn), 3 miles N. of the village S. of the N.W. of Sēlēth or Shiloh. The "vineyards," in which the maidens of Shiloh used to dance (ver 20) at the Feast of Tabernacles, lay no doubt where vineyards still exist in the little plain S. of this site. It is clear that the writer of these two narratives had a sound knowledge of Palestinian topography as exact as that shown throughout Jgs. Nor (if the reading "captivity of the ark" be correct) is there any reason to suppose that they were written after 722 BC.

The Book of Ruth gives us a vivid picture of Heb life "when the judges ruled" (1 1 AV), about a century before the birth of David. Laws as old as Hāmmerūbi's age allowed the widow the choice of remaining with her husband's family, or of quitting his house (cf 1 8). The beating out of gleanings (2 17) by women is still a custom which accounts for the rock mortars found so often scooped out on the hillside. The villagers still sleep, as a guard, beside the heap of winnowed corn in the threshing-floor (S 7?); to-day they still set out in the morning to trample it. The barley has been used to carry six measures of barley (ver 15). The courteous salutation of his reapers by Boaz (2 4) recalls the common Arab, greeting (Allah mālākum), "God be with you." But the thin wine (ver 14) is the "current" of the Semitic peasants, who only "dip" their bread in oil.

(1) Samuel.—The two Books of S present an equally valuable picture of life, and an equally real topography throughout. Samuel 4 Books of Saul's father—apious Levite (1 Samuel 6 27)—descended from Zuph who had lived at Ephrathah (Bethlehem; cf 1 S 9 4 5), had his house at Ramah (1 19) close to Gibeath, and this town (er-Rām) was Samuel's home also (7 17; 25 1). The family is described as "Ramathites, Zuphites of Mt. Ephraim" (1 18), but the term "Mt. Ephraim" was not confined to the lot of Ephraim, since it included Bethel and Ramah, in the land of Benjamin (Jgs 4 5). As a Levite, Elikanah obeyed the law of making annual visits to the central shrine, though this custom had to be generally observed in an age when "every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Jgs 21 25). The central shrine had been removed by Joshua from Shechem to the remote site of Shiloh (Josh 18 1), perhaps on the top of this, and here the tabernacle (ver 19) was pitched (cf 1 S 22 22) and remained for 4 centuries till the death
of Eli. The great defeat of Israel, when the ark was captured by the Philis, took place not far from Mizpah (4 1), although the track from Shiloh (cf ver 12). Ekron, whence it was sent back (16 16), was only 12 miles from Beth-shechem ("Ain shems"); where the ark rested on a "great stone" (LXX, ver 18); and Beth-shechem was only 4 miles W of Bethel. Jonathan slew (vers 1-7) which placed the latter was probably removed after Eli's death, when Shiloh was deserted. The exact site of Nob is not known, but probably (cf Isa 10 22) it was close up to Mizpah, whence the first glimpse of Jerus. is caught, and thus near Gibea, where it was laid apart. to "the shed of the priest"" (1 S 21 1; 22 18; 2 Ch 1 3), when the ark was again taken to Kirath-jearim (2 S 6 2). Mizpah (Tell en-Naheb) was the gathering-place of Israel under Samuel, and the "stone of help" (Ehren-zeer) was erected, after his victory over the Philis, "between Mizpah and Shen" (1 S 7 12)—the latter place (see LXX) being probably the same as Jeshanan ("Ein Sinai"). 6 miles N of Mizpah which Samuel visited yearly as a judge (ver 16).

(1) "The journey of Saul, who, "seeking assed found a kingdom," presents a topography which has often been misunderstood. He started (9 4) from Gibea ("Jebus") and went first to the land of Shalisha through Mt Ephraim. Baal-shalisha (2 K 4 12) appears to have been the present Kefer Thilth, 18 miles N of Lydda and 24 miles N.W. of Gibea. Saul then searched the land of Shaim—probably that of Shaul (1 S 13 17), N.E. of Gibeah. Finally he went south beyond the border of Benjamin (10 2) to a city in the "land of Zuph," which seems probably to have been Bethel, whence (as above remarked) Samuel's family—descendants of Zuph—came originally. If so, it is remarkable that Saul and David were concealed the fact of his anointing (10 16) till the lot fell upon him at Mizpah. This public choice by lot has been thought (Wellhausen, Hist Israel, 1885, 252) to indicate a double narrative, but to a Hebrew there would not appear to be any discrepancy, since "The lot is cast into the lap, but the whole disposing thereof is of Jah" (Prov 16 33). Even at Mizpah he was not fully accepted till his triumph over the Ammonites, when the kingdom was "renewed" at Gilgal (11 14). This cam. was celebrated with great rejoicing. Only 7 days' respite was allowed to the men of Jabesh in Gilead (11 3), during which news was sent to Saul at Gibeah, and messengers dispatched "through the borders of Israel" (ver 7), while the host went on to the battle. Saul at Gibeah on the 7th or 8th day (vs 8-10 at dawn. Bezeck appears to be a different place from that W. of Jerus (Jgs 1 4) and to have been in the middle of Pal at Beth, 14 miles N. of Shechem, and 25 miles W. of Gibeah, which probably lay by the road through the Gilead. It is not difficult for the messengers would not have exceeded 80 miles; and, allowing a day for the news to reach Saul and another for the march from Bezek to Jabesh, there would have been just time for the gathering of Israel at this fairly central meeting-place.

The scene of the victory over the Philis at Michmash is equally real. They had a 'post' in Gaba (or Gibeon, 13 3), or a governor (cf LXX), whom Jonathan slew. They came up to Michmash (Mikmads) to attack Jonathan's force which held Gibeah, on the southern side of the Michmash valley, hard by. The northern cliff of the great gorge was called Bozae ("shining") in contrast to the south here called Besech or "thorn" (14 4). Jos (BII, V, ii, 2) says that Gibeon of Saul was by "the valley of thorns," and the ravine, flanked by the two precipitous cliffs E. of Michmash, is still called Wady es Suwewet, or "the valley of little thorn trees." Jonathan climbed the steep slope that leads to a small flat top (1 S 14 14 AV), and surprised the Phili 'post.' The pursuit was by Bethel to the Valley of Ajalon, down the steep Beth-horon pass (vs 23 31); but it should be noted that there was no "wood" (vs 25 26) on this bare hilly ridge, and the word (cf Cant 5 1) evidently means "honeycomb." It is also possible that the altar raised by Saul, for fulfilment of the Law (Gen 9 4; Ex 20 25), was at Nob where the central shrine was then established.

(4) David's early life—David's early life—David's early life—David's early life—David's early life—David's early life—David's early life—David's early life—David's early life. The wilderness below Bethel, where many a silent and dreadful "Valley of Shadows" (cf Ps 23 4) might make the stoutest heart fail. The lion crept up from the Jordan valley, and (on another occasion) the bear came out on the rugged mountains above (1 S 17 34). No bears are now known S. of Hermon, but the numerous references (2 K 2 24; Isa 59 11; Hos 13 8; Prov 17 12; 28 15) show that they must have been exterminated, like the leprosy, in comparatively late times. The victory over Goliath, described in the chapter containing this allusion, occurred in the Valley of Elah near Shochoth (Shuweteh); and this broad valley (Wady es Sual) ran into the Phili plain at the probable site of Gath (Tell es S'elle) to which the pursuit led (1 S 17 12 52). The watercourse still preserves "smooth stones" (ver 40) fit for the sling, which is still used by Arab shepherds; and the valley still has in it fine "terebinths" such as those from which the story of Goliath's armor of the giant (vs 5 6) indicates an early stage of culture, which is not contradicted by the mention of an iron spearhead (ver 7), since iron is found to have been in use in Pal long before David's time. The story of Goliath being taken "to Jerus" is also capable of explanation. Jerus was not conquered till at least 10 years later, but it was a general practice (as late as the 7th cent. BC in Assyria) to preserve the heads of dead foes by salting them, and it was probably done in another case (2 K 10 7) when the heads of Abah's sons were sent from Samaria to Jezered to be exposed at the gate.

David's outlaw life began when he took refuge with Samuel at the "settlements" (Nacho) near Ramah, where the company of prophets lived. He easily met Jonathan near Gibeon, which was only 2 miles E.; and the "stone of departure" ("Ezel," 1 S 20 19) may have marked the Levitical boundary of that town. Nob also (21 1) was, as we have seen, not far off, reached Bezech on the 7th or 8th day (vs 8-10 at dawn). The boundary Thence David retraced the road of the Valley of Elah to Adullam (Aid-el-ma), which stood on a hill W. of this valley near the great turn (southeastward) of its upper course. An inhabited cave still exists at Wady es Yellah (vert 6 25) and there is a repetition of this requirement (Sfl P, III, 311, 347, 361 67). Keilah (25 1) is represented by the village Kila, on the east.
side of the same valley, 3 miles farther up; and Hereth (25 3) was also near, but "in Judah" (23 3), as at the village Khorais on a wooded spur 7 miles N.W. of Hebron and near the "downland" (ver 2) to Kidseh 2 miles away to the W. As there was no safety for the outlaws, either in Philistia or in Judah, they had to retreat to the wilderness of Ziph (Tell ez Zif), 4 miles S.E. of Hebron. The word "wood" (hâresh) may more probably be a proper name, represented by the ruin of Khorais, rather more than a mile S. of Ziph, while the hill Hachilah (ver 19) might be the long spur, over the Jeshimon or desert of Judah, 6 miles E. of Ziph, now known as Maum (Mpera) on the edge of the same desert still farther S., about 8 miles from Hebron. En-gedi (23 29; 24 1 2) was on the precipices by the Dead Sea. The "wild goats" (ibex) still exist here in large droves, and the caves of this desert are still used as fold for sheep in spring (ver 3). The villagers S. of Hebron are indeed remarkable for their large flocks—which by agreement with the nomads—are sent to pasture in the Jeshimon, like those of Nabal, the rich man of Carmel (Karmel), near Nazareth (25 2), who refused the customary present to David's band which had protected his shepherds "in the fields" (ver 15) or pastures of the wilderness. In summer David would naturally return to the higher ridge of Hachilah (25 1) on the south side of which there was a large (impassable save by a long detour), across which he talked to Saul (ver 13), likening himself (ver 20) to the desert "partridge" still found in this region.

(7) Early years of David's reign.—David, till the 5th year of his reign, was king of Judah only. The first battle with Saul's son occurred at Gibeon (2 S 2 13), where Saul's "pool" was captured, as Saul himself was probably the Sayra, Malhâkhâh ("cliff of slippings" or "of slippings away", near Maum of 1 S 23 19 24 28), which lay farther S. than Ziph.

(8) Hebrew letter-writing.—In this connection we find the first notice of a "letter" (11 14) as written by David to Joab. Writing is of course noticed as early as the time of Moses when—as we now know—the Canaanites wrote letters on clay tablets in cuneiform script. These, however, were penned by special scribes, and such a scribe is mentioned at Ugarit (Ugarit Expedition). The list of cities to which David sent presents at the time of Saul's death (30 20 31) includes those near Ziklag and as far N. as Hebron, thus referring to "all the places where David himself and his men were wont to haunt.

(9) Wellhausen:-theory of a double narrative.—The study of David's wanderings, it may be noted, and of the climatic conditions in the Jeshimon desert, does not serve to confirm Wellhausen's theory of a double narrative, based on the secret sunction and public choice of Saul, on Gibeon, and of the fact that an obsequious king had forgotten the name of David's father. The history is not a "pious make-up" without a "word of truth" (Wellhausen, Hist Israel, 48 49); and David as a "youth" of twenty years, may yet have been called a "man after my own heart" (Ps 13 1 2 18), without being recognized by the reader of this genuine chronicle. Nor was there any "Apelik in Sharon" (p 200), and David did not "amuse himself by going first toward the north" from Gibeon (p 267); his visit to Ramah does not appear to be a "worthless anachronistic anecdote" (p 271); and no one who has visited the terrible Jeshimon could regard the meeting at Hachilah as a "jest" (p 265). Nor did the hill ("the dusky top") "take its name from the" (Wellhausen) "desert road" (ver 4) to Kidseh 2 miles away to the W. As there was no safety for the outlaws, either in Philistia or in Judah, they had to retreat to the wilderness of Ziph (Tell ez Zif), 4 miles S.E. of Hebron. The word "wood" (hâreš) may more probably be a proper name, represented by the ruin of Khorais, rather more than a mile S. of Ziph, while the hill Hachilah (ver 19) might be the long spur, over the Jeshimon or desert of Judah, 6 miles E. of Ziph, now known as Maum (Mpera) on the edge of the same desert still farther S., about 8 miles from Hebron. En-gedi (23 29; 24 1 2) was on the precipices by the Dead Sea. The "wild goats" (ibex) still exist here in large droves, and the caves of this desert are still used as fold for sheep in spring (ver 3). The villagers S. of Hebron are indeed remarkable for their large flocks—which by agreement with the nomads—are sent to pasture in the Jeshimon, like those of Nabal, the rich man of Carmel (Karmel), near Nazareth (25 2), who refused the customary present to David's band which had protected his shepherds "in the fields" (ver 15) or pastures of the wilderness. In summer David would naturally return to the higher ridge of Hachilah (25 1) on the south side of which there was a large (impassable save by a long detour), across which he talked to Saul (ver 13), likening himself (ver 20) to the desert "partridge" still found in this region.
(9) Last years of David's reign.—On the rebellion of Absalom David retreated to Mahanaim, apparently by the road N. by the Mount of Olives, if the Tq of Jerusalem (2 K 15 5) be correct. In place of Bahurim at Almon (Abin), N.E. of Jerus. It is not clear where the "wood of Ephraim," in which Absalom perished, may have been, but it was beyond Jordan in Gilead (17 22; 18 6); and oak woods are more common there than in Western Pal. The latest revolt, after Absalom's death, was in the extreme north at Abel (Abib), in Upper Galilee (20 14), after which Joab's journey is the last incident to be studied in the Books of S. For census purposes he was king of the Jordan valley (perhaps the city on the Arnon), to the "river of Gad" (Wady Na'â'dâr) near Jazer, and through Gilead. Tahim-hodshi (24 6) is believed (on the authority of three Gr MSS) to be a corruption of the "Hittites to Kadesh" (Kodes), the great city on the Orontes (see Hirîtîttes), which lay on the northern boundary of David's dominions, of the kingdom of Hamath. Thence Joab returned to Zidon and Tyre, and after visiting all Judah to Beersheba reached Jerus again within 10 months. The acquisition of the temple-site then closes the book.

(1) Solomon's provinces.—The Books of K contain also some interesting questions of geography. Solomon's twelve provinces appear to answer very closely to the lots of the twelve tribes described in Josh. They included (1 K 4 7-19) the following: (a) Ephraim, (b) Dan, (c) Southern Judah (see Josh 12 17), (d) Manasseh, (e) Issachar, (f) Northern Gilead and Bashan, (g) Southern Gilead, (h) Naphtali, (i) Asher, (j) part of Issachar and probably Zebulun (the text is doubtful, for the order of ver 17 differs in LXX), (k) Benjamin, (l) Reuben. LXX renders the last clause (ver 19), "and one Nephesh [i.e. officier] in the land of Judah," probably superior to the other twelve. Solomon's dominions included Philistia and Southern Syria, and stretched along the trade route by Tadmor (Palmyra) to Tischlah on the Euphrates (vs 21.24; of 9 18=Tamar; 2 Ch 8 4=Tadmor). Another Tischlah (now Tishlah) lay 6 miles S.W. of Shechem (2 K 15 16). Gezer was presented to Solomon's wife by the Pharaoh (1 K 9 16).

(2) Geography of the Northern Kingdom.—Jeroboam was an Ephraimite of Zereda, probably 30 miles N.W. of Bethel, but the LXX reads "Sarâir," which might be Sûrâr, 1 1/2 miles E. of Shiloh. After the revolt of the ten tribes, "Shishak king of Egypt" (11 40; 14 25) sacked Jerus. His own record, though much damaged, shows that he not only invaded the mountains near Jerus, but that he even conquered part of Galilee. The border between Israel and Judah lay S. of Bethel, where Jeroboam's calf-temple was erected (12 28), Ramah (er-Râm) being a frontier town with Qevas and Mizpah (15 17 23); but after the Syrian raid into Galilee (ver 20), the capital of Israel was fixed at Tirzah (ver 21), a place celebrated for its beauty (Cant 6 4), and perhaps to be placed at Tâerêzr, about 11 miles N.E. of Shechem, in romantic scenery above the Jordan valley. Omri reigned here also for six years (16 23) before he built Samaria, which remained the capital till 722 BC. Samaria appears to have been a city at least as large as Jerus, a strong site 5 miles N.W. of Shechem, commanding the road which ran to its west. It resisted the Syrians for 3 years, and when it fell Sargon took away 27,290 captives. Excavations at the site will, it may be hoped, yield results of value not as yet published. See next article.

The wanderings of Elijah extended from Zarephath (Sourân), S. of Sidon, to Damascus. The position of the Brook Cherith (17 3) where—according to one reading—"the Arabs brought him bread and flesh" (17 6) is not known. The site of this great contest with the prophets of the Tyrian Baal is supposed to be at el Mahrâkah ("the place of burning") at the southeastern end of the Carmel ridge. Some early king of Israel perhaps, or one of the judges (cf Dt 33 19), had built an altar to Jeh above the Kishon (1 K 18 20.40) at Carmel; but, as the water (ver 35) probably came from the river, it is doubtful whether this altar was on the "top of Carmel," 1,500 ft. above, from which Elijah's servant had full view of the sea (vs 42.43). Elijah must have run before Ahab no less than 15 miles, from the nearest point on Carmel (ver 46) to Jezreel, and the journey of the Shunammite woman to find Elisha (2 K 4 25) was equally long. The vineyard of Naboth in Jezreel (1 K 21 1) was perhaps on the east of the city (now Zer'in), where rock-out wine presses exist. In the account of the ascension of Elijah, the expression "went down to Bethel" (2 K 2 2) is difficult, if he went "from Gilgal" (ver 1). The town intended might be Jîyânâ, on a high hill 7 miles N. of Bethel. LXX, however, reads 'they came.'

(3) Places connected with Elisha.—The home of Elisha was at Abel-meholah (1 K 19 16) in the Jordan valley (Jgs 7 22), probably at Ain Huleh, 10 miles S. of Beth-shan. If we suppose that Ophel (2 K 5 24 RVm), where he lived, was the present Afulah, it is not only to understand that he would often "pace by Shunem" (which lay between Ophel and Abel-meholah), but also how Naaman might have gone from the palace of Jezreel to Ophel, and thence to the Jordan and back again to Ophel (vs 6.14.24), in the course of a single day in his chariot. The road down the valley of Jezreel was easy, and up it Jehu afterward drove furiously, coming from Ramoth in Gilead, and visible afar off from the wall of Jezreel (9 20). The top of the asents' (ver 13), at Ramoth, refers no doubt to the high hill on which this city (now Re'mâ) stood as a strong fortress on the border between Israel and the Syrians. The flight of Ahaziah of Judah, from Jezreel was apparently N. by Gur (Kârûn), 4 miles W. of Ibleam (Yebâla), on the road to the "garden house" (Bêt Je'n), and thence by Megiddo (Mo'âz) down the Jordan valley to Jerus (9 27.28). Of the rebellion of Moab (2 K 1 1; 3 4) it is
enough to point out here that King Meshia's account on the M S agrees with the OT, even in the minute detail that "men of Gad dwelt in Ataroth from of old" (cf Nu 32 34), though it lay in the lot of Reuben.

The topographical notices in the books written after the captivity require but short notice. The Benjaminites built up Lod (Luds), Ono (Kofran) and Abu Gosh (Abu), which are found to the south of the list of the hosts of III, a century before the Heb conquest, mentioned in Chronicles (2 Chron 13 16). There is much less information not to be found elsewhere in the OT. His list of Rehoboth's fortresses (2 Chron 11 10) includes 14 towns, most of which were on the frontiers of the diminished kingdom of Judah, some being noticed (such as Shear and Tamar) by Moses in Edom. He speaks of the "valley of Sorekith" (14 10), now Wady Safah, which is otherwise unnoticed, and places it correctly at Mearasha (Mezarsh), on the edge of the Philo plain. He is equally clear about the topography in describing the attack on Jezebel by the Ammonites, Moabites and Edomites. They camped at En-gedi (Cain Jida), and marched W toward Tokha (Takha), to reach an ambiguous spot, after an attempt. Heb victory, was in the valley of Beraea (2 Chron 30 19 20 36), which retains its name as Beka'at, 4 miles W.

IV. Palestine in the Poetic Books of the OT.—In Job the scene is distinctly Edomite. Ub (Job 1 1; cf Gen 22 21 E RV; Jer 25 20; 26 of Job 15 24) are the Assyrian Ezau and Bazu reached by Esarhaddon in 673 BC S. of Edom. Tena and Sheba (Job 6 19) are noticed yet earlier, by Tiglath-pileser III, and Sargon, who conquered the Thamudites and Nabataeans. We have also the connexion of snow-capped mountains and ice (Job 6 16) with notice of the desert and the 'Arabah valley (24 5), which could hardly apply to any region except Edom. Again, we have a nomad population dwelling close to a city (29 4 7)—perhaps, or rather, there were mines, not in the Sinai desert, but at Punon in Northern Edom (cf 28 2 11). The white broom (30 4) is distinctive of the deserts of Moab and Edom. The wild ass and the ostrich (39 13 14) are known only in the desert E. of the Dead Sea, while the stork (39 13 RVm) could have been found only in the 'Arabah, or in the Jordan valley. The wild ox (39 9 RV), or Bos primigenius, is now extinct (LXX "unicorn", Nu 23 22; Dt 33 17), though it abounds in the Jordan valley. It was hunted in the 1330 BC in Syria by Tiglath-pileser I (cf Ps 29 6), and is mentioned as late as the time of Isaiah (34 7) in connection with Edom; its Heb name (ger kau), attached to a representative of the beast, as regards the crocodile ("Leviathan," 41 1), it was evidently well known to the writer, who refers to its strong, musky smell (ver 31), and it existed not only in Egypt but in Pal, and is still found in the Crocodile River, N. of Caesarea in Sharon. Beemoth (40 13), though commonly supposed to be the hippopotamus, is more probably the elephant (on account of its long tail, its trunk, and its habit of feeding in mountains, vs 17 20 24); and the elephant was known to the Assyrians in the 9th cent. BC, and was found wild in the Euphrates in the 16th cent. BC. The physical allusions in Job seem clearly, as a rule, to point to Edom, as do the geographical names; and though Christian tradition in the 4th cent. AD St. Silva, who shared the Urn in the four times of the LXX (42 18) defines it as lying "on the boundary of Edom and Arabia." None of these allusions serves to fix dates, or do the peculiarities of the language, though they suggest Aram. and Arab. influences. The mention of Babyloniens (1 17) (Kasdim) as raiders may, however, point to about 600 BC, since they could not have reached Edom except from the N., and did not appear in Pal between the time of Amraphel (who only reached Kades-harcha) and of Nebuchadrezzar (Ps 10 15) E. of the plateau to 6,700 ft. above sea-level; but there may be a reference to the time of Solomon, being the last in the original collection of 'prayers of David' (ver 20). In Ps 5 8 we find a confederacy of Edom, Ishmael, Moab and the Hagarines (or "wanderers") E. of Pal; (cf 1 Ch 5 18-22) with Gebal (in Lebanon), Ammon, Amaele, and Tyre, all in alliance with Assyria—a condition which first existed in 732 BC, when Tiglath-pileser III conquered Damascus and the Hagarines to the E. (25 1-32) tribes points to this date (ver 3), since this conqueror made captives also in Galilee (2 K 15 20; 1 Ch 5 26; Isa 9 1).

In Prov the allusions are more peaceful, but not geographical. References to Seir occur at (21 15), 12 11 23, to trade (7 16; 31 14 24) and to books (30 1 10). The "unanswerable paradoxes" of 28 8 reads literally, "As he who packs a stone into the stoneyard, so is he that gives or receives gifts." Jerome said that this referred to a superstitious custom; and the erection of stone heaps at graves, or round a sacred place (Gen 41 45 46), is a widely spread and very ancient custom (still preserved by Arabs), each stone being the memorial of a visitor to the spot, who thus honored either a local ghost or demon, or a dead man—a rite which was foolish in the eyes of a Hebrew of the age in which this verse was written (see Expos II, VIII, 590, 524).

The geography of Cant is specially important to a right understanding of this bridal ode of the Syrian princess who was Solomon's first bride.

4. Songs of Solomon. It is not confined, and as it says, to the north, but includes the whole of Pal and Syria. The writer names Kedar in North Arabia (1 5) and Egypt, whence horses came in Solomon's time (1 9 1 K 10 28 29). He knows the henna (Anthemis), and the vineyards of En-geidi (1 14), where vineyards still existed in the 12th cent. AD. He speaks of the "rose" of Sharon (2 1), as well as of Lebanon, with Shenir (Assy. Sziriu) and Homeun (4 5) above Damasc. (7 4). He knows the hilly slopes of Gilead (6 5), and the brown pool, full of small fish, in the brook below Heshbon (7 4), in Moab. The locks of the "peaceful one" (6 13, Vulg pacificae) are like the thick copes of Carmel; the king is sought in the "sage gallery." She is "beautiful as Tirzah (in Samaria), comely as Jerusalem, terrible to look at" (6 4 AV). She is a garden and a "paradise" ("orchard") of spices in Lebanon, some of which spices (calamus, cinnamon, frankincense and myrrh) have come from far lands (4 12-15). Solomon's vineyard—another emblem of the bride—(1 6 8 11) was in Baal-hamon, which some suppose to be Baal-hermon, still famous for its vineyards. He comes to fetch her from the wilderness (5 6); and the dust raised by his followers is like that of a chariot and horse, which stack over the dry plains of Bashan in summer. The single word "paradise" (4 13 m) is hardly enough to establish late date, since—though used in Pers,—its etymology and origin are unknown. The word for "vineyard" is also not Pers (6 11), for the Arab, word Isra, is Sem, and means a "pair," referring to the walnut which abounds in Shechem. The "rose of Sharon" (2 1), according to the Tg, was the white "narcissus"; and the Heb word occurs also in Assy (bahashidad), as noted by Delitzsch (quoting W F, V 32, no 4), referring to a white bulbous plant.
Sharon in spring is covered still with wild narcissi, Arab. buqel (cf Isa 35 1 2). There is perhaps no period when such a poem is more likely to have been written than in the time of Solomon, when Israel "dwelt safely, every man under his vine and under his fig-tree" (1 K 4 25); when the roe and the fallow deer (Cant 2 17; 1 K 4 25) abounded; and when merchants (Cant 3 6) brought "powders" from afar; when also the dominion included Damascus and Southern Lebanon, as well as Western Pal with Gilead and Moab. See also Song of Songs.

V. Palestine in the Prophets.—Isaiah (1 S) likens Zion, when the Assyrian armies were holding Samaria, Moab and Philistia, to "a booth in a vineyard, a lodge in a garden of cucumbers." He refers no doubt to a "tower" (Mt 21 33), or platform, such as is to be found beside the rock-cut wine press in the deserted vineyards of Pal; and such as is still built, for the watchman to stand on, in vineyards and vegetable gardens.

The chief topographical question (10 28–32) refers to the Assyrian advance from the north, when the outposts covered the march through Samaria (whether in 732, 722, or 702 BC) to Philistia. They extended on the left wing to Ai (Hajān), Michmash (Mukhmds), and Geba, S. of the Michmash valley (Jeho), leading to the flight of the villagers, from Ramah (er-Rām) and the region of Gebah—which included Ramah, with Geba (1 S 22 6) and Migron (1 S 14 2) or "the precipice." They were alarmed also at Gallim (Bet Jāda), and Anathoth (Arād), near Jerus; yet the advance ceased at Nob (cf Neh 11 32) where, as before noted, the first glimpse of Zion would be caught if Nob was at or near Mizpah (Tell en Nāṣibeh). The main north road leading W. of Ramah.

Another passage refers to the towns of Moab (Isa 15 1–6), and to Nimrim (Tell NW'mr) and Zoar (Tell shāhār) in the valley of Shittim. The ascent of Luhith (ver 5) is the present Tāat el Heith, on the southern slope of Nebo (Jebel Neba). The curious term "a heifer of three years old" (cf Jer 48 34 m) is taken from LXX, but might better be rendered "a round place with a group of three" (see EGLAITH-SHELISHIYAH). It is noticed with the "high places" of Moab (Isa 15 2; Jer 48 35), and probably refers to one of those large and ancient stone circles, surrounding the central group of three rude pillars, which still remain in Moab (SEP, I, 187, 203, 233) near Nebo and Zoar. Samiah—probably ostrich want of care for her young, because she endeavors (like other birds) to escape, and thus draws away the hunter from the hest. This verse should not be regarded as showing that the author knew that whales were mammals, since the word "sea-monsters" (AV) is more correctly rendered "jackals" (RV) or "wild beasts."

In Ezk (ch 27), Tyre appears as a city with a very widespread trade extending from Asia Minor to Arabia and Egypt, and from Assyria to the isles (or "coasts") of the Mediterranean. The "oaks of Bashan" (27 6; Isa 2 14; Zee 11 2) are still found in the S.W. of that region near Gilead. Judah and Israel then provided wheat, honey, oil and balm for export as in the time of Jacob. Damascus sent white wool and the wine of Helbon (Helbōn), 13 miles N., where fine vineyards still exist. The northern border described (47 15–18) is the same that marked that of the dominions of David, running along the Euphrates River toward Zedad (Sūfa). It is described also in Nu 34 8–11 as passing Riblah (Riblah) and including Ain (el 'Ain), a village on the western slopes of the Anti-Lebanon, E. of Riblah. In this passage (as in Ezk 47 18) the Hauman (or Bashan plain) is excluded from the land of Israel, the border following the Jordan valley, which seems to point to a date earlier than the time when the Havvoth-jair (Nu 32 41; Dt 3 15; Jos
13:30: Jgs 10:4; 1 K 4:13; 1 Ch 2:23), in Gilgal and Bashan, were conquered or built—possibly after the death of Joshua. The southern border of the land is described by Ezekiel (47:19) as extending from Kirjath-jearim (‘Arvah)—probably Bethel—to Tamar, which seems to be Tamarah, 6 miles N.E. of Gaza.

In the Minor Prophets there are fewer topographical notices. Hosea (12:11) speaks of the boundaries of Gilead and Gilgal as being "the heights in the furrows of the fields."

4. Minor Prophets—He perhaps alludes to the large dolmen-fields of this region, which still characterize the country E. of the Jordan. He also perhaps speaks of human sacrifice at Bethel (13:2). In Joel (1:12) the apple tree (Heb. yayŷāh, Arab. buṭṭahl), is noticed (as Cant 2:3 5; 8 5), and there seems to be no reason to doubt that the apple was cultivated, since el Mukaddasi mentions "excellent apples" at Jerus in the 10th century. AD, though it is not now common in Pal. The acyclic fig (Am 7:14), which was common in the plains and in the shdhibbôn (1 K 10:27), grew also near Jericho (Lk 19:4), where it is still to be found. In Mic (1:10-15), a passage which appears to refer to Hezekiah's destruction of the shrines of Bethel and Dan (2 K 23:15), there is mention of going on Gaza before 702 BC (2 K 18:2 8; 2 Ch 28:18) gives a list of places and a play on the name of each. They include Gath (Tell el-Safî), Safir (es Safîr), Lachish (Tell el-Hesî), Agrab (Arab. ‘Akrâb), and Marreshah (Marâshô). The glories of the tube shall not even unto Adullam (‘Aid-el-ma) perhaps refers to Hezekiah himself (Mic 1:15). After the captivity Philistia (Zec 9:5) is still independent. See PHILISTINES. The meaning of the "mound of Hezekiah," called Gihon, is disputed. Jerome (see Reland, Pal Ituat., II, 891) says that the former of these names referred to a town near Jezreel (Maximianopolis, now Ramāneh, on the western side of the plain of Esdraelon), but the mound of an only son was probably a site of the Syrian god called Hadas, or otherwise Rimmon, like the mourning for Tammuz (Ezk 8:14).

VI. Palestine in the Apocalypse.—The Book of Jth is regarded by some (Eusebius, V. 14 20; as Ρωμανός, or legend, written in Heb in 74 AD. It is remarkable, however, that its geographical notices are less accurate than those of other authors.

Juth was apparently the tribe of Ma- ca, though the name, was buried between Dotham (Tell Dothan) and Balnam (in Wady Belâneh), E. of Dothan. Her history is very obscure. She is mentioned (in high hill (6:11.12), 5 miles S.E. of Dothan (SWP, II, 1894, 54), as the "land of Marreshah," the narrative of the above is well met; for this village is supplied only by wells (7:13.20), though there are springs at the foot of the hill to the S. (7:719), while there is a good view over the valley to the N. (10:19), and over the plain of Esdraelon to Nazareth and Tabor. Other mountains surround the village (11:3). The camp of the invaders reached from Dothan to Belaim (Balnam) from W. to E., and their rear was at Oymam (Tell Keimân), at the foot of Carmel. The Babylonians were allied with tribes of Carmel, Gilgal and Galilee on the N. with the Samaritans, and with others from Betanea (probably Beth-anath, now Beit A‘in, N. of Hebron), and with the tribes of S.W. of Beersheba, and Kades (‘Ain Kade), on the way to Egypt. Among Samaritan towns S. of Shechem, Ekrehel (‘Akrahô) and Chisil (‘Kâshû) are mentioned with "the brook Mechunor" (Wady el Hamûne) rising N. of Ekrehel and running E. into the Jordan.

The Biblical Book of Wisd has many references to Pal; and in Eccles the only allusions are to the palm of Emek Da’ud, which is still exist., and to the "rose plant in Jericho" (Ps 14 4 of 39 13; 50 8); the description of the rose in the field, as "the rod of wild, crystal, rises high," is "the rod of donerion (Tстра, NHB, 477), which boughs near the Jordan and grows to the boughs of Gilgal.

Juda Maccaeus.—The first Book of Macca is a valuable history going to 135 BC, and its geographical allusions are sometimes important. Modin, the home of Judas Maccabaeus (2:16), where his brother Simon erected seven monuments visible from the sea (9:19; 20 20-25), was about 20 miles W. of the present village el Mâdîth on the low hills with a sea view, 17 miles from Jerus and 6 miles S. of Lydda, near Yehoshua (Yômôni s.v. "Modeim") places Modin. The first victory of Judas (3:24) was won at Beth-horon, and the second at Emacma (labeled by the Transjordan scenes of Joshua's victories also.

The Green Man attacked to reach Jerus from the S. and were again defeated at Beth-zur (4:29), now Beit-sâûr, on the watershed, 15 miles S. of Jerus, where the road runs through a pass. In the plain of Emmaus (the temple in 165 BC) marched S. of the Dead Sea, attacking the Edomites at Arbatinne (perhaps Akrahôm) and penetrating to the Moabite frontier (3:5-8). On his return to Judae the heathen of Gilgal and Bashan rose against the inhabitants of Tiberias (ver 33) or Tob (Tawîyêbê), and the Phoenicians against the Galilean Hebrews who were, for a time, withdrawn to Jerus. (cf Jph. 15), and was then visible to Jerus. (11 7.69). In the regions of Northern Gilead and Egypt (5:26-37), and in the Upper Galilee they are recorded (Bast), Almea (Kefû el-mo), Casolon (Kisifôn), Maged (perhaps el Mójd, N. of ‘Amân), and Carmain (Asher-karnam), now Tell ‘Ashirâh. The notice of a "brook" at the last-named place (ver 42) is an interesting one. 34 BC Judas was defeated at Basilathâria (6:32), now Beîl Shôra, 9 miles S. of Jerus, but the cause was small. The brook is, at the west end of the town, a fine stream runs through the centre of the town. In 63 BC Judas was defeated at Basilathâria (6:32), now Beîl Shôra, 9 miles S. of Jerus, but the cause was small. The brook is, at the west end of the town, a fine stream runs through the centre of the town.

Thus the districts for the southern border of Samaria were then added to Judaea (10:30; 11:34), namely Syzn, Amairis (or Escrên), now Taïlîyêb, and Ramathem (er-Rââm); and Jonathan defeated the Greeks in Philistia (10 60; 11:6). Simon was "captain," from the village of Tered (or Tekrûr), or the pass N. of Accho, to the borders of the Jordan (11:50), and the Greeks in Upper Galilee were again defeated by Jonathan, who advanced from Gennesaret to the plain of Hazor (Qaz‘ar), and pursued them even to Kedron. Napthali (Kenê), which marches near the Jordan, but in 159 BC the Greeks made peace with Jonathan, who returned to Mehemach (73) and lived another year to Jerus (10 17). This district is the southern border of Samaria, which were then added to Judaea (10:30; 11:34), namely Syzn, Amairis (or Escrên), now Taïlîyêb, and Ramathem (er-Rââm); and Jonathan defeated the Greeks in Philistia (10:60; 11:6). Simon was "captain," from the village of Tered (or Tekrûr), or the pass N. of Accho, to the borders of the Jordan (11:50), and the Greeks in Upper Galilee were again defeated by Jonathan, who advanced from Gennesaret to the plain of Hazor (Qaz‘ar), and pursued them even to Kedron. Napthali (Kenê), which marches near the Jordan, was next (4), and five years later he won a final victory at Cedron (Ketra), near Jemâma (Yeboah), but was murdered at Dok (16:15), near Jericho, which site was a small fort at ‘Ain Dâb, a spring N. of the city.

The second Book of Macca presents a contrast to the first in which, as we have seen, the geography is easily understood, and the site of Cais was with its lake (12:25). It seems to be placed in Dimâmah, and Charax (or Charax) is the lake, and later Galata (ver 17). Ephron, W. of Asher-karnam (vs 26.27), is unknown; and Beth-shemesh is called by its later name a place (or Beth-shemesh) near to Beth-lama (Jgs 1:27) and in Jos (Ant. XII, v. 5:6). 1. A curious passage (8:26-6) seems to record the destruction of some great towers (still used by Parsees), one of which appears to have existed at Berea (Aleppo), though this was not a Greek custom.
Palestine

Jesus expected the Messiah to appear in the home of David (Mic 5:2); and the Northern Bethlehem was not called "of Nazareth," as asserted by Rix (Tent and Testament, 258); this was a conjectural reading by Neubauer (Géog. du Talm., 189), but the Talm (Talm Jerus, M'hillah 1) calls the place Bethlehem-gräd ("of halm"), no doubt from the storax-bush (Styrax officinalis) or stacte (Ex 30:34), the Arab, 'abbar, which still abounds in the oak wood close by.

(1) Galilean scenery.—The greater part of the life of Jesus was spent in Nazareth in Zebulun, and the ministry at Capernaum in Naphtali (cf Mt 4:13-15; Isa 9:1), with yearly visits to Jesus. The Gospel narratives and the symbolism of the parables constantly recall the characteristic features of Galilean scenery and nature, as they remain unchanged today. The "city set on a hill" (Mt 5:14) may be seen in any part of Pal; the lilies of the field grow in all its plains; the "foxes have holes" and the sparrows are still eaten; the vineyard with its tower; the good ploughland, amid stony and thorny places, are all still found throughout the Holy Land. But the deep lake surrounded by precipitous cliffs and subject to sudden storms, with its shoals of fish and its naked fishes; the east nets and dragnet nets and small heavy boats of the Sea of Galilee, are more distinctive of the Gospels, since the lake is but briefly noticed in the OT.

(2) Nazareth was a little village in a hill plateau N. of the plain of Esdraelon, and 1,000 ft. above it.

Traditional Mount of the Precipitation near Nazareth.

Plowing near Nazareth.

The name (Heb náqórûd) may mean "verdant," and it had a fine spring, but it is connected (Mt 2:23) in the Gospels with the prophecy of the "branch" (néger, Is 11:1) of the house of David. Its population was Hebrew, for it possessed a synagogue (Lk 4:16). The "brow of the hill whereon their city was built" (4:29) is traditionally the "hill of the leap" (Jebel Kafés), 2 miles to the S. on a cliff overhanging the plain. Nazareth was not on any great highway; and so obscure was this village that it is unnoticed in the OT, or by Jos, while even a Galilaean (Jn 1:46) could hardly believe that a prophet could come thence. Jerome (Onom s.v.) calls it a "village"; but today it is a town with 4,000 Christians and 2,000 Moslems, the former taking their Arab name (Nasratā) from the home of their Master.

(3) Capernaum (Mt 4:13; 9:1) lay on the shore of the Sea of Galilee, apparently (Mt 14:34; Jn 6:17) in the little plain of Gennesaret, which stretches for 3 miles on the northwest side of the lake, and which has a breadth of 2 miles. It may have stood at the foot of the cliff and been overlooked by the Sin. MS rendering of Mt 11:23—"Shalt thou be exalted unto heaven?"—and it was a military station where taxes were levied (9:9), and possessed a synagogue (Mk 1:21; Lk 4:33; Jn 6:50). Christian tradition, since the 4th cent., AD, has placed the site at Tell Ham, where ruins of a synagogue (probably, however, not older than the 2d cent. AD) exist; but this site is not in the plain of Gennesaret, and is more probably Kaphar 'Āhirim (Talm Bab, Middoth 86n). Jewish tradition (Midrash Koheloth, vii:20) connects Capernaum with mixim or "heretics"—that is to say Christians—whose name may yet linger at 'Āin Mineyeh at the north end of the plain of Gennesaret. Jos states (Bf, III, x, 8) that the spring of Capernaum watered this plain, and contained the can. coronicus which is still found in 'Āin el Mudawwarah ("the round spring"), which is the principal source of water in the Gennesaret oasis.

(4) The site of Chorazin (Kerdah) has never been lost. The ruined village lies about 2 miles N. of Tell Ham and possesses a synagogue of similar character. Bethsaida ("the house of fishing") is once said to have been in Galilee (Jn 12:21), and Rehob (Pet Hlastr., II, 555-55) thought that there were two towns of the name. It is certain that the other notices refer to Bethsaida, called Julias by Herod Philip, which Jos (Ant. XVIII, ii:1; iv:6; Bf, III, x, 7) and Pliny (NH, v:15) place E. of the Jordan, near the place where it enters the Sea of Galilee. The site may be at the ruin of Dikkēh ("the platform"), now 2 miles N. of the lake, but probably nearer of old, as the river deposit has increased southward. There are remains of a synagogue here also. The two miracles of feeding the 5,000 and the 4,000 as both done at E. of the Jordan, the former (Lk 9:10) in the desert (of Golan) "belonging to the city called Bethsaida" (AV). The words (Mk 6:45 AV), "to go to the other side before unto Bethsaida," may be rendered without any straining of grammar, "to go to side opposite to Bethsaida." For the disciples are not said to have reached that city; but, after a voyage of at least 3 or 4 miles (Jn 6:17,19), they arrived near Capernaum, and landed in Gennesaret (Mk 6:53), about 5 miles S.W. of the Jordan.

(5) The place where the swine rushed down a steep slope into the lake (Mt 8:32; Mk 5:1; Lk 8:26) was in the country of the Gerasenes (see Vat. Mis.), probably at Kereon on the eastern shore opposite Tiberias, where there is a steep slope to the water. It should be noted that this was in Decapolis (Mk 5:20), a region of "ten cities" which lay (except Seytopolis) in Southwest Bashan, where a large number of early Gr inscriptions have been found, some of which (e.g. Vogé-Waddington, nos. 2412, 2413) are as old as the 1st cent. AD. There was evidently a Gr population in this region in the time of Our Lord, and his accounts for the feeding of swine, otherwise distinctive of "a far country" (Lk 16:13,15); for, while no Hebrew would have tended swine, the uncleanness which rendered them were swineherds from the time at least of Homer.

(6) The site of Magadan-Magdala (Mejdel) was
on the west shore at the S.W. end of the Genezareth plain (Mt 15:39). In Mk 8:10 we find Dalmanutha instead. Magdala was the Heb migdōl ("tower"), and was probably called "Bēth-magdōl" at that time. This stood at the head of the stream (Mo-jaronk) which runs thence to the sea N. of of Acts Jews, and it was thus a half-way station between Jerusalem and the sea-side capital of Capernaum. It was then called "Rds el Ḫān" ("head of the spring"), and a cistern, built in the 12th cent., stands above the waters. The old Rom road runs close by (SWP, II, 258). Caeasarea was a new town, founded by Herod the Great about 20 BC (SWP, II, 13-29). It was even larger than Joppa, and had its own harbor. 

The Book of Acts the only new site, unnoticed before, is that of Gadir. This stood near the head of the stream (Mo-jaronk) which runs thence to the sea N. of Acts.

(7) Other allusions in the Synoptic Gospels, referring to natural history and customs, include the notice of domestic fowls (Mt 23:37; 25:34), which are never mentioned in the OT. They came from Persia, and were introduced probably after 400 BC. The use of manure (Lk 13:8) is also unnoticed in the OT, but is mentioned in the Mish (Shabbat, i. 2), as is the custom of annually whitening sepulchers (Mt 23:27; Sckalim, i. 1). The removal of a roof ( Mk 2:4; cf Lk 5:19) at Capernaum was not difficult, if it resembled those of modern Arabian houses.

G. The toponymy of the Fourth Gospel is important as indicating the writer's personal knowledge of Pal. He mentions several places not otherwise noticed in the NT.

Fourth Gospel

Beth-abarah, a depending village, was at Bethabara (Jn 1:28, RV "Bethabarah," 10 40), or "the house of the crossing," was beyond the Jordan." Origen rejected the reading "Bethania," instead of Beth-abarah, common in his time, and still found in the third oldest uncial MSS in the 4th and 5th cents. AD. The place was a halting place of journey, and the name of the toponymy (Lk 2:7) may have been that of a "Kāvā," a mile N. of Nazareth. It was two or three days' distance from Bethany near Jerus (Jn 10:40; 11:36-17). and would thus lie in the upper part of the Jordan valley. In 1874, the surveyors found a ford well known by the name "Abārāth, N. of Beisan," in the required situation. John, we are told, baptized "in all the region round about the Jordan" (Mt 3:5), including the waters of Ḥémon near "Bethane" (Jn 3:23). There is only one stream which answers to this description, namely of Wady Fârâh, N.E. of Shechem, on the boundary of Judaea and Samaria, where there is much water." Ḥémon would be "Ḥāmān, 4 miles N. and Salîm is Salīm, 4 miles S. of this perennial affluent of the Jordan.

(2) The site of Sychar (Sam Ḥabar, Arab. Ḥakab) near Jacob's well (Jn 4:5, 6) lay W. of Salim, and just within the Sam border. The present village is only half a mile N. of the well. Like the preceding sites, it is noticed only in the Fourth Gospel, as is Bethesda, while this Gospel also gives additional indications as to the position of Calvary. The town of Ephraim, "near to the wilderness" (11:51), is noticed earlier (2 S 13:29; of Ephraim, 2 Ch 13:19), and the surveyors may be regarded as the Arab. equivalent (D'almânābhy) meaning "the place of high buildings"; so that there is no necessary discrepancy between the two accounts. From this place Jesus again departed by ship to "the other side," and reached Bethsaida (Mt 16:5; Mk 8:13:22), travelling thence up the Jordan valley to Caesarea Philippi (Mt 16:13; Mk 8:27), or Bāniyās, at the Jordan springs. There may be little doubt that the "high mountain apart" (Mt 17:1) the verbal signification "separate," to the solitary temple; and the sudden formation of cloud on the summit seems to explain the allusion in Lk 9:34.

2. Fourth Gospel

Beth-abarah (Jn 1:28, RV "Bethabarah," 10 40), or "the house of the crossing," was beyond the Jordan." Origen rejected the reading "Bethania," instead of Beth-abarah, common in his time, and still found in the third oldest uncial MSS in the 4th and 5th cents. AD. The place was a halting place of journey, and the name of the toponymy (Lk 2:7) may have been that of a "Kāvā," a mile N. of Nazareth. It was two or three days' distance from Bethany near Jerus (Jn 10:40; 11:36-17), and would thus lie in the upper part of the Jordan valley. In 1874, the surveyors found a ford well known by the name "Abārāth, N. of Beisan," in the required situation. John, we are told, baptized "in all the region round about the Jordan" (Mt 3:5), including the waters of Ḥémon near "Bethane" (Jn 3:23). There is only one stream which answers to this description, namely of Wady Fârâh, N.E. of Shechem, on the boundary of Judaea and Samaria, where there is much water." Ḥémon would be "Ḥāmān, 4 miles N. and Salîm is Salīm, 4 miles S. of this perennial affluent of the Jordan.

(2) The site of Sychar (Sam Ḥabar, Arab. Ḥakab) near Jacob's well (Jn 4:5, 6) lay W. of Salim, and just within the Sam border. The present village is only half a mile N. of the well. Like the preceding sites, it is noticed only in the Fourth Gospel, as is Bethesda, while this Gospel also gives additional indications as to the position of Calvary. The town of Ephraim, "near to the wilderness" (11:51), is noticed earlier (2 S 13:29; of Ephraim, 2 Ch 13:19), and the surveyors may be regarded as the Arab. equivalent (D'almanābhy) meaning "the place of high buildings"; so that there is no necessary discrepancy between the two accounts. From this place Jesus again departed by ship to "the other side," and reached Bethsaida (Mt 16:5; Mk 8:13:22), travelling thence up the Jordan valley to Caesarea Philippi (Mt 16:13; Mk 8:27), or Bāniyās, at the Jordan springs. There may be little doubt that the "high mountain apart" (Mt 17:1) the verbal signification "separate," to the solitary temple; and the sudden formation of cloud on the summit seems to explain the allusion in Lk 9:34.
2. Northern Palestine
   (1) Tell Ta‘anek
   (2) Tell el-Mutesellim
   (3) Tell el-Ham
3. Eastern Palestine
4. Central Palestine
   (1) Tell Fajtun
   (2) Samaria
   (3) Ain Shems
   (4) Gezer

Literature

Previous to the last century, almost the entire stock of knowledge concerning ancient Pal, including its races, languages, history and manners, was obtained from Jos and the Bible, with a few brief additional references given by Gr and Rom authors; knowledge concerning modern Pal was limited to the reports of chance travelers. The change has been due largely to the compelling interest taken in sacred history and the "Holy Oracles." This smallest country in the world has aroused the spirit of exploration as no other country has or could. It has largely stimulated many of the investigations carried on in other lands.

I. Era of Preparation.—Much direct information concerning ancient Pal, absolutely essential to the understanding of modern exploration in that country, is contained in the Holy Bible. The book or books of the Bible which have been most carefully studied and commented on by modern scholars are the Books of Genesis and Deuteronomy, the two most ancient, i.e., containing the earliest historical data. The Book of Deuteronomy, in so far as it deals with the history of Israel, has been especially valuable, not only for the event list given in it, but for the light it throws upon the law or laws of the patriarchal period. The events of the Exodus and the period of the Israelites in the desert are, even now, the most obscure chapters in the history of ancient Pal, though the Burnt Offering of the Israelites, and the descent of Moses on Mount Horeb, are subjects about which the Bible, in detail, is silent. The history of the twelve tribes of Israel, as given in the Bible, is the best account we have of them. Only a very few trace of the tribes of Benjamin and Levi, and the two lost tribes, Joseph and Dan, that is, the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, have any information about them. It is a matter of doubt whether the Bible contains the history of the other tribes.

The Book of Deuteronomy, however, contains a large amount of geographically correct information concerning Pal of the time of Moses. The Bible is, therefore, the only ancient source of information concerning Pal which can be relied upon in modern exploration. The Book of Jos, on the other hand, contains a large amount of information concerning Pal of the period of Jos, but the information is less valuable, and the events are not always the same.

II. In Palestine

GEORGE LEUPOLD

The Jewish Bible, and the Christian Bible, are the two main sources of information concerning ancient Pal. The Jewish Bible is the Old Testament, and the Christian Bible is the New Testament. The Jewish Bible contains the history of the Jews, and the Christian Bible contains the history of the Christians. The Jewish Bible is divided into the two parts of the Law and the Prophets, and the Christian Bible is divided into the Gospels and the Epistles.

The Jewish Bible is the most important source of information concerning ancient Pal, as it contains a large amount of information concerning Pal of the period of the Jews. The Christian Bible is also important, as it contains a large amount of information concerning Pal of the period of the Christians.

III. The Importance of the Bible

The Bible is the most important source of information concerning ancient Pal, as it contains a large amount of information concerning Pal of the period of the Jews and Christians. The Bible is the only ancient source of information concerning Pal which can be relied upon in modern exploration.

IV. The Importance of Other Sources

Other sources of information concerning ancient Pal are the ancient monuments, the ruins, the inscriptions, the papyri, the coins, and the documents. These sources of information are of great importance, as they can be used to supplement the information contained in the Bible.

V. The Importance of the Bible and Other Sources

The Bible and other sources of information concerning ancient Pal are of great importance, as they are the only ancient sources of information concerning Pal which can be relied upon in modern exploration. The Bible is the most important source of information concerning ancient Pal, as it contains a large amount of information concerning Pal of the period of the Jews and Christians. Other sources of information concerning ancient Pal are also important, as they can be used to supplement the information contained in the Bible.

VI. The Importance of the Bible in Modern Exploration

The Bible is the most important source of information concerning ancient Pal, as it contains a large amount of information concerning Pal of the period of the Jews and Christians. Other sources of information concerning ancient Pal are also important, as they can be used to supplement the information contained in the Bible. Modern exploration of ancient Pal is based on the information contained in the Bible and other sources of information.
gathering from the multitude of pilgrims between the 8th and 13th centuries. Under the influence of the Crusader
2. Scientific exploration and discovery.

Pal (Exploration) The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia

in the 13th century, John of Ibelin gave a few geographical notices of the area. Theodore
poets, and indeed the wild beasts in the Jordan forests and the customs of the inhabitants. He

draws a clever and well-arranged picture of the various stages of

romans, and the Moslems of the 15th century, and the

entepreneur, one of his chief triumphs being the discovery of

Peters and the scientific location of Mt. Sinai.

(2) The discovery of the tomb of Christ. The climax of

on the moun-
cemeteries, rock-cut tombs and other monuments. He also laid down important criteria for the age of stone masonry (yet see PEFs, 1897, LXI); identified various sites including Adullam, found the "cave Dexib," "Zoeth," etc., and made innumerable plans of churches, tombs, etc., and did an incredible amount of other important work. Capt., afterward Col., C. R. Conder did an equally important work, and as the head of the archaeological party could finally report 10,000 plans, names and geometry, to the Society for Exploration, and 172 new Bible sites successfully identified, while the boundaries of the tribes had been practically settled and many vitally important Bible locations for the first time fixed. The excavations in Jerus under the same auspices had meanwhile been carried out as planned. After an introductory examination by Sir Charles Wilson, including some little excavating, Sir Charles Warren (1867-70) and, later, Col. Conder (1872-75) made thorough excavations over a large area, sinking shafts and following ancient walls to a depth of 80-150 ft. They uncovered the Temple-area from its countless tons of debris and traced its approximate outline; examined underground rock chambers; opened ancient streets; discovered many thousands of specimens of pottery, glass, etc., from Jewish to Byzantine, and the place in the Tyropoeon Valley, where Robinson's arch had rested, and also parts of the ancient bridge; traced the line of several important ancient walls, leading gates and towers, and fixed the date of one wall certainly as of the 8th cent. BC, and probably of the age of Solomon (G. A. Smith), thus accomplishing an epoch-making work upon which all more recent explorers have safely rested—as Mr. Gladstone (1875), in his masterly Memoirs of Alexander the Great, and Guthe (1881), who made fine additional discoveries at Ophel, as well as Warde and Conder in their work afterward (1884), when they published plans of the whole city with its streets, churches, mosques, etc., 25 in. to the mile, which in that direction remains a basis for all later work. See JERUSALEM.

Perhaps, however, the greatest work of all done by this society was the Topographical Survey (1881-88), accomplished for Judaea and Samaria by Col. Conder, and published in large, attractive form, resulting in a great map of Western Pal in 26 sheets, on a scale of an inch to the mile (with several abridged additions), showing all previous identifications of ancient places. These maps, with the seven magnificent folios of Memoirs, and the thousands of feet of scientific work done by the various parties, marked such an epoch-making advance in knowledge that it has been called "the most important contribution to illustrate the Bible since its translation into the vulgar tongue."

In addition to the above the Palestine Exploration Fund established a Quarterly Statement and Society of Biblical Archaeology from which subscribers could keep in touch with the latest Bib results. And has published large quantities of in of ancient texts and travels and of books reporting discoveries as these were made. Altogether more advance was made during these 15 years from 1865-80 than in the 15 centuries before.

The next ten years (1880-90) did not furnish as much new material as from Pal exploration, but in 1880 the Silasam Inscription (of 2 K

3. Most Recent Results in Surface Exploration were scientific discoveries of Eastern Pal. In 1881 H. Clay Trumbull rediscovered and properly described Kadesh-barnae, settling authoritatively its location and thus making it possible to fix previously obscure places mentioned in the account of the Exodus. Excavations in tombs, etc., and new investigations in small districts not adequately described previously have taken place, new additions to the zoological, botanical, geological and meteorological knowledge of Pal have been frequent; studies of irrigation and the water-supply have been made, as well as investigations into the customs, proverbs, folklore, etc., of the Arabs; many districts E. of the Jordan and through Petra down into Sinai have yielded important results, and many discoveries of surface tombs, ossuaries, mosaics, seals and manuscripts have been made in many parts of Pal. This has been done perhaps chiefly by the Palestine Exploration Fund, but much by individuals and some by the newly organized excavation societies (see below). The most surprising discoveries made by this method of surface exploration (a method which can never become completely obsolete) have been the finding at different times of four the Boundary Stones of Gezer (1874, 1881, 1889) by C. F. Hamilton, in 1889, of the very large monolith at Medeba by Father Cleopas, librarian of the Greek Patriarch.

The latter proved to be part of the pavement of a 6th-cent. basilica and is a "veritable map of Pal," showing its chief cities, the boundaries of the tribes, and the city of Jerus with its walls, gates, chief buildings, including the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and chief streets, notably one long straight street intersecting the city and lined with colonnades. As Archeologists are fond of saying, on the ground of Mt. Nebo, it is thought the artist may have intended to represent ideally a modern (6th-cent.) vision of Moses. George Adam Smith (HGHL, 7th ed, 1901); Jerusalem (2 vols, 1910), and E. Huntington, Pal and Its Transformation (1911), have given fine studies illustrating the supreme importance of accurate topographical knowledge in order to understand correctly the Bible narratives and the social life and politics of the Hebrews.

III. Of Scientific Excavation (1) Tell el-Hes (Palestine Exploration Fund) — Excavation must always continue, but excavation 1. Southern is a vast advance. The modern era in Palestinian study begins with Petrie at LACHISH (v.) in 1860. Though Renan was the first to put any excavations into the soil (1860), yet his results were practically confined to Phoenicia. From Renan's time to 1890 there had been no digging whatever, excepting some narrow but thorough work in Jerus, and a slight tickling of the ground at Jericho and the so-called Tombs of the Kings. Nothing was more providential than this delay in beginning extensive excavations in Pal, such as had been previously so profitably conducted in Egypt and elsewhere. The results could not have been interpreted even two years earlier, and even when these excavations were commenced, the only man living who could have understood what he found was the man who had been selected to do the work. Nearly two centuries before, a traveler in Pal (Th. Shaw) had suggested the possibility of certain mounds ("tels") being artificial (cf Josh 6 28; Jer 30 18); but not even Robinson or Guérin had suspected that these were the cenotaphs of buried cities, and had believed them to be mere mannerly cut hour in the history of exploration in Pal, and perhaps in any land, was that in which on a day in April, 1890, W. M. Flinders Petrie climbed up the side of Tell el-Hes, situated on the edge of the Phil plain, e 30 miles S.W. of Jerus, and 17 miles
N.E. from Gaza, and by examining its strata, which had been exposed by the stream cutting down its side, determined before sunset the fact, from Tell el-Hesy that the stratum XIX was a marked city covering 1,000 years of history, the limits of occupation being probably 1500 BC to 500 BC. This ability to date the several occupations of a site without any inscription to assist him was due to the chronological scale of styles of pottery which he had studied earlier and worked out positively for the Gr epochs at Naukratis a year or two before, and for the epochs preceding 1100 BC at Iklhun in the Fayyûm only a month or two before. The potsherds were fortunately very numerous, and Tell el-Hesy, being the only six weeks' work he could date approximately some eight successive occupations of the city, each of these being mutually exclusive in certain important forms of pottery in common use. Given the surface date, depth of accumulation and rate of deposit as shown at Lachish, and a pretty sure estimate of the history of other sites was available. Not only was this pottery scale so brilliantly confirmed and elaborated at Tell el-Hesy that all excavators have been enabled to date the last settlement on a mound almost by walking over it; but by observations of the methods of stone dressing he was able to rectify many former guesses as to the age of buildings and to establish some new architectural supports of age. He has proved that some of the walls at this site were built by "the same school of masons which built the Temple of Solomon," and also that the Iliconic volute, which the Greeks borrowed from the Asians, went back to the 15th cent. BC, while one pilarster he found the architectural motif of the "ram's horn" (cf Ps 118 27). He also concluded, contrary to former belief, that this mound marked the site of Lachish (Josh 10 31; 2 K 18 14), as by a careful examination he found that no other ruins near could fill the known historic conditions of that city, and the inscription found by the next excavator and all more recent research make this conclusion practically sure. Lachish was a great fortress of the ancient world. The Egypt Pharaohs often mention it, and it is represented in a picture on an Assyrian monument, under which is written, "Sennacherib . . . . . . receives the spoil of Lachish" (see 2 Fr 18 14). It was strategically a strong point, the mound rising some 50 ft. above the valley and the fortification which Sennacherib probably attacked being over 10 ft. thick. The debris lay from 50-70 ft. deep on top of the hill. Petrie fixed the directions of the various walls, and settled the approximate dates of each city and of the imported pottery found in several of these. One of the most unexpected things was an iron knife dug up from a stratum indicating a period not far from the time when Israel must have entered Canaan. The earliest form of Gezer's weapons ever found up to this date (cf Josh 17 16).

The next two years of scientific digging (1891-92), admirably conducted by Dr. F. G. Bliss on this site, wholly confirmed Petrie's general inductions, though the limits of each occupation were more exactly fixed and the beginning of the oldest city was pushed back to 1700 BC. The work was conducted under the usual dangers, not only from the Bedawyn, but from excessive heat (104 in the shade), from malaria which at one time prostrated 8 or 10 of the party, and of the early season wars which had to be carried 6 miles, and from the sirocco (see my report, Proc, XXI, 140-70 and Petrie's and Bliss's journal, XXI, 219-46; XXIII, 192, etc). He excavated thoroughly one-third of the entire hill, moving nearly a million cubic feet of debris. He found that the wall of the oldest city was nearly 30 ft. thick, that of the next city 17 ft. thick, while the latest wall was thin and weak. The oldest city covered a space 1,300 ft. sq., the latest only one-third of this. The pottery had a richer color and higher polish than the later, and this art was indigenous, for at this level no Phoen or Mycenaean styles were found. The late pre-Israelitish period (1550-800 BC) shows such imports and also local Canaani limitations. In the "Jewish" period (800-330 BC) this influence is lost and the new styles are coarse and ungraceful, such degeneration not being connected with the entrance of Israel into Canaan, as many have supposed, but with a later period, most probably with the desolation which followed the exile of the ten tribes (Bliss and Petrie). In the pre-Israelite cities were found mighty towers, fine bronze implements, such as battle-axes, spearheads, bracelets, pins, needles, etc, a wine and træche press, one very large building "beautifully symmetrical" a smelting furnace, and finally an inscribed tablet from Zimrida, known previously from the Am Tab to have been governor of Lachish, c 1400 BC. Many Jewish pot ovens were found in the later ruins and incorporated into the larger fortifications, and marks and others with inscriptions. Clay figures of Astarte, the goddess of fertility, were found in the various layers, one of these being of the unique Cypriote type, with large earrings, and many Cypriote figures, symbols and animal forms. See also LACHISH.

(2) Excavations in Jerus.—During 1894-97, notwithstanding the previously good work done in Jerus (see above) and the peculiar embarrassments which then 1011 with the attempt to dig in a richly populated town, Dr. Bliss, assisted by an expert architect, succeeded in adding considerably to the sum of knowledge. He excavated over a large area, not only positively confirming former inductions, but discovering the remains of the wall of the empress Eudokia (450 AD), and under this the line of wall which Titius had destroyed, and at a deeper level the wall which surrounded the city in the Herodian age, and deeper yet that which must probably be dated to Hezekiah, and below this a construction "exquisitely preserved," with walls which must be either the remains of a wall of Solomon or some other preëxille fortification not later than the 8th cent. He found gates and anciently paved streets and manholes leading to ancient sewers and cisterns, and many other places, but esp. settled disputed questions concerning important walls and the levels of the ancient hills, thus fixing the exact topography of the ancient city. H. G. Mitchell and others have also carefully examined certain lines of wall, identifying Nehemiah's Dung Gate, etc, and making a new survey of certain parts of underground Jerus, the results of the entire work being a modification of tradition in a few particulars, but confirmatory in most. The important springs and reservoirs, valleys and hills of the ancient Jerus have been certainly identified. It is now settled that modern Jerus "still sits virtually upon her ancient seat and at much the same slope," though not so large as the Jerus of the kings of Judah which certainly extended over the Southwestern Hill. Mt. Zion, contrary to tradition which locates it on the Southwestern Hill where the citadel stands, probably lay on the Eastern Hill above the Virgin's Spring (Ghion). On this Eastern Hill at Ophel lay the Temple, and S. of the Temple on the same level lay the old Jebusite stronghold (David's City). The ancient altar of burnt offering was almost surely at es-Sakhra. The evidence has not been conclusive as to the line of the second wall, so that the site of Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre cannot certainly

(3) *Excavations in the Shephelah* (Palestine Exploration Fund).—During 1898-1900 important work was done by Bliss and Macalister at 4 sites on the border land between Philistia and Judaea, with five other excavations confined to small mound areas, but without important results. The four chief sites were Tell Zakariya, lying about midway between Jerus and Tell el-Hesay; Tell es-Safi, 5 miles W. of Tell Zakariya, and Tell Sandahannah, about 10 miles S., while Tell ej-Judeidah lay between Tell Zakariya and Tell Sandahannah. As Tell ej-Judeidah was only half-excavated and merely confirmed other results, not being remarkable except for the large quantity of jar inscriptions found (37), we omit further mention of it. (a) Tell Zakariya: From this height, 1,214 ft. above the sea, almost all Philistia could be seen. A pre-Israelitish town was found under some 20 ft. of débris, containing pre-Israelitish, Jewish and Seleucidan pottery. Many vaulted cisterns, partly hewn from the rock, were found in the lowest level. Various large Jewish pit ovens were found and inscribed jar-handles with winged Egyptian symbols, implements of bronze, iron, bone and stone, and Egyptian images of Bes and the Horus eye, etc., besides a strange bronze figure of a woman with a fish's tail which seems to represent the Atargatis of Ashkelon. The ancient rampart was strengthened, perhaps in Rehoboam's time, and towers were added in the Seleucidan era. Only half of this site was excavated. (b) Tell es-Safi. The camp was pitched near here in the Vale of Elah. From a depth of 21 ft. to the rock, was found the characteristic pre-Israelitish pottery and much imported pottery of the Mycenaean type. A high place was also found here, containing boxes of camels, sheep, cows, etc., and several monoliths of soft limestone in situ, and near by a jar-burial. In an ancient rubbish heap many fragments of the goddess of fertility were found. Many old Egyptian and later Gr relics were also found, and four Babylonian seals were found, as was much earlier pre-Israelitish and later pottery. With strong probability this site was identified as Gath. (c) Tell Sandahannah: This was situated c 1,100 ft. above sea-level. The town covered about 6 acres and was protected by an inner and outer wall and multiple town gates. The strongest wall averaged 30 ft. thick. The work done here "was unique in the history of Palestinian excavation" (Bliss). At Tell el-Hesay only one-third of each stratum was excavated; at Tell Zakariya only one-half; at Jerus the work was confined to the enclosures of the temple, a few city walls and a few churches, pools, streets, etc, but at Tell Sandahannah "we recovered almost an entire town, probably the ancient Maresha* (Josh 15:44), with its inner and outer walls, its gates, its streets, etc." (Bliss). Nearly 400 vessels absolutely intact and unbroken were found. It was a Seleucidan town of the 3d and 2d cent. B.C., with no pre-Israelitish remains. The town was built with thin brick, like bits of soft limestone, set with wide joints and laid in mud with occasionally larger, harder stones chisel-picked. The town was roughly divided into blocks of streets, some of the streets being paved. The houses were lighted from the street and an open court was enclosed in the lowest part of the house, while many were of awkward shape. Many closets were found and pit ovens and vaulted cisterns, reached by staircases, as also portions of the old drainage system. The cisterns had plastered floors, and sometimes two heavy coats of plaster on the walls; the houses occasionally had vaulted roofs but usually the ordinary roof of today, made of boards and rushes covered with clay. No religious building was found and no trace of a colonnade, except perhaps a few fragments of ornament. An enormous columbarium was uncovered (1906 niches). No less than 328 Gr inscriptions were found on the handles of imported wine jars. Under the Seleucidan town was a Jewish town built of rubble, the pottery of the usual kind including stamped jar-handles. An Astarte was found in the Jewish or Gr stratum, as also various animal forms. The Astarte was very curious, about 11 in. high, hollow, wearing a long cloak, but with breasts, body and part of right leg bare, having for headdress a closely fitting sunbonnet with a circular serrated top ornament in front and with seven stars in relief. A most striking find dating from about the 2d cent. AD was that of 16 little human figures bound in fetters of lead, iron, etc., undoubtedly representing "revenge dolls" through which the owners hoped to work magic on enemies, and 49 fragments of magical tablets inscribed in Gr on white limestone, with exorcisms, incantations and imprecations. It ought to be added that the four towns as a whole supplement each other, and positively confirm former results. No royal stamps were found at Tell el-Hesay, but 77 were found in these 4 sites, in connection with 2- or 4-winged symbols (Egypt scarabaeus or winged sun-disk). Writing-materials (stylus) were found in all the strata, their use being "continuous times into the Seleucidan period" (Bliss). From the four towns the evolution of the lamp could be traced from the pre-Israelite, through the Jewish to the Gr period. Some 150 of the labyrinthine rock-cut caves of the district were also examined, some of which must be pre-Christian, as in one of these a million cubic feet of material had been excavated, yet so long ago that all signs of the rubbish had been washed away. (A) Painted "Tombs of Marissa."—In 1902 John P. Peters and Hermann Thiersch discovered at Beit Jibrin (adjoining Tell Sandahannah) an example of sepulchral art totally different from any other ever found in Pal. It was a tomb containing several chambers built by a Sidonian, the walls being brilliantly painted, showing a bull, panther, serpent, ibex, crocodile with ibis (?) on its back, hunter on horseback, etc, with dated inscriptions, the earliest being 196 BC (see John P. Peters, *Painted Tombs in Necropolis of Marissa*, 1905). The writer (April 18, 1913) found another tomb here of similar character, decorated with grapes, birds, two cocks (life size), etc. Perhaps most conspicuous was a wreath of beautiful flowers with a cross & in its center. Nothing shows the interrelations of that

Stamped Jar-Handles, Lamp and Iron Implements from Tombs at Beit Jibrin.
age more than this Phoen colony, living in Pal, using the Gr language but employing Egypt and Libyan characteristics freely in their funeral art.

(1) Tell el-Tanenek (Austrian government and Vienna Academy).—During short seasons of three years (1902–4) Professor Ernst Sellin made a rapid examination of this town (Bib. Taannah), situated in the plain of Esdraslon in Northern Pal, on the ancient road between Egypt and peculiarly foreign type, wearing excessively large earrings, and this is in close connection with one of the most unique discoveries ever made in Pal—a hollow terra cotta Can. or Israelite (2 K 16 10) altar (800–600 BC), having no bottom but with holes in its sides, in which what is marked on the craft when fire was kindled below; in its ornamentation showing a mixture of Bab and Egypt motives, having on its right side winged animals with human heads by the side of which is a man (or boy) struggling with a serpent the head of which is widely distended in anger; at its top two ram's (?) horns, and between them a sacrificial bowl in which to receive the “drink offering”; on its front a tree (of life), and on each side of it a rampant ibex. A bronze serpent was found near this altar, as also near the high place at Gезer. Continuous evidence of the gruesome practice of foundation sacrifices, mostly of little children, but in one case of an adult, was found between the 13th and 9th cents. BC, after which they seem to cease. In the house the skeletons of a lady and five children were found, the former with her rings and necklace of gold, five pearls, two scarabs, etc. Many jar-burials of new-born infants, 16 in one place, were found, and, close to this deposit, a rock-hewn altar with a jar of yellow incense (?). Egypt and Bab images were found of different eras and curious little human-looking amulets (as were also found at Lachish) in which the parental parts are prominent, which Sellin and Bliss believe to be “serpulmin”. (Gen 31 19 34;cf. Mackay, Oriental Research, 57, etc.), such as Rachel, being pregnant, took with her to protect her on the hard journey from Haran to Pal (Maacalister).

The high place, with one or more steps leading up to it, suggesting “elevation, isolation and mystery” (Cf. p. 272), was of course near this altar; and on many other Palestinian ruins, and the evidence shows that it continued long after the entrance of Israel into Canaan. When Israel entered Pal, no break occurred in the civilization, the art development continuing at about the same level; so probably the two races were at about the same culture-level, or else the Hebrew occupation of the land was very gradual. In the 8th cent. there seems to have been an indication of the entrance of a different race, which doubtless is due to the curious and interesting discovery that was of the dozen cuneiform tablets found in a terra cotta chest or jar (cf Jer 32 14) from the pre-Israelite city.

These few letters cannot accurately be called “the first literary found in Pal”; but the documents were there, since the personal and comparatively unimportant character of some of these notes and their easy and flowing style prove that less formal documents must have existed. These show that letter-writing was used not only in great questions of state between foreign countries, but in local matters between little contiguous towns, and that while Pal at this period (c 1400 BC) was politically dependent on Egypt, yet Babylonia had maintained its old literary supremacy. One of these letters mentions “the finger of Ashirat,” this deity recalling the “translated” or sacred post of the OT (see Images); another note is written by Abi-Yawi, a name which corresponds to Heb Abir, that is, “well-born,” thus indicating that the form of the Divine name was then known in Canaan, though its meaning (i.e. the essential name of the Lord) remains unknown. Ex 3 16; 16 6; Neh 9 2; Jer 44 20, may not have been known. Abi-Yawi invokes upon Ishaar-washir the blessing of the Lord of the Gods.”

On the same level with these letters were found two subterranean ovens with a wooden box with a lid in front and a rock-hewn altar above, and even the ancient drain which is supposed to have conveyed the blood from the altar into the “chamber of the dead” below. It may be added that Dr. Sellin thinks that the city of which this city is entirely harmonious with the Bible accounts of its history (Josh 13 21; 17 11; Jgs 1 37; 5 19–21; 1 K 4 12; 9 15; 1 Ch 7 29). So far as the ruins testify, there was no settled city life

Interior of Tomb at Marissa.
between c 600 BC and 900 AD, i.e. it became a desolation about the time of the Bah captivity. An Arab castle dates from about the 10th cent. AD.

(2) Tell el-Mutesellim (Megiddo, Josh 12:21; Jgs 5:19; 2 K 9:27).—This great commercial and military center of Northern Pal was opened to the world in 1903-5 by Dr. E. Sellin and his efficient staff. The diggings being conducted under the auspices of His Majesty the Kaiser and the Ger. Pal Society. The mound, about 5 miles N.W. from Tel 'annak, stood prominently 120 ft. above the plain, the ruins being limited to 1.02 acres. An average of 70 diggers were employed for the entire time. The debris was over 33 ft. deep, covering some eight mutually excluding populations. The surrounding wall, 30×35 ft. thick, confirmed itself to the contour of the town. The excavations reached the virgin rock only at one point; but the oldest stratum uncovered showed a people living in houses, having fire, cooking food and making sacrifices; the next city marked an advance, but the third city, proved by its Egypt remains to go back as far as the 20th cent. BC, shows Hebrew presence at a stage indicating a surprising civilization, building magnificent city gates (57×36 ft.), large houses and tombs with vaulted roofs, and adorning their persons with fine scarabs of white and green steatite and other jewelry of bronze. In the very rich colored pottery and little objects such as tools, seals, terra cotta figures and animals, including a bridled horse, and some worked iron is also said to have been found. In one pile of bowldes were two children wearing beautiful bronze bracelets. The city lying above this begins as early as the 16th cent. BC, as is proved by a scarab of Thothmes III and by other signs, although the scarabs, while Egypt in form, are often foreign in design and execution. Anbais, Bethanah and other Egyptian figures appear also 32 scarabs in one pot, much jewelry, including gold ornaments, and some very long, sharp bronze knives. One tomb contained 42 vessels, and one skeleton held 4 gold-mounted scarabs in its hand. One remarkable fragment of pottery contained a colored picture of pre-Israelite warriors with great black beards, carrying shields (?). A most interesting discovery was that of the little copper (bronzes?) tripod supporting lamps, on one of which is the figure of a girl, being strikingly similar to pictures of Delphic oracles and to representations lately found in Crete (MNDPV, 1906, 46). This city was destroyed by a fearful conflagration, and is separated from the next by a heavy stratum of cinders and ashes. The fifth city is a remarkable fact, a splendid palace with walls of stone from 3-5 ft. thick. This city, which probably begins as early as Solomon's time, shows the best masonry. An oval, highly polished seal of jasper on which is engraved a Heb name in script closely resembling the MS. suggests a date for the city, and casts an unexpected light upon the Heb culture of Pal in the days of the monarchy. The seal is equal to the best Egypt or Assyrian work, clearly and beautifully engraved, and showing a climax of art. In the center is the Lion ( SCR), with wide open, tall erect, body tense. Upon the seal is carved: "To Shema, servant of Jeroboam." This name may possibly not refer to either of the Bib. kings (10th or 8th cent. BC), but the stratum favors this dating. The seal was evidently owned by a member of the large, prosperous period when the Jeroboam was in power, and so everything is in favor of this being a relic from the court of one of these kings, probably the latter (Kautzsch, M. u. N., 1904, 81). We have here, in any case, one of the oldest Heb inscriptions known. We find another elegant ever engraved (see MNDPV, 1906, 33). After seeing it the Sultan took it from the museum into his own private collection. A second seal of lapis lazuli, which Schuchmacher and Kautzsch date from about the 7th cent. BC, also contains in Old Heb the name "Ashph" (cf M. u. N., 1906, 334; MNDPV, 1904, 147). There are several other remarkable works of art, as e.g. a woman playing the tambourine, wearing an Egypt headdress; or a series of six terra cotta heads, one with a prominent Sem nose, another with Egypt characteristics, another quite un-Egypt, with regular features, vivacious eyes, curls falling to her shoulders in an area.

The sixth stratum might well be called the temple-city, for here were found the ruins of a sanctuary built of massive blocks in which remained much of the ceremonial furniture—sacrificial dishes, a beautiful basalt pot with three feet, a plate having a handle in the form of a flower, etc. Seemingly connected with the former town, three religious buildings covered by a fourth, and one with a pyramidal top; so here several monoliths were found which would naturally be thought as religious monuments—though, since they have been touched with tools, this is perhaps doubtful (Ex 20:25). One incense altar, carved out of gray stone, is so beautiful as to be worthy of a modern Gr cathedral. The upper floor rests on the stratum. In it some stair-ways in colored pottery, including iron plowshares, larger than the bronze ones in the 20th cent. 4th layers. No buildings were found, which may possibly belong to the former town, representing a man before an altar with his hands raised in adoration, possibly to a sacred animal, such as a 6-pointed star, crescent moon, etc. Another most wonderful seal has a white hard stone with several lines of symbols, in the first a vulture chasing a rabbit; in the second a conventional palm tree, with wings of creatures on one side, and a third a large head, an ibex (?) under the crescent moon. Near by was found a cylinder of black granite, containing hieroglyphs, and much crushed pottery. The 7th city, which was previous to the Gr or Rom eras, shows only a complex of destroyed buildings. After the abandonment, the place remained occupied till the 11th cent. AD, when a poor Arab tower was erected, evidently to protect the passing caravans.

These excavations were specially important in proving the archaeological richness of Pal and the elegance of the native works of art. They were reported with an unexampled minuteness—various drawings of an original design showing the exact place and altitude where every little fragment was found.

(3) Tell 'Ham (Capernaum), etc.—In April and May, 1905, the German Oriental Society excavated a Heb synagogue of the Rom era at Tell 'Ham. It was 78 ft. long by 59 ft. wide, was built of beautiful white limestone, almost equal to marble, and was in every way more magnificent than anything yet found in Pal, that in Chorazin being the next finest. Its roof was gable-shaped and it was surprisingly ornamented with fine carvings representing animals, birds, fruits, flowers, etc., though in some cases these ornamentations had been intentionally mutilated. In January, 1907, Macalister and Masterman proved that Khan Minyeh was not the ancient Capernaum, as it contained no pottery older than Arab time, thus showing Tell 'Ham to be the ancient site, so that the synagogue referred to in Lk 7:29 be the one referred to in Lk 7:5. At Samieh, 6 hours N. of Jerus, two important Can. cemeteries were discovered by the fellahin in 1906, consisting of circular or oval tomb chambers, with roofs roughly dome-shaped. One at Gezer, covering a large quantity of pottery and bronze objects, much of excellent quality, was found (Harvard Theol. Rev., I, 70-96; Masterman, Studies in Gallei; Henson, Researches in Palestine). Jericho (German Oriental Society).—During 1908-9, Dr. E. Sellin, assisted by a specialist in pottery, (Watzinger) and a professional architect (Langenegger), with the help of over 200 workmen, opened to view this famous Bib. city (Josh 6:1-24). Jericho was most strategically situated
at the eastern gateway of Pal, with an unlimited water-supply in the 'Ain es-Sultan, having complete control of the great commercial highway across the Jordan and possessing natural provisions in its palm forest (Smith, *HGHL*). It was also set prominently on a hill rising some 40 ft. above the plain. The excavations proved that from the earliest historic time these natural advantages had been increased by every possible artifice known to ancient engineers, until it had become a veritable Gibraltar. The oldest city, which was in the form of an irregular ellipse, somewhat egg-shaped, with the point at the S.W., was first surrounded with a rampart following the contour of the hill, a rampart so powerful that it commands the admiration of all military experts who have examined it. The walls even in their ruins are some 28 ft. high. They were built in three sections: (a) a substratum of clay, gravel and small stones, making a deposit upon the rock about 3 or 4 ft. deep, somewhat analogous to modern concrete; (b) a rubble wall, 6 to 5 ft. thick, of large stones laid up to a height of 16 ft. upon this conglomerate, the lowest layers of the stone being enormously large; (c) upon all this a brick wall over 6 ft. thick, still remaining, in places, 8 ft. high. Not even Megiddo, famous as a military center throughout all the ancient world, shows such workmanship (cf Josh 2 1; Nu 13 28). "These were masters in stone work and masonry" (The Builder): "Taken as a whole it may justly be regarded as a triumph of engineering skill which a modern city, under the same conditions, could scarcely excite!" (Langenegger): "It is as well done as a brilliant military engineer with the same materials and tools could do today" (Vincent). All the centuries were not able to produce a natural crevice in this fortification. At the N., which was the chief point of danger, and perhaps along other sections also, a second wall was built about 100 ft. inside the first, and almost as strong, while still another defense ("the citadel"), with 265 ft. of frontage, was protected not only by another mighty wall but by a well-constructed glacis. The old pre-Israelite culture in Jericho was exactly similar to that seen in the southern and northern cities, and the idolatry also. In its natural elements Canaan civilization was probably superior to that of the Hebrews, but the repugnant and ever-present polytheism and fear of magic led naturally to brutal and impure manifestations. It cannot be doubted that, at least in some cases, the infants buried in jars under the floors represented foundation sacrifices. Some of the pottery is of great excellence, comparing favorably with almost the best examples from Egypt; a number of decorative figures of animals in relief are specially fine; the bronze utensils are also good; esp. notable are the 22 writing-tablets, all ready to be used but not inscribed. Somewhere near the 15th cent. the old fortifications were seriously damaged, but equally powerful ones replaced them. The German experts all believed that a break in the city's history was clearly shown about the time when, according to the pottery, Israel ought to have captured the city, and it was confidently said that the distinctively Canaanite pottery ceased completely and permanently at this point; but further research has shown that at least a portion of the old town had a practically continuous existence (so Josh 16 7; Jgs 11 16; 3 13; 2 S 10 5). No complete Israelitish house was preserved, but the Israelitish quarter was located close to the spring and no little furniture of the usual kind was found, including dishes, pots, combs, lamps, etc., many iron instruments and terra cotta heads of men and animals. The pottery is quite unlike the old Canaanite, being closely allied to the Gr-Phoen ware of Cyprus. It is noticeable that, as in other Palestinian towns, in the 7th and 6th cent. some little influence is discernible; the Assyrian and Egyptian influence is not as marked as in the cities dug up near the Mediterranean coast. One large edifice (60 by 80 ft.) is so like the dwellings of the 7th cent. B.C., that it has been named "the Syrian palace" (Vincent). Absolutely unique was the series of 12 Rhodian hand-carvings stamped in Aram. "To Jehovah" (Yah, Yahweh). Vincent has suggested that as during the monarchy (7th to 6th cent.) "To the King" meant probably "For His Majesty's Service," so in post-exilic time the Divine name meant "For the Temple" (Rev. biblique). After the exile the city had about 3 centuries of prosperity; but disappears permanently in the Maccabean era (*MDP*, 1907; *MDQ*, 1908-9; *PEPS*, 1910; *Rev. biblique*, 1907-9).

(1) Jerusalem.—See above, III, 1, (2).

(2) Samaria (Harvard Expedition).—Although the ancient capital of the Northern Kingdom, yet Samaria was centrally located, being 4. Central 20 miles from the Mediterranean coast and only about 30 miles N. of Jerusalem. Ancient Samaria was very famous in Israel for its frivolity and wealth, special mention being made of its palace of music, luxurious couches, and its "ivory palace" (Am 6 4-6; 1 K 16 14). Its history is known so fully that the chronological sequences of the ruins can be determined easily. The Citadel and town originally lay on the hill, with the Temple of Baal and palace were constructions of Ahab (1 K 16 32; 22 39); it continued prosperous down to the Assyrian exile, 722 BC (1 K 22 to 2 K 17); Sargon and Esarhaddon established a Babylon colony and presumably fortified the town (720-670 BC); Alexander the Great captured it in 331 BC, and established there a Syriac-Maccabean colony; it was destroyed by John Hyrcanus in 109 BC, but rebuilt by Pompey in 60 BC, and again by Herod (90-1 BC). All of these periods are identified in the excavations, Herod's work being easily recognized, and Josephus' description of the town being found correct; the Gr work is equally well defined, so that the lower layers of masonry which contained the characteristic Jewish pottery, and which in every part of the ruin lay immediately under the Bab and Gr buildings, must necessarily be Heb, the relative order of underlying structures thus being "beyond dispute" (Reisner). During the 1908-9 expedition, Reisner, with a staff of specialists, including David G. Lyon of the Harvard Semitic Museum, G. Schumacher, and an expert architect, undertook systematically and thoroughly to excavate this large detached "tell" lying 350 ft. above
the valley and 1,450 ft. above sea-level, its location as the only possible strategic stronghold proving it to be the ancient Samaria. This was a "gigantic enterprise" because of the large village of 800 population, which covered the hill. Some $65,000 were spent during the two seasons, and the work finally ceased before the site was fully excavated. The following statement is an abridgment, in so far as possible in their words, of the official reports of Dr. Reissner and to the Harvard Theological Review: An average of 285 diggers were employed the first season and from 280-60 the second. Hundreds of Arabian lamps, etc., were found close to the surface, and then nothing more until the Rom ruins. Many fine Rom columns still remained upright, upon the surface of the hill. The road of columns leading to the Forum and ornamental gate (oriented unlike the older gates), the great outer wall "20 stadiin in circuit" (Jos), the hippodrome, etc., were all found with inscriptions or coins and pottery of the early Roman Empire. Even the old Rom chariot road leading into the Forum was identified. Adjoining the Forum and connected with it by a wide doorway was a basilica, consisting of a large open stone-paved court surrounded by a colonnade with a colonnade on each side. An architrave from a Greek architrave in the courtyard dates this to 12-15 AD. The plan of the Herodian temple consisted of a stairway, a portico, a vestibule and a cella with a corridor on each side. The staircase was about 80 ft. wide, composed of 17 steps beautifully constructed, the steps being quite modern in style, each tread overlapping the next lower by several inches. The roof was arched and the walls very massive and covered with a heavy coat of plaster still remaining traces of columns of Cubic Drusian marble found near here, and 150 "Rhodian" stamped amphora handles and many fragments of Lat inscriptions. A complete inscription on a large stele proved to be a dedication from some Pannonian soldiers (probably 2d or 3d cent. AD) to "Jupiter Optimus Maximus." Near this was found a torso of heroic size carved in white marble, which is much finer than any ever discovered before in Pal, the work "bringing to mind the Vatican Augustus" (Vincent), though not equal to it. Gr in front of the statue was a Rom altar (presumably Herodian) c 13 by 7 ft., rising in six courses of stone to a height of 6 ft. Beneath the Rom city was a Seleucid town (c 300-108 BC), with its fortifications, gates, and streets, temples, public buildings and a complex of private houses, in connection with which was a large bath house, with mosaic floor, hot and cold baths, water closet, etc., which was heated by a furnace. Underneath the Gr walls, which were connected with the well-known red figured Gr ware of c 400 BC, were brick structures and very thick fortress walls built in receding courses of small stones in the Bab style. In the filling of the construction trench of this Bab wall were found Israelite vases. A few Gr seals with some inscriptions, and 1 fragment of a cuneiform tablet. Below these Bab constructions "there is a series of massive walls beautifully built of large limestone blocks founded on rock and forming a part of one great building which can be no other than the Jewish palace." It consisted of "great open courts surrounded by small rooms, comparable in plan and even in size with the Bab palaces and is certainly royal in size and architecture." Its massive outlines which for the first time in Israel modern work. Masonry of an Israelite palace show that unexpected material resources and technical skill were at the command of the kings of Israel. An even greater discovery was made when on the palace hill was found an alabaster vase inscribed with the cartouche of Osorkon II of Egypt (874-853 BC), Ahab's contemporary; and at the same level, about 75 fragments of pottery, not jar-handle but ostraca, inscribed with records or memorials in ancient Hebrew. The script is Phoenician, and is sent to such experts as Lyon and Driver, practically identical with that of the Siloam Inscription (c 700 BC) and MS (c 850 BC). "The inscriptions are written in ink with a reed pen in an easy flowing hand and show a pleasing contrast to the stiff forms of Phoen inscriptions cut in stone. The graceful curves give evidence of a skill which comes only with long practice" (Lyon). The ink is well preserved, the writing is distinct, the words are divided by dots or strokes, and with two exceptions all the ostraca are dated, the reigning king probably being Ahab. The following samples represent the ordinary memoranda: "In the 11th year. From 'Abi'tezer. For 'Ashi, Akhelemelek (and Ba'al). From 'Elathan (?). . . . in 9th yr. From Yasat. For 'Abi'mam. A jar of old wine. . . . in 11th yr. For Badyo. The vineyard of the Tell." Baal and El form a part of several of the proper names, as also the Heb Divine name, the latter occurring naturally not in its full form, YHWH, but as ordinary in compounds with it. For the dates see Rev., 1911, 79-83. In a list of 30 proper names all but three have Bib. equivalents. "They are the earliest specimens of Heb writing which have been found, and in amount they exceed by far all known ancient Heb inscriptions; moreover, they are the first Palestinian records of this nature to be found" (see esp. Lyon, op. cit., I, 70-96; II, 102-13; III, 136-38; IV, 136-43; Reissner ib, III, 246-63; also Theol. Literar., 1911, 23-27; Rev. biblique, VI, 435-45). (3) 'Atin Shems (Beth-shemesh, 1 S 6:1-21; 2 K 14.11). In a short but important campaign, during 1911-12, in which from 86 to 167 workmen were employed, Dr. D. Mackenzie uncovered a massive double gate and primitive walls 12-15 ft. high, with mighty bastions, and found in later deposits Gr images, Syrian Astaries, imported Aegean vases and a remarkable series of inscribed "royal jar-heads" in the form of a "goose to the archy" (Vincent), as also what seemed to be an ancient Sem tomb with facade entrance. The proved Cretan relations here are esp. important. The town was suddenly destroyed, probably in the era of Seti's successor (PEFS, 1911, LXXIX, 172; 1912, XII, 145). (4) Gezer (Palestine Exploration Fund).—Tell e-Jezar occupies a conspicuous position, over 250 ft. above the plain, and 750 ft. sea level, on a ridge of hills some 20 miles N.W. of Jerua over-looking the plain toward Jaffa, which is 17 miles distant. It is in plain sight of the two chief trade caravans of Southern Pal which it controlled. The ancient Gezer was well known from many references to it in the N.T., the Book of Kings, the Epistle of Barnabas, etc. As a center of 13th century BC and 12th century BC, Gezer is known from the name of several governors of Gezer being given in letters dating from c 1400 BC and Menephtah (c 1200 BC) calling himself "Binder of Gezer," etc. The discovery of the boundary stones of Gezer (see above) positively identified it. It was thoroughly excavated by R. A. Stewart Macalister in 1902-5, 1907-9, during which time 10,000 photographs were made of objects found. No explorations have been so long continued on one spot or have brought more unique discoveries, among which are six dividing monuments of Palestinian culture and religion, and none have been reported as fully (Excavations of Gezer, 1912, 3 vols; Hist of Civilization in Pal, 1912). Ten periods are recognized as being distinctly marked in the history of the mound—which broadly
Pal (Exploration)  THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA  2232

speaking represents the development in all parts of Pal: (a) pre-Sem period (c 3000-2500 BC), to the entrance of the first Semites; (b) first Sem city (c 2500-1800 BC), to the end of the XIIth Egypt Dynasty; (c) second Sem city (c 1800-1400 BC), to the end of the XVIIIth Egypt Dynasty; (d) these periods continued (1400-1000 BC) to the beginning of the Hebrew monarchy; (e) fourth Sem city (c 1000-550 BC), to the destruction of the monarchy and the Bab exile; (f) Pers and Hel period (550-100 BC), to the beginning of the Rom dominion; (g) this period (100 BC-350 AD); (h) Byzantine (350-600 AD); (i) and (j) early and modern Arabian (350 AD to the present). The last four periods have left few important memorials and may be omitted from review.

(a) The Neolithic non-Sem inhabitants of Gezer were troglodytes (Gen 14:7) living in the caves of a honeycomb district (of ZDPY, 1909, VI, 12), modiﬁed for domestic purposes for hours within a small area 5 ft. 4 in. to 5 ft. 7 in. in height, slender in form, with rather broad heads and thick skulls, who hunted, kept and raised domestic animals, and wove and spun wool, and cooked food; possessed no metals, made by hand a porous and gritty soft-baked pottery which they decorated with simple lines and found in large quantities of about a yard high and long by 24 ft. and in the bodies were burned with evidence of a ritual. The cup made in the rocks suggest possible religious rites; in close connection with these markings were certain remains, including bones of swine (cf Lev 11:7).

(b) The Semites who displaced this population were more advanced in civilization, having stone tools and potter's wheels, with ﬁner and more varied pottery; they were a heavier race, being 5 ft. 7 in. to 5 ft. 11 in. in stature, large-headed, broad-faced, with jaws and teeth large, and remarkable of all were their works of engineering. They built enormous structures, square, rectangular and circular. One of the soft chalk and limestone rocks, of which consisted 60 chambers, one chamber being 40 ft. long by 30 ft. wide, was a tomb which was made c 2000 BC, passing out of use c 1540-1250 BC, and which shows the power of these Early Philistines. The tomb was 200-350 ft. in circumference, being a runway cut through the rock of some 47 ft. to an inner hall, 12 ft. high and 8 ft. in thickness, which led to a long sloping passage of equal dimensions, with the arch having a vaulted roof and the sides well plumb. This led into a bed of much harder rock, where dimensions were reduced and the workmanship was poorer, but ultimately reached, about 130 ft. below the present surface of the ground, an enormous living chamber of such depth that the excavators could not empty it of the soft mud with which it was ﬁlled. A well-cut but well-worn and battered stone staircase, over 12 ft. high, connects the upper and lower sections of the tunnel 94 ft. above. Beyond the spring was a natural cave 80 ft. by 25 ft. Dr. Macalister asks, "Did a Canaanite governor plan and Canaanite workmen execute this vast work? How did the ancient engineers discover the plan answer?" Certainly the tunnel was designed to bring the entrance of the water passage within the courtyard protected by the palace wall.

Another great reservoir, 57 by 40 ft., at another part of the city was squared in the rock to a depth of 29 ft. and below this another one of equal depth but not so large, and narrowing toward the bottom. These were over ﬁlled with layers of cement and surrounded by a wall; they would hold 60,000 gallons.

(c) The second Sem city, built on the ruins of the first, was smaller. Here were fewer buildings but larger rooms. The potter's wheel was worked, pottery becomes much ﬁner, better styles and decoration reaching a climax of grace and refinement. Foreign trade begins in this period and almost or quite reaches its culmination. The Hyksos scarabs found here prove that under their rule (XVth and XVIth Dynasties) there was close intercourse with Pal, and the multitudes of Egypt articles show that this was also true before and after the Hyksos. The Cretan and Phoenician trade, esp. the latter, introduced new art ideas which soon brought local attempts at imitation. Scribes implements for writing in wax and clay begin here and are found in all strata hereafter.

While the pottery is elaborately painted, it is but little modeled. The potter "combed" it. (Possibly) "combed" it, and it disappears, while garnished ornament reaches high-water mark. Another distinctive feature of this period is the elaborately modeled and stuck on; but it is insufﬁcient art. Burials still occur in natural caves, but also in stone masonry. Mummies were deposited on the floor without coffins, generally in a crouching posture, and stones are laid around and over them without system. Drink offerings always and food offerings generally are placed with the dead. Scarabs are found with the skeletons, and ornaments of bronze and silver, occasionally gold and beads, and sometimes even a chain. Lamps also begin to be deposited, but in small numbers.

(d) During this period Menephtah "spoiled Gezer," and Israel established itself in Canaan.

The excavations have given no hint of Menephtah's raid, unless it be found in an ivy pectoral bearing his cartouche. About 1400 BC a great wall, 4 ft. thick, was built of large and well-shaped stones and protected later by particularly fine towers, perhaps, as Macalister suggests, by the Pharaoh who captured Gezer and gave it as a dowry to his daughter, wife of King Solomon. A curious fact, which seemingly illustrates Josh 18:10, is the large increase of the town shortly after the Heb invasion. "The houses are smaller and more crowded and the sacred area of the high place is built over." There is no indication of an exclusively Israelite population around the city outside. (Macalister, v. Driver, Modern Research, 69). That land was taken for building purposes from the old sacred enclosure, and that new ideas in building plans and more heavily fortified buildings were now introduced have been thought to suggest the entrance among the ancient population of another element with different ideas. The finest palace of this period with very thick walls (3-9 ft.) carefully laid out at right angles, and certainly built near "the time of the Heb invasion," was perhaps the residence of Horam (Josh 10:33). At this period Early first are found (10 being found here, as against 28 in the next period, and 31 in the Hellenistic) and also iron tools; the use of the carpenter's compass is proved, the bow drill was probably in use, bronze and iron nails appear (wrought iron being fairly common from e 1000 BC); a cooking-pot of bronze was found, and spoons of shell and bronze; modern methods of making buttons and button holes are found from this period; pottery buttons being introduced in the next city. One incantation to the alliance between Gezer and Lachish (Josh 10:33) finds unexpected illustration from the fact that a kind of pottery peculiar to Lachish, not having
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been found in any other of the Southern Palestinian towns, was found at Gezer. The pottery here in general shows the same method of construction as in the 3d stratum, but the decoration and shapes deteriorate, while there is practically no molding. It shows much the same foreign influence as before, the styles being affected from Egypt, Crete, the Aegean, and esp. Cyprus. From this period come 218 scarabs, 68 from the period previous and 93 from the period following. Ornamental colored specimens of imported Egyptian glass also occur, clear glass not being found till the next period. Little intercourse is proved with Babylon at this era as against 16 Bab cylinders found in the previous period, only 4 were found in this and 15 in the next period. There is no marked change in the method of disposing of the dead, but the food vessels are of smaller size and are placed in the graves in greater numbers, most of these being broken either through the use of poor vessels because of economy or with the idea of liberating the spirit of the object that it might serve the deceased in the spirit world. Lamps are common now in every town but there is a marked decrease in the quantity and value of ornamental objects. Religious emblems occur but rarely. The worship of Astarte (see Ashtoreth), the female consort of Baal, is most popular at this era, terra cotta figures and plaques of this goddess being found in many towns and in large numbers. It is suggestive that these grow notably less in the next stratum. It is also notable that primitive idols are certainly often intentionally ugly (Vincent). So to this day Arab women cover their heads with a veil.

C) This period, during which almost the entire prophetic lit. was produced, is of peculiar interest. Gezer at this time as at every other period was in general appearance like a modern Arab village, a huge mass of crooked, narrow, airless streets, shut inside a thick wall, with no trace of sanitary conveniences, with huge cisterns in which dead men could lie undetected for centuries, and with no sewers. Even in the Maccabean time the only sewer found ran, not into a cesspool, but into the ground, close to the governor's palace. The mortuary pile was excessively high, few old men being found in the cemetery, while curvature of the spine, syphilis, brain disease, and esp. broken, unset bones were common. Tweezers, pins, pendants, rings, mirrors, perfume boxes, scrapers (for baths) were common in this stratum and in all that follow it, while we have also here silver earrings, bracelets and other beautiful ornaments with the first sign of clear glass objects; tools also of many kinds of stone, bronze and iron, an iron hoe just like the modern one, and the first known pulley of bronze. The multitude of Heb weights found here have thrown much new light on the weight-standards of Pal (see esp. Macalister, Gezer, II, 287-90, E. J. Pyle, PEPS, 1912; A. R. S. Kenyon, Expedition, XXIV). The pottery was poor in quality, clumsy and coarse in shape and ornament, excepting as it was imported, the local Aegean imitations being unworthy. Combed ornament was not common, and the burned as a rule was limited to random scratches. Multiple lamps became common, and a large variety of styles in small jars was introduced. The motives of the last period survive, but in a degenerate form. The hard frieze so characteristic of the 3d Temp period disappear. The scarab stamp goes out of use, but the impressions of other seals "now become fairly common as potter's marks." These consist either of simple devices (stars, pendants, etc) or of names in Cn. Heb script. These Heb-inscription stamps were found at many sites and consist of two classes, (i) those containing personal names, such as Azariah, Hagga, Menahem, Shebaniah, etc, (ii) those which are confined to four names, often repeated—Hebron, Socoh, Zipp, Manshith—in connection with a reference to the king, e.g. "For [or Of] the king of Hebron." These latter date, according to Dr. Macalister's final judgment, from the Pers period. He still thinks they represent the names of various potters' guilds in Pal (cf. 1 Ch 2, 4, 5, and see esp. Bible Side-Lights from Gezer, 150, etc), but others suppose these names to represent the local measures of capacity, which differed in these various districts; others that these represented guilds of potters, whose wares would be used and bought. At any rate, we certainly have here the work of the king's potters referred to in 1 Ch 4 23. Another very curious Heb tablet inscription is the so-called Zodiacal Tablet, on which the signs of the Zodiac are figured with certain other symbols which were at first supposed to express some esoteric magical or religious meaning, but which seem only to represent the ancient agricultural year with the proper months indicated for sowing and reaping—being the same as the modern seasons and crops excepting that flax was cultivated anciently. An even more important literary memorial from this period consists of two cuneiform tablets written about three-quarters of a century after the Ten Tribes had been carried to Assyria and foreign colonies had been thrown into Israelite territory. This collapse of the Northern Kingdom was not marked by any local catastrophe, so far as the ruins indicate, any more than the mass of the KINGDOM of the Assyrians from Israel entered Pal; but soon afterward we find an Assyrian colony settled in Gezer "using the Assyrian language and letters, etc, and carrying on business with Assyrian methods." In one tablet (649 BC), which is a bill of sale for certain land in the town of Ziph, the language, appearing the name of the buyer, seals of seller and signature of 12 witnesses, one of whom is the Egyptian governor of the new town, another an Assyrian noble whose name precedes that of the governor, and still another a Western Asiatic, the others being Assyrian. It is a Hebrew "Nethaniah," who the next year, as the other tablet shows, sells his field, his seal bearing upon it a lunar stellar emblem. Notwithstanding the acknowledged literary work of high quality produced in Pal during this period, no other hint of this is found clear down to the Gr period except in one neo-Bab tablet. The burials in this period were much as previously, excepting that the caves were smaller and toward the end of the period the shelves around the walls received the bodies. In one Sem tomb as many as 150 vessels were found. Quite the most astonishing discovery at this level was that of several tombs which scholars generally agree to be "Philistine." They were not native Canaanite, but certainly Aegean intruders with relations with Crete and Cyprus, such as we would expect the Philistines to have (see PHILISTINES). The tombs were
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oblong or rectangular, covered with large horizontal slabs, each tomb containing but a single body, ascribed, and these were only covered with a sheet of alabaster and silver about her, and wearing a Cretan silver mouth plate; another was a man of Simon's body, a large oblong vessel, 3 ft. long and 2 ft. broad and 1 ft. 2 in. deep, which is differently interpreted as being the block upon which the 'Heb ébôth, may have been erected, or as an altar, or perhaps a laver for ablutions. Inside the sacred enclosure was found a small bronze cobra (2 K 18 4), and also the entrance to an ancient cave, where probably oracles were given, the excavators finding that this cave was connected with another by a small, secret passage—through which presumably the message was delivered. In the stratum underlying the high place was a cemetery of infants buried in large jars. "That the sacrificed infants were the firstborn, devoted in the temple, is indicated by the fact that none were over a week old" (Macalister). In all the Sem strata bones of children were also found in corners of the houses, the deposits being identical with infant burials in the high place; and examination showed that these were not stillborn children. At least some of the burials under the house thresholds and under the foundations of walls carry with them the mute proofs of this most gruesome practice. In one place the skeleton of an old woman was found in a corner where a hole had been left just large enough for this purpose. A youth of about 18 had been cut in two at the waist and only the upper part of his body deposited. Before the coming into Pal of the Israelites, a lamp began to be placed under the walls and foundations, probably symbolically to take the place of human sacrifice. A lamp and bowl deposit under the threshold, etc., begins in the 3rd Sem period, but is rare till the middle of that period. In the 4th Sem period it is common, though not universal; in the Hellenic it almost disappears. Macalister suspects that these bowls held blood or grape juice. In one striking case a bronze figure was found in place of a body. Baskets full of phalli were carried away from the high place. Various types of the Astarte were found at Gezer. When we see the strength and popularity of this religion against which the prophets contended in Canaan, "we are amazed at the survival of this world-religion," and we now see "why Ezra and Nehemiah were forced to raise the fence of the law" against this heathenism, which did in fact overwhelm all other Sem religions" (George Adam Smith, P E F S, 1906, 288).

(f) During the Maccabean epoch the people of Gezer built reservoirs (one having a capacity of 4,000,000 gallons) used well-paved rooms, favored complex house plans with pillars, the courtyard becoming less important as compared with the rooms, though domestic bowls were now for the first time introduced. The architectural decorations have all been annihilated (as elsewhere in Pal) excepting a few molded stones and an Ionic volute from a palace, supposed to be that of Simon Maccabaeus because of the references in Jos and because of a scribbled impression found in the courtyard: "May fire overtake [?] Simon's palace." This is the only inscription from all these post-exilic centuries, to which so much of the beautiful Bible lit., is ascribed, excepting one grotesque animal figure on which is screwed a name which looks a little like "Antiochus." Only a few scraps of Gr bowls, some Rhodian jar-handles, a few bronze and iron arrow heads, a few animal figures and a fragment of an Astarte, of doubtful chronology, remain from these four centuries. The potsherds prove that foreign imports continued and that the local potters followed classic models and did excellent work. The ware was always burnished hard; combed ornament and burnishing were out of style; molded ornament was usually confined to the rope design; painted decorations were rare; potter's marks were generally in Gr, though some were in Heb, the letters being of late form, and no names appearing similar to those found in Scripture. The tombs were well-cut square chambers, with shafts hewn in the rock for the bodies, usually nine to each tomb, which were cut into them head foremost. The doorways were well cut, the covers almost always being mov-
able flat slabs, though in one case a swinging stone door was found—circular rolling stones or the "false doors" so often found in the Jerus tombs being unknown here. Little shrines were erected above the forecourt or vestibule. When the body decayed, the bones in tombs having these kakhin, shafts, were collected into ossuaries, the inscriptions on these ossuaries showing clearly the transition from Old He to the square character. After the Maccabean time the town was deserted, though a small Jewish community lived here in the 4th cent. AD. See also GEZER.

LITERATURE.—Most important recent monographs: Publications of Palestine Exploration Fund, esp. Survey of Western Pal (9 vols., 1884); Survey of Eastern Pal (2 vols., 1889); "Pal Pilgrim's Text Society's Library" (13 vols) and the books of W. M. Flinders Petrie, F. J. Bliss and R. A. S. Macalister; also Bliss, Development of Pal Exploration (1906), and Macalister, Bible Side-Lights from the Mound of Gezer (1900); Ernst Sellin, Tell Ta'an'ne (1904); Eine Nachlaß auf dem Tell Ta'an'ne (1905); C. Steuernagel, Tell el-Mutesellim (1898); Mommert, Tell el-Mutesellim (1905); H. Guite, Bibliothas (1911).

Most important periodicals: PEFS; ZDPV; Mitteilungen und Nachrichten des deutschen Palästina-Vereins; Palästina-Jahrbuch (MNDP); Revue Biblique.

Most important general works: L. B. Palen, Early History of Syria and Pal (1902); Quinet, Syria, Liban et Pal (1896-1900); H. V. Hilprecht, Explorations in Bible Land during the 19th Cent. (1905); H. Vincent, Canaan, d'apris l'exploration recente (1907); G. A. Smith, Jerus (1908); S. R. Driver, Modern Research as Illustrating the Bible (1909).

CAMEL M. COBERN

PALLU, pal'6, PALLUTES, pal'-tis (Stg., pal'th, 'distinguished'): A son of Reuben (Gen 46 6 "Phallu"); Ex 5 14; Nu 26 5.8; 1 Ch 5 3). Perhaps Peleth of Nu 16 1 is the same. Pallutes, the patronymic, occurs in Nu 26 5.

PALM, pām (OF THE HAND) (יָד, yôd): The Heb word which is used in a variety of senses (see HAND; FAW) is usually tr3 (hand) in EV, but the tr "palm" is found in 5 passages of the OT, in 3 of which the Heb text adds the word "yôd, ("hand.") 1 S 5 4; 2 K 9 35; Dnl 10 10). It would properly mean the "hollow hand" (root kaphph, "to bend," "to break," etc.), which receives or grasps things. It is therefore used in reference to filling the priest's hands with sacrificial portions (Lev 14 15.16). The palms of the hands of Dagon are mentioned as cut off, when the idol was found mutilated in the presence of the ark of Jeh (1 S 6 4), from which many people inferred that this deity was represented with hands spread out in blessing, as we find in numerous Bab representations of divinities.

In a beautiful metaphor God answers the repentant people of Jerus, who thought Jeh had forgotten and forsaken them: "Behold, I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands" (Isa 49 16; see also Ecles 18 3). Daniel is touched upon the palms of his hands to wake him from sleep (Dnl 10 10).

In the NT we find the phrase, "to smite with the palms of hands," as a τρόπος in the Gr th rhópsa, rhópsos (Mt 21 9; 20 19; Mk 11 9; 11 11; 11 7); see also 5 19; 1 X X X Hos 11 1; 1 Esd 4 30), and, derived from the same vb., δωευσα, rhópsa, a blow of the palm on the cheek, etc (Mk 14 65; Jn 18 22; 19 3, where, however, in EV the word "palm" has not been given). The marginal tr "to smite or strike with the palms" (Mt 21 19; 11 57; Jn 18 22; 19 3) and "strokes of rod" (Mk 14 65 m) does not seem to be applicable to the Gr text of the OT and NT, while it is a frequent meaning of the words in classical language. It would therefore be better to eliminate these marginal additions.

H. L. E. LINERING

PALM TREE, pām'trē (ποιμ, dāmār, same as the Aram. and Ethiopic, but in Arab. = "date"); φοίνιξ, phóiniz (Ex 15 27; Lev 23 40; Nu 33 9; Dt 34 3; Jgs 1 16; 3 13; 2 Ch 28 15; Neh 8 15; Ps 92 12; Cant 7 7 f; Joel 1 12); tāmer, Deborah "dwelt under the palm-tree" (Jgs 4 5); "they are like a palm-tree in [m"pillar"], of turned work" (Jer 10 5); הַתָּנָר, tāmarâd [only in pl.], the palm tree as an architectural feature (1 K 6 29.32.35; 7 36; 2 Ch 3 5; Ezk 40 16]; Gr only Ecles 50 12; Jn 12 13; Rev 7 9): The palm, Phoenix dactylifera (N.O. Palmae), Arab. nakẖl, is a tree which from the earliest times has been associated with the Sem peoples. In Arabia, the very existence of man depends largely upon its presence, and many authorities consider this to have been its original habitat. It is only natural that such a tree should have been sacred both there and in Assyria in the earliest ages. In Pal the palm leaf appears as an ornament upon pottery as back as 1800 BC (cf PEFS, Gezer Memoirs 1, 172). In Egypt the tall palm stem forms a constant feature in early architecture, and among the Hebrews it was extensively used as a decoration of the temple (1 K 6 29.32.35; 7 36; 2 Ch 3 5). It is a symbol of beauty (Cant 7 7) and of the righteous man: "The righteous shall flourish like the palm-tree: He shall grow like a cedar in Lebanon. They are planted in the house of Jehovah; They shall flourish in the courts of our God. They shall still bring forth fruit in old age; They shall be full of sap and growth" (Ps 92 12-14).

The palm tree or branch is used extensively on Jewish coinage and most noticeably appears as a symbol of the land upon the celebrated Judaea Capta coins of Vespasian. A couple of centuries or so later it forms a prominent architectural feature in the ornamentation of the Galilean synagogues, e.g., at Tell Hal (Capernaum). The method of artificial fertilization of the pistillate (female) flowers by means of the staminate (male) flowers appears to have been known in the earliest historic times. Winged figures are depicted on some of the early Assyra sculptures shaking a bunch of the male flowers over the female for the same purpose as the people of modern Gaza ascend the tall trunks of the fruit-bearing palms and tie among the female flowers a bunch of the pollen-bearing male flowers.

Date Palm with Fruit (at Jaffa).
In Pal today the palm is much neglected; there are few groves except along the coast, e.g. at the bay of Akka, Jaffa and Gaza; solitary palms occur all over the land in the ancient courts of mosques (cf Ps 92 13). Abundance and houses even in the mountains. In Palestine once palms flourished upon the mount of Olives (Neh 8 15), and Jericho was long known as the "city of palm-trees" (Dt 34 3; Jgs 1 16; 3 13; Jos, Ib, IV, viii, 2-3), but today the only palms are scarce and small; under its name Hazzazon-tamar (2 Ch 20 2), En-gedi would appear to have been as much a place of palms in ancient days as we know it was in later history. A city too, called Tamar ("date palm") appears to have been somewhere near the southwestern corner of the Dead Sea (Ezk 47 19; 48 28). Today the numerous salt-encrusted stumps of wild palm trees washed up all along the shores of the Dead Sea witness to the existence of these trees within recent times in some of the deep valleys around.

Branches of palms have been symbolically associated with several different ideas. A palm branch is used in Isa 9 14; 19 15 to signify the "head" of the highest of the people, as contrasted with the rush, the "tail," or humblest of the people. Palm branches appear from early times to have been associated with rejoicing. On the first day of the Feast of Tabernacles the Hebrews were commanded to take branches of palms, with other trees, and rejoice before God (Lev 23 40; cf Neh 8 15; 2 Macc 10 7). The palm branch still forms the chief feature of the lulabb carried daily by every pious Jew to the synagogue, during the feast. Later it was connected with the idea of triumph and victory. Simon Maccabeus entered the Akra at Jerusalem after its capture, "with thanksgiving, and branches of palm trees, and with harps and cymbals, and with songs and hymns; because there was destroyed a great enemy out of Israel" (1 Macc 13 51 AV; cf 2 Macc 10 7). The same idea comes out in the use of palm branches by the multitudes who escorted Jesus to Jerusalem (Jn 12 13) and also in the vision of the "great multitude, which no man could number ... standing before the ... Lamb, arrayed in white robes, and palms in their hands" (Rev 7 9). Today palms are carried in every Moslem funeral procession and are laid on the new-made grave.

So also Tamar as a proper name.

E. W. G. Masterman

PALMER-WORM, Pām'ēr-wārn (272, jāzān; LXX καμήλ, kammēlem; Am 4 9; Joel 1 4; 2 255): "Palm-worm" means "eaterpillar," but the insect meant is probably a kind of locust. See Insect; Locust.

PALSY, pōl'zi, PARALYSIS, par-al'i-sis (παράλυσις, paralúsis): The Eng. word "palsy" is derived from the Gr. paralysis, which in Middle Eng. was shortened into palese, the form in which it appears in Wyclif's version. In the 16th cent. it appears as "palsy," the form used in AV. This, however, is seldom used at the present day, the Latinized Gr form "paralysis" being more frequently employed, both in modern literature and in colloquial Eng. "Sick of the palsy" is the tr either of the adj. para-
times; one of them, called the Kimax or the Ladder, with its broad stair-like steps 2,000 ft. high, may still be seen on the high land which was once called “Pisidia,” but which the Romans, in 70 AD, made a part of Pamphylia.

Pamphylia, unless in pre-historic times, was never an independent kingdom; it was subject successively to Lydia, Persia, Macedon, and Rome. Because of its comparatively isolated position, civilization was less developed than in the neighboring countries, and the Asiatic influence was at most times stronger than the Gr. As early as the 6th cent. B.C. a Gr. colony settled there, but the Gr. language which was spoken in some of its cities soon became corrupted; the Gr. inscriptions, appearing upon the coins of that age, were written in a peculiar character, and before the time of Alexander the Great, Gr. ceased to be spoken. Perga then became an important city and the center of the Asiatic religion, of which the Artemis of Perga, locally known as Leot, was the goddess. Coins were struck also in that city. Somewhat later the Gr. City of Attaleia, which was founded by the Ptolemies (159–188 B.C.), rose to importance, and until recent years has been the chief port of entry on the southern coast of Asia Minor. About the beginning of our era, Side became the chief city, and issued a long and beautiful series of coins, making possible to facilitate trade with the pirates who found there a favorable market for their booty. Pamphylia is mentioned as one of the recipients of the “letters” of 1 Mac 15 23.

Christianity was first introduced to Pamphylia by Paul and Barnabas (Acts 13 13; 14 24), but because their stay in the country was brief, or because of the difficulty of communication with the neighboring countries, or because of the Asiatic character of the population, it was slow in being established. See also Attalia; Perga; Side, the chief cities of Pamphylia.

E. J. BANKS

PAN: Name of a utensil used in the preparation or the serving of food, and representing several words in the original. Passing over the use of the word in connections like 1 Ch 9 31, “things baked in pans,” where the Heb word ḫabbāthin refers, not to the pan itself, but to the cakes baked in the flat pan or griddle which was called mōḥāth (Ex 27 23; 1 K 7 50, etc.), we see that we have been used to carry burning coals, we note the following words:

1. ḫōṭḥāḇ, mōḥāḥth, “pan” AV, “baking-pan” RV, a dish of uncertain shape and size which was used in the preparation of the minḥāḥ, or vegetable offering. See Lev 2 5; 6 21; 7 9; 1 Ch 23 29.

2. Ḫēḡōr, rendered “pan” in 1 S 2 14. The same word is used in the phrase, “pan of fire” RV, “hearth of fire” AV (Zec 12 6); and it is also trd “laver” in the descriptions of the furnishing of tabernacle and temple (Ex 30 18; 1 K 7 20, etc.). As it held water and was used for boiling meat and the like, it must have been a kind of pot or kettle.

3. Ḫōṭḥāḇ, masērāth (2 S 13 9). The connection gives no clue as to shape or size except that it must have been small enough to serve food in, and of the proper shape to hold a substance which could be poured out. Some authorities suggest a connection with the root Ḫōr, 5th sgr, “leave,” and think that this pan was the kneading-trough in shape.

4. Ḫēḡōr, sgr, rendered “pan” in Ex 27 3 AV, “pot” RV (see Port).

5. Ḫōṭḥāḇ, pārār, “pan” in Nu 11 8 AV, “pot” RV (see Port).

6. Ḫōṭḥāḇ, ṣēlābhāḥ (2 Ch 35 13). Some kind of dish or pot. Slightly different forms of the same root are rendered “cruse” in the Vulgate, “diah” (2 K 21 13 [cāllāḥāth]; and also in RV in Prov 19 24; 26 15, instead of the probably incorrect “bosom” of AV.

7. Ḫēḡō or, lēbēs, trd “pan” in 1 Esd 1 12 AV (“cauldron”).

8. Ḫēḡō’, ṣāghōn, 2 Mac 7 35, with the vb. Ḫēḡō, ṣāghō, ṣāghō, ver 5, is the usual Gr word for “frying-pan,” but here a large sheet of metal must be meant (cf 4 Mac 8 13; 12 10 20).

LITERATURE—Whitehouse, Primer of Hebrew Antiquities, 76, 77; Benzing, Hebräische Archäologie, 70, 71; Nowack, Hebräische Archäologie, 1, 144.

WALTER R. BETTGEREON

PANNAG, pan’aq (םענ, pannagq: kar‘ia, kasia; Ezk 27 17 m, “Perhaps a kind of confection”): One of the articles of commerce of Judah and Israel. The kasia of the LXX is said to be a similar shrub to the laurel. Nothing is known of the nature of pannag. Cheyne (EB, 3565) thinks the Heb letters have got misplaced and should be קק קק קק, gophen, “vine,” and he would join it to the יִּבְבַּי, “wine,” which follows in the verse, giving a tr “grape honey,” the ordinary ḫabb of Pal.—an extremely likely article of commerce. See Honey.

PANOPLY, pan’o- pli: 1 Mac 13 29 RVm. See Armor.

PAP (פָּפ, shabd, ?w, shōdāh, “breast” [Ezk 23 21]; μαστός, masōs, “the breast” [Lk 11 27; 25 29; Rev 1 13]). The Eng. word, which goes back to Middle Eng. “pappe” (see Skeat, Concise Etymological Dict. of the Eng. Language, 327) and is now obsolete, has been replaced in RV by “breast.” The Heb word signifies the “female breast”; the Gr word has a wider signification, including the male chest.

PAPER, pā’ pēr. See Crafts, II, 13; Papyrus; Reed; Writing.

PAPER REEDS, rēdā: In Isa 19 7 AV (RV “meadows”).

PAPHOS, pā’ fōs: The name of two towns, Old (Ἀλάξα Ἀλάξα, Palæa Paphos, Ἀλάξανδρα, Palaipaphos) and New Paphos (Νέος, Néos Paphos), situated at the southwestern extremity of Cyprus. Considerable confusion is caused by the use of the single name Paphos in ancient writers to denote now one, now the other, of these cities. That referred to in Acts 13 6 13 is strictly called New Paphos (modern Bafio), and lay on the coast about a mile S. of the modern Ktima and some 10 miles N.W. of the old city. The latter (modern Ktikia) is situated on an eminence more than a mile from the sea, on the left bank of the Diakirio, probably the ancient Bocarus.

It was founded by Cinyras, the father of Adonis, or, according to another legend, by Acras, and was regarded as the capital of the most important kingdom in Cyprus except that of Old Salamis. Its territory embraced Paphos a considerable portion of Western Cyprus, extending northward to that of Soli, southward to that of Galatia, and eastward to the range of Troodos. Among its last kings was Nicodem, who ruled shortly after the death of Alexander the Great. In 310 BC Nicotan of Salamis, who had been set over the whole of Cyprus by
Ptolemy I of Egypt, was forced to put an end to his life at Paphos for plotting with Antigonus (Diodorus xx. 21, who wrongly gives the name as Nicocles; see note on the Roman Agrippa), and it is from that time Paphos remained under Egyptian rule until the Roman annexation of Cyprus in 58 BC. The growth of New Paphos brought with it the decline of the old city, which was also ruined by successive earthquakes. Yet its temple still retained much of its old fame, and in 69 AD Titus, the future emperor of Rome, turned aside on his journey to Jerusalem, which he was to capture in the following year, to visit the sacred shrine and to inquire of the priests into the fortune which awaited the island (Tacitus Hist. ii. 24; Suetonius Titus 5).

New Paphos, originally the seaport of the old town, was founded, according to tradition, by Agapenor of Arcadia (Hid. ii.600; Hid. iii.520); its possession of a good harbor secured its prosperity, and it had several rich temples. According to Dio Cassius (iv.23) it was restored by Augustus in 15 BC after a destructive earthquake and received the name Augustoa (Or Schol. on the Roman Agrippa), which was the the administrative capital of the island and the seat of the governor. The extent remains all date from this period and include those of public buildings, private houses, city walls and the moles of the harbor.

The sanctuary of Paphos, the source of its fame was the local cult, of which the kings and their descendants remained hereditary priests down to the Roman seizure of Cyprus. The goddess, identified with the Greek Aphaia, was said to have risen from the sea at Paphos, was in reality a Nature-goddess, closely resembling the Bab Ishtar and the Phoen Astarte, a native deity of Asia Minor and the Aegean Islands. Her cult can be traced back at Paphos to Homeric times (Odyssey vii.362) and was repeatedly celebrated by Gr and Lat poets (Aeschylus Suppl. 555; Aristoph. Lys. 833; Virgil Aen. i.415; Horace Odes i.19 and 30; iii.20; Statius Silvae i.2, 101, etc.). The goddess was represented, not by a statue in human form, but by a white conical stone (Max. Tyr. viii.8; Tacitus Hist. ii.3; Servius Ad Aen. i.724), of which models were on sale for the benefit of pilgrims (Athenaeus xxv.18); her worship was spread further afield and she is referred to by Athenais as the dedication of lust (Contra Gentes 9). Excavation has brought to light at Old Paphos a complex of buildings belonging to Rom times and consisting of an open court with chambers or colonnades on three sides and an entrance on the E. only, the whole forming a quadrilateral enclosure with sides about 210 ft. long. In this court may have stood the altar, or altars, of incense (Homer speaks of a single altar, Virgil of "a hundred altars warm with incense"; a good might be shed thereon, and although it stood in the open it was "wet by no rain" (Tacitus, 1c.; Pliny, NH, ii.210). On the south side are the ruins of another building, possibly an earlier temple, now almost destroyed save for the western wall (Journal of Hellenic Studies, 193-224). But the fact that no remains or inscriptions have been found here earlier than the Rom occupation of Cyprus militates against the view that the sanctuary stood at this spot from prehistoric times. Its site may be sought at some distance to the south of Kouklia (D. G. Hogarth, Times, August 5, 1910), or possibly on the plateau of Rachhantì, some 3 miles S.E. of the village, where numerous inscriptions in the old Cyprian syllabic script were found in the summer of 1910 (M. Olmefalsch-Richer, Times, July 12, 1910).

After visiting Salamis and passing through the whole island, about 100 miles in length, Barnabas, Paul and Mark reached Paphos, the 5. The Apostle Barnabas of the Rom proconsul, Apostles' Sergius Paulus (for the title see Visit Cyprus). Here too they would doubtless begin by preaching in the synagogue, but the governor—who is probably the same Paulus whose name appears as proconsul in an inscription of Soli (D. G. Hogarth, Devia Cyprus, 114)—hearing of their mission, sent for and questioned them on the subject of their preaching. A Jew named Bar-Jesus or Elymas, who, as a Magian or exorcist, was known as "the sorcerer," presumably as a member of his suite, used all his powers of persuasion to prevent his patron from giving his adherence to the new faith, and was met by Paul (it is at this point that the name is first introduced) with a seething denunciation and a sentence of temporary loss of sight. The blindness which at once fell on him produced a deep impression on the mind of the proconsul, who professed his faith in the apostolic teaching. From Paphos, Paul and his companions sailed, as Tacitus tells us, "to the island of Crete," a weekly direction to Pergamum Pamphylia (Acts 15 6-13).

Paul did not revisit Paphos, but we may feel confident that Barnabas and Mark would return there on their 2d missionary journey (Acts 15 39). Of the later history of the Paphos church little is known. Tycho, Paul's companion, is said to have been martyred there, and Jerome tells us that Hilarion sought in the neighborhood of the decayed and almost deserted town the quiet and retirement which he craved. (Vita Hieron. 42). The Acts Barnabas speak of a certain Rhoden, who was attached to the temple service at Old Paphos, as having accepted the Christian faith.

LITERATURE—Besides the works already referred to see Journal of Hellenic Studies, 175-92 citation of passages from ancient authors relating to Old Paphos, together with a list of medival and modern authorities, 235-71 (inscriptions and combs), and the bibliography appended to INT. CYPRUS.

MARCUS N. TOD


A marsh or water plant, abundant in Egypt in ancient times, serving many purposes in antiquity. The papyrus tuft was the emblem of the Northern Kingdom in Egypt. Like the lotus, it suggested one of the favorite capitals of Egypt architecture. Ropes, sandals, and mats were made from its fibers (see Odyssey xxi.391; Herod. ii.37, 69), and bundles of the long, light stalks were bound together into light boats (Isa 18 2; Breasted, Hist Egyptians, 91).

Most importantly, from it was made the tough and inexpensive paper which was used from very ancient times in Egypt and which 1. Papyrus Paper became the common writing-material. Paper of the cellular pith of the long triangular papyrus stalk was stripped of its bark or rind and sliced into thin strips. Two layers of these strips were laid at right angles to each other, paste between (Pliny, says with the air of a secret). The sheets thus formed were
ΤΕΛΕΙΩΤΑΙ ΑΛΛΑ
ΟΛΟΝ ΕΙΛΗΙ ΕΙΩΥ
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ΛΕΥΤΕΡΟΤΑΙ ΡΑ

ΠΑΠΑΙ ΧΑΙΡΙΟΤΟΥ
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ΚΑΠΑΝ ΣΟΝΤΙ ΝΑ

ΑΛΦΕΙ ΣΩΤΗΡΑΥ

ANCIENT MANU
..
Egypt papyrus rolls are in existence dating from the 27th cent. BC, and no doubt the manufacture of papyrus had been practised for centuries before. The Egypt rolls were sometimes of great length and were often beautifully decorated with colored vignettes (Book of the Dead). Egypt docu-

ments of great historical value have been preserved on these fragile rolls. The Papyrus Ebers of the 16th cent. BC sums up the medical lore of the Egyptians of the time of Amenhotep I. The Papyrus Harris, 133 ft. long, in 117 columns, dates from the middle of the 12th cent. BC and records the benefactions and achievements of Ramses III. For the XIXth, XXth and XXIst dynasties, indeed, papyrus are relatively numerous, and their contribution important for Egypt history, life and religion. By the year 1000 BC, papyrus had doubtless come to be used for writing far beyond the limits of Egypt. The Wenamon Papyrus (11th cent.) relates that 500 rolls of papyrus were among the gifts sent from the Delta to the Prince of Biblus, but except in the rarest instances papyrus have escaped destruction only in Upper Egypt, where climatic conditions esp. favored their preservation.

In very recent years (1895, 1904, 1907) several Aram. papyri have been found on the island of Elephantine, just below the First Cat-

aract, dating from 494 to 400 BC.

Papyrus

They show that between 470 and 408 BC a flourishing colony of Jews existed there, doing business under Pers away, and wor-

shipped their god Yahwot not in a synagogue, but in a temple, in which they offered meal offerings, incense and burnt offerings. In 408, the Egyptians had destroyed their temple at Yot, and the Jews appealed for address to the Pers governor. It is well known that some Jews had taken refuge in Egypt in 586 BC, taking the prophet Jeremiah with them, and with some such band of refugees the Yeh colony may have originated, although it may have been much older (cf Jer 44 1.15; 2 Macc. XXIX, 1907, 305 ft.; XXXI, 448 ft.; chief publications by Euting, Bayce and Cowley, and esp. Sachau, Drei aramische Papyrusurkunden aus Elephantine, 2d ed, 1908; Aramische Papyrus und Ostroaka, 1911).

The first important discovery of Gr papyri made in modern times was among the ruins of Heracleanum, near Naples, where in 1752 the Papyrus Antiquorum.

In 1820 another body of papyri was found by natives, buried, it was said, in an earthen pot, on the site of the Serapeum at Memphis, just above Cairo. These came from the most part of the year 155 BC. They fell into various hands, and are now in the museums of London, Paris, Leyden, Rome and Dresden. With them the stream of papyri began to flow steadily into the British and Continental museums. In 1821 an Englishman, Mr. W. J. Bankes, bought an Elephantine roll of the xxvith book of the Itiad, the first Gr literary papyrus to be derived from Egypt. The efforts of Mr. Harris and others in 1847-50 brought to England considerable parts of lost orations of Hyperides, new papyri at the xxvith book of the Itiad, and parts of Itiad ii, iii, ix. In 1855 Mariette purchased a fragment of Alcman for the Louvre, and in 1856 Mr. Stobart obtained the funeral oration of Hyperides.

The present period of papyrus recovery dates from 1877, when an immense mass of Gr and other papyri, for the most part documentary, not literary, was found in the Fayum, on the site of the ancient Asinoeo. The bulk of this collection passed into the hands of Archchuke Rainer Vienna, minor portions of it being secured by the museums of Paris, London, Oxford and Berlin. These belong largely to the Byzantine period. Another great find was made in 1892 in the Fayum; most of these
went to Berlin, some few to the British Museum, Vienna and Geneva. These were mostly of the Rom period.

It will be seen that most of these discoveries were the work of natives, digging about indiscriminately in the hope of finding antiquities to sell to tourists or dealers. By this time, however, the Egypt Exploration Fund had begun its operations in Egypt, and Professor Flinders Petrie was at work there. Digging among Ptolemaic tombs at Gurob in 1889-90, Professor Petrie found many mummies, or mummy-casings, adorned with breast-pieces and sandals made of papyri pasted together. The separation of these was naturally a tedious and delicate task, and the papyri when extricated were often badly damaged or mutilated; but the Petrie papyri, as they were called, were hailed by scholars as the most important found up to that time, for they came for the most part from the 3d cent. BC. Startling acquisitions were made about this time by representatives of the British Museum and the Louvre. The British Museum secured papyri of the lost work of Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens, the lost Mines of Herodas, a fragment of an oration of Hyperides, and extensive literary papyri of works already extant; while the Louvre secured the larger part of the Oration against Athenogenes, the masterpiece of Hyperides. In 1894 Bernard P. Grenfell, of Oxford, appeared in Egypt, working with Professor Petrie in his excavations, and securing papyri with Mr. Hogarth for England. In that year Petrie and Grenfell obtained from native dealers papyrus rolls, one more than 40 ft. in length, preserving revenue laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus, dated in 259-258 BC. These were published in 1896 by Mr. Grenfell, the first of many important works in this field from his pen.

With Arthur S. Hunt, of Oxford, Mr. Grenfell excavated in 1896-97, at Bohness, the Rom Oxyrhynchus, and unearthed the greatest mass of Greek papyri of the Rom period thus far found. In 9 large quarto volumes, aggregating 3,000 pages, only a beginning has been made of publishing these Oxyrhynchus texts, which number thousands and are in many cases of great importance. The story of papyrus digging in Egypt since the great find of 1896-97 is largely the record of the work of Grenfell and Hunt. At Tebtunis, in the Fayum, in 1900, they found a great mass of Ptolemaic papyri, comparable in importance with their great discovery at Oxyrhynchus. One of the most productive sources of papyri at Tebtunis was the crocodile cemetery, in which many mummies of the sacred crocodiles were found rolled in papyrus. Important Ptolemaic texts were found in 1902 at Hibeh, and a later visit to Oxyrhynchus in 1903 produced results almost as astonishing and quite as valuable as those of the first excavations there. The work of Rubensohn at Abusir in 1906 has exceptional interest, as it developed the first considerable body of Alexandrian papyri that has been found. The soil and climate of Alexandria are destructive to papyri, and only to the fact that these had anciently been carried off into the interior as rubbish is their preservation due. Hogarth, Jouguet, Wileken and other Continental scholars have excavated in Egypt for papyri with varying degrees of success. The papyri are found in graves a few feet below the surface, in house ruins over which sand has drifted, or occasionally in carthen pots buried in the ground. Despite government efforts to stop indiscriminate
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native digging, papyri in considerable quantities have continued to find their way into the hands of native dealers, and thence into English, Continental, and even American collections.

Thus far upward of 650 literary papyri, great and small, of works other than Bib. have been published. The fact that about one-third of these are Homeric attests the great popularity enjoyed by the Homeric poems in Gr-Rom times. These are now so abundant and extensive as to make an important contribution to the Homeric text. Rather less than one-third preserve works of other ancient writers which were already known to us through later copies, mediaeval or modern. Among these are works of Plato, Demosthenes, Isocrates, Thucydides, Euripides, Sophocles, Aeschines, Herodotus and others. Rather more than one-third preserve works, or fragments of works, which have been either quite unknown or, oftener, regarded as lost. Such are portions of Aleman and Sappho, fragments of the comedies of Menander and the iambic of Callimachus, Mimes of Herodas, poems of Bacchylides, parts of the lost Antiope and Hypsipyle of Euripides, Aristotle On the Constitution of Athens, the Periochae of Timotheus (in a papyrus of the 4th cent. BC, probably the oldest Gr book in the world), and six orations, one of them complete, of Hyperides. In 1906 Grenfell and Hunt discovered at Oxyrhynchus the unique papyrus of the lost Paean of Pindar, in 380 fragments, besides the Hellenic of Theopompos (or Cratinus?), whose works were believed to have perished.

Of the Gr OT (LXX) more than 20 papyri have been discovered. Perhaps the most important of these is the Berlin Genesis (3d or 4th cent.) 1 in a cursive hand, purchased at Akhmim in 1906. Other papyri preserving parts of Gen among the Amherst (2), British Museum (3), and Oxyrhynchus (4), papyri date from the 3d or 4th cent. A Bodleian papyrus leaf (6) (7th or 8th cent.) preserves Cant. 1-6. An Amherst papyrus (6) (7th cent.) contains Job 1:21; 2:3. There are several papyri of parts of the Ps. An Amherst papyrus (7) (5th or 6th cent.) has Ps 5-6-12. Brit. Mus. 37 (Fragmenta Londinensis, 6th or 7th cent.) (8), of thirty leaves, contains Ps 10:2-18:6 and 20:14-34:6. This was purchased in 1836 and is one of the longest of Bib. papyri. Brit. Mus. 230 (9) (3d cent.) preserves Ps 12:7-15:4. A Berlin papyrus (10) contains Ps 40:20-41:4. Oxyrhynchus papyrus 845 (11) (4th or 5th cent.) contains parts of Ps 65, 70. Another Amherst papyrus (12) (7th cent.) shows parts of Ps 108, 118, 135, 138-140. There is also a papyrus at Leipzig (13) which contains part of the Ps. Of the Prophets the chief papyrus is the Heidelberg codex (14) (7th cent.), which contains Zec 4:6-Mal 4:5. Oxyrhynchus 846 (15) (6th cent.) contains Am 2. A Rainer papyrus (16) (3d cent.) preserves Isa 38-3:13-16, and a Bodleian (17) (3d cent.) shows Exk 5:12-6:3. The Rylands papyri include Dt 2:3 (18) (4th cent.); Job 1:5, 6 (19) (6th or 7th cent.); Ps 90 (20) (5th or 6th cent.). Recent Oxyrhynchus volumes supply parts of Ex 21, 22, 40 (21, 22) (3d cent., O.P. 1074, 1075); and of Gen 16:23 (3d cent., O.P. 1160), and 31:24 (4th cent., O.P. 1187). The great antiquity of some of
these documents gives especial interest to their readings. Twenty-three papyri containing parts of the Gr NT have thus far been published, nearly half of them coming from Oxyrhynchus (O.P. 2, 208, 209, 402, 457, 1058, 1009, 1078, 10, 23, 14, 7), the pieces range in date from the 3d to the 6th cent. Their locations, dates and contents are:

1. Philadelphia, Pa. 3d or 4th cent. Mt 1 1-9, 12.
3. Vienna. 6th cent. Lk 7 56-55; 10 34-42.
5. Cambridge, Mass. 4th or 5th cent. Jn 4 1-12.
7. St. Petersburg. 5th cent. 1 Cor 1 17-20; 6 13.
16. Berlin Pap. 13,269 (7th cent.) is a liturgical paraphrase of Jn.
17. Further details as to nos. 1-14 may be found in Gregory, Papyri, 1056-92, and for nos. 1-20 in Kenyon, Handbook to Text. Crit., or Milligan, NT Documents, 249-54.

Among other theological papyri, the Oxyrhynchus Sayings of Jesus (O.P. 1,564), dating from the 2d and 3d cent.s, are probably the most widely known (see LOGIA). Other papyri

9. Theological

Oxyrhynchus pieces preserve parts of the Apocrypha of Baruch (chs 12-14; 4th or 5th cent.; O.P. 493); the Gospel according to the Hebrews (in its later form, if at all: 3d cent.; O.P. 655); the Acts of John (4th cent.; O.P. 850, cf 851); the Shepherd of Hermas (3d or 4th cent.; O.P. 494); Irenaeus, Adv. Haer., ii.i9 (3d cent.; O.P. 495). Other small fragments of the Shepherd and Iggdrasil are among the Amherst and Berlin papyri. Early Christian hymns, prayers and letters of interest have also been found.

We have spoken thus far only of literary papyri, classical and theological. The overwhelming majority of the papyri found have of course been documentary—private letters, accounts, wills, receipts, contracts, leases, deeds, complaints, petitions, notices, invitations, etc. The value of these contemporary and original documents for the illumination of ancient life can hardly be overestimated. The life of Upper Egypt in Ptolemaic and Rom times is now probably better known to us than that of any other period of history down to recent times. Many papyri that have no literary papyri at all, but are rich in documentary value. Each year brings more of these to light and new volumes of them into print. All this vast and growing body of material contributes to our knowledge of Ptolemaic and imperial times, often in the most intimate ways. Among the most important

of these documentary papyri from Ptolemaic times are the revenue laws of Ptolemy Philadephus (259 BC) and the decrees of Ptolemy Euergetes II, 47 in number (118 BC, 140-130 BC). Very recently (1910) a Hamburg papyrus has supplied the Constitutin Antonianum, by which the empire was officialy conferred upon the peregrini of the empire. The private documents in ways even more important illustrate the life of the common people under Ptolemaic and Rom rule.

It is not necessary to point out the value of all this for Bibl. and esp. NT study. The papyri have already made a valuable contribution to textual materials of both OT and NT. The NT Study has been of surprising interest (the Oxyrhynchus Logia and Gospel fragments). The discovery of a series of uncial MSS running through six centuries back of the Codex Vaticanus breaks the gap between what were our earliest uncials and the hand of the inscriptions, and puts us in a better position than ever before to fix the dates of uncial MSS. Minuscule or cursive hands, too, so common in NT MSS of the 10th and later centuries, appear in a new light when it is seen that such writing was not a late invention arising out of the uncials, but a break from the opposite side with it at least the 4th cent. BC, as the ordinary, as distinguished from the literary, or book, hand. See WITTING. The lexical contribution of these documentary papyri, too, is already considerable, and it is likely to be very great. Among the NT writings, they reflect the common as distinguished from the literary language of the times, and words which had appeared exceptional or unknown in Gr lit. are now shown to have been in common use. The problems of NT syntax are similarly illuminated. Speculative or theoretical notices sometimes light up dark points in the NT, as in a British Museum decree of Gaius Vibius Maximus, prefect of Egypt (104 AD), ordering all who are out of their districts to return to their own homes in view of the approaching census (cf Lk 2 1-5). Most important of all is the contribution of the papyri to a sympathetic knowledge of ancient life. They constitute a veritable gallery of NT characters. The strong life sometimes thrown upon the social evils of the time, of which Ptolemaic Egypt was so sterily. The child, the prodigal, the thief, the host with his invitations, the steward with his accounts, the thrifty housholder, the soldier on service receiving his vocation, or retired as a veteran upon his farm, the Jewish merchant, the house-bandman, and the publican, besides people in every domestic relation, we meet at first hand in the papyri which they themselves in many cases have written. The worth of this for the historical interpretation of the NT is very great.

The principal collections of Gr papyri with their editors are Schow, Herculeanum Papyri; Peyron, Turin Papyri; Leumann, Leyden Papyri; Wessel, Breslau, and Berlin Papyri; Kenyon and Bell, British Museum Papyri; Mahaffy and Smyly, Petrie Papyri; Grenfell and Hunt, Oxyrhynchus, Amherst, and Hith Papyri (with Hogarth), Fayum Papyri, and (with Smyly and Converse) Tenius Papyri; Hunt, Rylands Papyri; Nicola, Geneve Papyri; Krebs, Wielken, Vieereck, Schubart and others, Berlin Papyri; Meyer, Hamburg and Gessen Papyri; Deismann, Pappyri, Hildergabern Papyri, Vitelli and Comparetti, Florence Papyri; Millies, Leipzig Papyri; Prisse and Strasbourg Papyri; Skemer and Schou, Papyri; Jouguet and Lessquier, Lilie Papyri; Rubensohn, Elephantine Papyri; Vassallo and Vassallo, Cairo Papyri; Godeau, Speedy, Calio and Chicago Papyri. The last-named have been described by Wielken. Milligan's Gr Papyri, Kenyon's Papyri, and Garbe's Palaeography of Gr Papyri, From the Ancient East are useful introductions to the general subject. Mayser has prepared a Grammatik der Ptolemaischen Papyri.

Coptic, Arab., Heb and Demotic papyri are
numerous; even Lat papyri are found. The Coptic have already made important contributions to early Christian literature. A considerable

13. Coptic, Coptic fragment of the Acts of Paul, Arabic and a Coptic (Akhmim) codex of 1
Other Papyrus, Clement, almost complete, have recently been published by Carl Schmidt. Another much mutilated papyrus of 1 Clement, with James, complete, is at Strassburg. A Coptic text of Prov has been brought to light from the same source which supplied the Clement codex (the White Convent, near Akhmt); indeed, Bib. papyri in Coptic are fairly numerous, and patristic lit. is being rapidly enriched by such discoveries of Coptic papyri, e.g. the Disputation of the Acts, Papyrus 1912 (cf. Sahidie NT, Oxford, 1911).

Arab. papyri first began to appear from Egypt in 1825, when three Arab. pieces were brought to Paris and published by Silvestre de Sacy. Two others, from the 7th cent., were published by him in 1827. It was not until the great papyrus finds of 1877-78, however, that any considerable number of Arab. papyri found their way into Europe. The chief collections thus far formed are at Vienna (Rainer Collection), Berlin and Cairo. Becker has published Schott's collections of Arab. papyri at Heidelberg, and Karabasche has worked upon those at Vienna. They belong of course to the period after the Arab. conquest, 640 AD.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED

PAPYRUS, VESSELS OF. See SHIPS AND BOATS, II, 2, (1).


Etymologically the word "parable" (παραβολή, parabolē) signifies a placing of two or more objects together, usually for the purpose of a comparison. In this widest sense of the term there is practically no difference between parable and simile (see Thayer, Dict. of NT Gr., s.v.). This is also what substantially some of Christ's parables amount to, which consist of only one comparison and in a single verse (cf. Mt 13 33.44-46). In the more usual and technical sense of the word, "parable" ordinarily signifies an imaginary story, in which details have actually transpired, the purpose of the story being to illustrate and inculcate some higher spiritual truth. These features differentiate it from other and similar figurative narratives as also from actual history. The similarity between the last-mentioned and a parable is sometimes so small that exegetes have differed in the interpretation of certain pericopes. A characteristic example of this uncertainty is the story of Dives and Lazarus in Lk 16 19-31. The problem is, as those who regard the story as actual history are compelled to interpret each and every statement, including too the close proximity of heaven and hell and the possibility of speaking from one place to the other, while those who regard it as a parable can restrict their interpretation to the features that constitute the substance of the story. It differs again from the fable, in so far as the latter is a story that could not actually have occurred (e.g. Jgs 9 8 ff.; 2 K 14 9; Es 27 2). The parable is often described as "absurd," but the etymological features of the word, as well as the relation of parables to other and kindred devices of style, are discussed more fully by Ed. Koenig, in HDB, III, 660 ff.

Although Christ employed the parable as a means of inculcating His message more extensively and more effectively than any other teacher, He did not invent the parable. It was His custom in general to take over from the re- ligious and popular literature that was available in His own day the materials that He employed to convey the higher and deeper truths of His gospels, giving them a world of meaning they had never before possessed. Thus e.g. every petition of the Lord's Prayer can be duplicated in the Jewish liturgies of the times, yet on Christ's lips these petitions have a significance they never had or could have for the Jews. The term "parable" for the second person in the Godhead is an adaptation from the Logos idea of a cosmic, religious thought, though not specifically of Philo's. Baptism, regeneration, and kindred expressions of fundamental thoughts in the Christian system are terms not absolutely new (cf. Deutsch, art. "Tal- mud," Literature Remains). The parable was employed both in the OT and in contemporaneous Jewish literature (cf. e.g. 2 Sm 12 1-4; Is 5 1-6; 28 24-28, and for details see König's art., i.e.). Jewish and other non-Bib. parables are discussed and illustrated by Mr.-ng's Mythology of the Parables of Our Lord, introd. essay, ch. iv: "On Other Parables besides Those in the Scriptures."

The one and only teacher of parables in the NT is Christ Himself. The Epp., although they often employ rhetorical allegories and similes, are not the absolutely same as parables, so common in Christ's pedagogical methods. The distribution of these in the Canonical Gospels is unequal, and they are strictly confined to the three Synoptic Gospels. Mark again has only one peculiar to this book, namely, the Seed Growing in Secret (Mk 4 26), and he gives only three others that are found also in Mt and Lk, namely the Sower, the Mustard Seed, and the Wicked Husbandman, so that the bulk of the parables are found in the First and the Third Gospels. Two are common to Mt and Lk, namely the Leaven (Mt 13 33; Lk 13 21) and the Lost Sheep (Mt 18 12; Lk 15 3 ff). Of the remaining parables, 18 are found only in Lk and 10 only in Mt. Lk's 18 include some of the finest, viz. the Two Debtors, the Good Samaritan, the Friend at Midnight, the Rich Fool, the Watchful Servants, the Barren Fig Tree, the Chief Seats, the Great Supper, the Rash Builder, the Rash King, the Lost Coin, the Juryman, the Unprofitable Servants, the Rich Man and Lazarus, the Unprofitable Servants, the Unrighteous Judge, the Pharisee and Publican, and the Pounds. The 10 peculiar to Mt are the Tares, the Hidden Treasure, the Pearl of Great Price, the Draw Net, the Unmerciful Servant, the Laborers in the Vineyard, the Two Sons, the Marriage of the King's Son, the Ten Virgins, and the Talents. There is some uncertainty as to the exact number of parables we have from Christ, as the Marriage of the King's Son is sometimes regarded as a different recension of the Great Supper, and the Talents of the Pounds. Other numberings are suggested by Trench, Jülicher and others.

It is evident from such passages as Mt 13 10 ff (cf Mk 4 10; Lk 8 9) that Christ did not in the beginning of His career employ the parable as a method of teaching, but introduced it later. This took place evidently during the 2d year of His public ministry, and is connected with the changes which about that time He made in His attitude toward the people in general. It evidenced was Christ's purpose at the outset to win over, if possible, the nation as a whole to His cause and to the gospel; when it appeared that the leaders and the great bulk of the people
would not accept Him for what He wanted to be and bring them to their carnal Messianic ideas and ideals, Christ ceased his appeal to the masses, and, by confining His instructions chiefly to His disciples and special friends, saw the necessity of organizing an ecclesiola in ecclesia, which was eventually to develop into the world-conquering church. One part of this general withdrawal of Christ from a proclamation of His gospel to the whole nation was this change in His method of teaching and the adoption of the parable. On that subject He leaves no doubt, according to Mt 13 11-12; Mk 4 21-23; Lk 8 8-14. The purpose of the parable is both to reveal and to conceal the truth. It was to serve the first purpose in the case of the disciples, the second in the case of the underserving Jews. Psychologically this difference, notwithstanding the acknowledged inferiority in the training and education of the disciples, esp. as compared with the scribes and lawyers, is not hard to understand. A simple-minded Christian, who has some understanding of the truth, can readily understand figurative illustrations of this truth, which would be absolute enigmas even to an educated Hindu or Chinaman. The theological problem involved is more difficult. Yet it is evident that we are not dealing with those who have committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, for the issue is not the possibility of a return to grace, according to He 6 4-10; 10 26 (cf Mt 12 31-32; Mk 3 28-30), and who accordingly could no longer be influenced by an appeal of the gospel, and we have rather before us the case of Christ having failed to draw the offer of redemption—whether temporarily or definitely and finally, remaining an open question—according to His policy of not casting pearls before the swine. The proper sense of these passages is to be understood in the light of the teaching of Mt 13 11 ff, where the διϊν, δία, is found. The word is to be withheld from these people, so that this preaching would not bring about the ordinary results of conversion and forgiveness of sins. Hence Christ now adopts a method of teaching that would be capable to all those who have yet been imbued by it, and this new method is that of the parable.

The principles for the interpretation of the parables, which are all intended primarily and in the first place for the disciples, are furnished by the parable itself and by Christ's own method of interpreting some of them. The first and foremost thing to be discovered is the scope or the particular spiritual truth which the parable is intended to convey. Just what this scope is may be stated in so many words, as is done, e.g., by the introductory words to that of the Pharisees and the Publican. Again the scope may be learned from the direction of the parable, as the question of Peter in Mt 18 21 gives the scope of the following parable, and the real purpose of the Prodigal Son parable in Lk 15 11 ff is not the story of this young man himself, but is set over against the murmuring of the Pharisees because Christ received publicans and sinners, in vs 1 and 2, to exemplify the all-forgiving love of the Father. Not the Son but the Father is in the foreground in this parable, which fact is also the connecting link between the two parts. Sometimes the scope can be learned only from the examination of the details of the parable itself and then may be all the more uncertain.

A second principle of the interpretation of the parables is that a sharp distinction must be made between what the older interpreters called the body (corpus) and the soul (anima). It is not to use other terms or words to distinguish between the shell or bark (cortex) and the marrow (medulla). Whatever serves only the purpose of the story is the “ornamentation” of the parable, and does not belong to the substance. The former does not call for interpretation. Once the spiritual lesson; the latter does. This distinction between those parts of the parable that are intended to convey spiritual meanings and those which are to be ignored in the interpretation is based on Christ's own interpretation of the so-called parabolae. The purpose of the parable in Mt 13 18 ff, interprets the parable of the Sower, yet a number of data, such as the fact that there are four, and not more or fewer kinds of land, and others, are discarded in this explanation as without meaning. Again in His interpretation of the Tares among the Wheat in Mt 13 36 ff, a number of details of the original parable are discarded as meaningless.

Just which details are significant and which are meaningless in a parable is often hard, because impossible to determine, as the history of their exegesis amply shows. In general it can be laid down as a rule, that those features which illustrate the scope of the parable belong to its substance, and those which are a mere dress are to be ignored. But even with this rule there remain many exegetical cruxes or difficulties. Certain, too, it is not that all of the details are capable of interpretation. Some are added of a nature that indeed illustrate the story as a story, yet, from the standpoint of Christian morals, are more than objectionable. The Unjust Steward in using his authority to make the bills of the debtors of his master smaller may be a model, in the shrewd use of this world's goods for his purposes, that the Christian may follow in making use of his goods for his purposes, but the action of the steward itself is incapable of defence. Again, the man who finds in somebody else's property a pearl of great price but conceals this fact from the owner of the land and quietly buys this ground may serve as an example to show how much the kingdom of God is worth, but from an ethical standpoint his action cannot be sanctioned. In general, the parable, like all other forms of figurative expression, is a means of tertium comparationis goes, that is, the third thing which is common to the two things compared. But all this still leaves a large debatable ground in many parables. In the Laborers in the Vineyard does the "penny" belong to the parable, and again the history of the debate on this subject is long. In the Prodigal Son do all the details of his sufferings, such as eating the husks intended for swine, have a spiritual meaning?

The interpreters of former generations laid down the rule, theologa parabolon non est argumentation, i.e., the parables, very rich in mission thoughts, do not furnish a basis for the Parables of the doctrinal argument. Like all figurative expressions and forms of thought, the parables too contain elements of doubt as far as their interpretation is concerned. They illustrate truth but they do not prove or demonstrate truth. Omnia similia claudieunt, “all comparisons limp,” is applicable here also. No point of doctrine can be established on figurative expressions of Scripture, as then all elements of doubt would not be eliminated, this doubt being based on the nature of language itself. The argumentative or doctrinal value of parables is found in this, that they may, in accordance with the harmony of Scripture, illustrate truth already clearly expressed elsewhere. Cf esp. Trench, introd. essay, in Notes on the Parables of Our Lord, ch iii, 30-43; and Terry,
PARACLETE, parakletos.

This word occurs 5 times in the NT, all in the writings of John. Four instances are in the Gospel and one in the First Ep. In the Gospel the passages are 14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7, in the Ep., 2:1. "Paraclete" is simply the Gr word transferred into Eng. The tr of the word in Ev is "Comforter," in the Gospel, and "Advocate" in the Ep. The Gr word is παρακλητός, paraklētos. It is derived from παρακλείω, parakleíō, parakleíō, to implore, entreat, beseech, supplicate, beseech, counsel, comfort. The word for "Paraclete" is passive in form, and etymologically signifies "called to one's side." The active form of the word is παρακλητός, parakleitēs, not found in the NT but found in LXX in Job 16:2 in the pl., and means "comforters," in the saying of Job regarding the "miserable comforters" who came to him in his distress.

In general the word signifies (1) a legal advocate, or counsel for defence, (2) an intercessor, (3) a helper, generally, (4) a helper, or teacher; (5) a helper, or teacher; (6) an advocate, or counselor, etc.

Meaning predominates in classical usage, corresponding to our word "advocate," "counsel," or "attorney." The corresponding Lat word was advocatus, "advocate." The advocate applied to Christ in Ev in the tr of the Gr word paraklētos, in 1 Jn 2:1. There is some question whether the tr "Comforter" in the passages of John's Gospel in AV and RV is warranted by the meaning of the word. It is certain that the meaning "comforter" is not the primary signification, as we have seen. It is very probable, however, a secondary meaning of the word, and some of its cognates clearly convey the idea of comfort in certain connections, both in LXX and in the NT (Gen 37:35; Zec 1:13; Mt 5:4; 2 Cor 1:3). In the passage in 2 Cor the word in one form or another is used 5 times and in each means "comfort." In none of these instances, however, do we find the noun "Paraclete," which we are now considering.

Among Jewish writers the word "Paraclete" came to have a number of meanings. A good deed was called a parakletos, or advocate, and a transgression was an accusation. Repeal and repentance and good works were called parakletos, or the verb of benevolence and mercy done by the people of Israel in this world become agents of peace and intercessors [parakletos] between them and their Father in heaven. The sin offering is parakletos; the parakletos created by each good deed is called an angel (Jew Enc, IX, 514-15, art. "Paraclete").

Philo employs the word in several instances. Usually he does not use it in the legal technical sense. Josephus is represented as bestowing forgiveness on his brethren who had wronged him and saying to them: "no one else as paraklete," or "intercessor" (De Joseph c. 40). In his Life of Moses, iii 4, it is a technical passage which indicates Philo's spiritualizing methods of interpreting Scripture as well as reflects his philosophical tendency. At the close of a somewhat elaborate narrative of the account of the emblematic significance of the vestments of the high priest and their jeweled decorations, his words are: "The twelve stones arranged on the breast in four rows of three stones each, namely, the emerald, being also an emblem of that reason which we hold to regulate the universe. For it was indispensable [ἀπαρακλητόν, unbegotten] that the man who was consecrated with the high priest should be called as a paraklete, his son, the being most perfect in all virtue, to procure the forgiveness of sins, and a supply of grace." This is rather a striking version or formal parallel to the statement in 1 Jn 2:1 where Christ was called with the N.T. name, although none of Philo's conceptions of the Divine "reason" and "son" are by no means the Christian conceptions.

If now we raise the question what is the best tr of the term "Paraclete" in the NT, we have a choice of several words. Let us glance at 5.

The Best them in order. The tr "Comforter" translation conveys an element of the usage of the word as employed in the Gospels, and harmonizes with the usage in connection with its cognates, but it is too narrow in meaning to be an adequate tr. Dr. J. Hastings in an otherwise excellent article on the Paraclete in HDB says the Paraclete was not sent to comfort the disciples, since prior to His actual coming and after Christ's promise the disciples' sorrow was turned into joy. Dr. Hastings thinks the Paraclete was sent to cure the unbelief or half-belief of the disciples, but this conceives the idea of comfort in too limited a way. No doubt in the mind of Jesus the comforting aspect of the Spirit's work applied to all their future sorrows and trials, and not merely to comfort for their personal loss in the going of Christ to the Father. Nevertheless there was more in the work of the Paraclete than comfort in sorrow. "Intercessor" comes nearer the root idea of the term and contains an essential part of the meaning. "Advocate" is a closely related word, and is also suggested by the work of the Spirit. Perhaps the Eng. word broad enough to cover all the significance of the word "Paraclete" except the word "Helper." The Spirit helps the disciples in all the above-indicated ways. Of course the objection to this tr is that it is too indefinite. The specific Christ's Spirit's work has been lost in the comprehensiveness of the term. Our conclusion, therefore, is that the term "Paraclete" itself would perhaps be the best designation of the Spirit in the passage in John's Gospel, and thus become a proper name for the Spirit and the various elements of meaning would come to be associated with the words which are found in the context of the Gospel.

Christianity introduced many new ideas into the world for which current terms were inadequate media of expression. In some cases it is best to adopt the Christian term itself, in our translations, and let the word slowly acquire its own proper significance in our thought and life. If, however, instead of translating we simply transfer the word "Paraclete" as a designation of the Holy Spirit in the Gospel passages, we would need then to translate it in the passage in the Ep. where it refers to Christ. But this would offer no serious difficulty. For fortunately in 1 Cor. the tr may very clearly be trd "Advocate" or "Intercessor.

We look next at the contents of the word as employed by Jesus in reference to the Holy Spirit.

In 14:16 the Paraclete is promised as one who is to take the place of Jesus. It is declared elsewhere by Jesus that it is expedient that He go away, for unless He go away the Paraclete will not come (Jn 16:7). Is the Paraclete, then, the successor or the substitute for Christ as He is sometimes called? The answer is that He is both and neither. He is the successor of Christ historically, but not in the sense that Christ ceases to act in the church. He is the substitute for Christ's physical presence, but only in order that He may make vital and actual Christ's spiritual presence. As we have seen, the Paraclete moves only in the range of truths conveyed in and through Christ as the historical manifestation of God. A "Kingdom of the Spirit," therefore, is impossible in the Christian sense, save as the historical Christ should be seen in the Spirit's action in history. The promise of Jesus in 14:18, "I come unto," is parallel and equivalent in meaning with the preceding promise of the Paraclete. The following are given as the specific forms of activity of the Holy Spirit: (1) to show them the
things of Christ, (2) to teach them things to come, (3) to teach them all things, (4) to quicken their memories for past teaching, (5) to bear witness to Christ, (6) to dwell in believers, (7) other things shown in the context such as “greater works” than those of Christ (see Jn 14 16,17), (8) to convict of sin, of righteousness and judgment. It is possible to range the shades of meaning outlined above under these various forms of the Spirit’s activity. As Comforter His work would come under (1), (2), (3) and (6); as Advocate and Intercessor under (6), (7), (8); as Helper and Teacher under (1), (2), (3), (4), (6), (7), (8).

The manner of the sending of the Paraclete is of interest. In Jn 14 16 the Paraclete comes in answer to Christ’s prayer. The Father will give the Spirit whom the world cannot receive. In 14 26 the Father will send the Spirit in Christ’s name. Yet in 15 26 Christ says, “I will send [him] unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth,” and in 16 7, “If I go, I will send him unto you.” See Holy Spirit.

It remains to notice the passage in 1 Jn 2 1 where the term “Paraclete” is applied to Christ: “If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous;” ver 2 reads: “and he is Christ the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world.” Here the meaning is quite clear and specific. Jesus Christ the righteous is represented as our Advocate or Intercessor with the Father. His righteousness is set over against our sin. Here, as well, is the basis of His propitiatory offering for the sins of men, intercedes for them with God and thus averts from them the penal consequences of their transgressions. The sense in which Paraclete is here applied to Christ is found nowhere in the passages we have cited from the Gospel. The Holy Spirit as Paraclete is Intercessor or Advocate, but not in the sense here indicated. The Spirit as Paraclete convicts the world of sin, of righteousness and judgment. Jesus Christ as Paraclete vindicates believers before God.


E. Y. MULLINS

PARADISE, par'-a-ils (Ὄαδος, παράδεισος, παραδείσος): A word probably of Pers origin meaning a royal park. See Garden.

1. Origin and Meaning. The word occurs in the Heb Scriptures but 3 t: Cant 4 13, where it is trd “an orchard”; Neh 2 8, where it is trd “a forest” (RVm “park”); Eccl 2 5, where it is in the pl. number (AV ‘orchards, RV ‘parks”). But it was early introduced into the Gr language, being made specially familiar by Xenophon upon his return from the expedition of Cyrus the Younger to Babylonia (see Arba, i, 2, § 7; 4, § 9; Cyrop. i, 3, § 14). In LXX the word is of frequent use for translating other terms of kindred significance. The Garden of Eden became “the paradise of pleasure or luxury” (Gen 2 15; 3 23; Joel 2 3). The valley of the Jordan became ‘the paradise of God’ (Gen 15 10). In Ezek 31 8,9, according to LXX, there is no tree in the ‘paradise of pleasure or luxury’ which symbolizes the glory of Assyria. The figures in the first 9 verses of this chapter may well have been suggested by what the prophet had himself seen of parks in the Pers empire.

In the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical lit. the word is extensively used in a spiritual and symbolic sense, signifying the place of happiness to be inherited by the righteous in contrast to Gehenna, the place of punishment to which the wicked are assigned. In the later Jewish lit. “Sheol” is represented as a place where preliminary rewards and punishments are bestowed previous to the final judgment (see Apocalyptic Literature; Eschatology of the OT; and of 2 Esd 2 19; Joel 2 20). The representations in this lit. are often vague and conflicting, some holding that there were 4 divisions in Sheol, one for those who were martyred for righteousness’ sake, one for sinners who on earth had paid the penalty for their sins, one for the just who had not suffered martyrdom, and one for sinners who had not been punished on earth (Ez 102 15). But among the Alexandrian Jews the view prevailed that the separation of the righteous from the wicked took place immediately after death (see Wis 3 14; 4 10; 5 17; Jos, Ant, XVIII, i, 3; BJ, II, viii, 14). This would seem to be the idea underlying the use of the word in the NT where it occurs only 3 t, and then in a sense remarkably free from sensuous suggestions.

Christ used the word but once (Lk 23 43), when He said to the penitent thief, “To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise” (see Abraham’s Bosom [cf Hades]). This was no time to choose words with dialectical precision. The consolation needed by the penitent thief suffering from thirst and agony and shame was such as was symbolized by the popular conception of paradise, which, as held by the Essenes, consisted of “habitations beyond the ocean, in a region that is neither open to the light of sun, or snow, or with intense heat, but that this place is such as is refreshed by the gentle breathing of a west wind, that is perpetually blowing from the ocean” (Jos, BJ, II, viii, 11). See Eschatology of the NT.

Nowhere in His public teaching did Christ use the word “Paradise.” He does indeed, when speaking in parables, employ the figure of the marriage supper, and of new wine, and in the parable of Abraham’s houses not made by hands, eternal in the heavens; but all these references are in striking contrast to the prevailing sensuous representations of the times (see 2 Esd 2 19; 8 32), and such as have been noted above. Hammedan lit. Likewise St. Paul (2 Cor 12 4) speaks of having been “caught up into Paradise” where he “heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter.” See Eschatology of the NT. But in ver 2 this is referred to more vaguely as “the third heaven.” In Rev 21 it is said to the members of the church at Ephesus who should overcome, “I [will] give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the Paradise of God.” The Eden of Gen 2 is made the symbol of the abode of the righteous, more fully described without the words in the last chapter of the book. The reticence of the sacred writers respecting this subject is in striking contrast to the profuse and cruder both of rabbinical writers before Christ and of apocryphal writers and Christian commentators at a later time. “Where the true Gospel are most reticent, the mythical are most exuberant” (Perowne). This is esp. noticeable in the Gospel of Nicodemus, the Acts of John, the apocryphal Acts of Peter, and The Shepherd’s Paradise and The Life of the Recluse; see Deut. 5 27; Deut 10 11; 13; De Anim. c. 55; Tertullian’s treatise De Paradiso is lost). Clement of Alexandria (Frag. 51), and John of Damascus (De Orthod. Fid., ii, 11). In modern lit. the conception of Paradise is
effectually sublimated and spiritualized in Faber’s familiar hymn:

“O Paradise, O Paradise, I greatly long to see
The special place my dearest Lord
Is destining for me:
Where loyal hearts and true
Stand ever in the light,
All capture thro’ and thro’.
In God’s most holy sight.”

LITURGY.—The articles in the great Dicts., esp. Hucbald; Alaric Siger, History of the
Doctrine of a Future Life: Schodde, Book of En: Light-
foot, Hor. Heb, on Lk 23:43; Salmon, The Christian
Doctrine of the Resurrection; For a good account of
Jewish and patristic speculation on Paradise, see Profes-
or Plummer’s art. in Smith’s DB, 1874 ff.

G. F. Wright

PARAH, pārā, pārā ( Revelation 21:9; ha-pārāh; B, ἡ φαρά, Pharād, Phārād, Α'Φαρ, Ἀφάρ): A city named as in the territory of Benjamin between Avvim and Ophrah (Josh 18:29). It may with some confidence be identified with Fārāk on Wādy Fārāk, which runs into Wādy Suweinīt, about 3 miles N.E. of ‘Anāda.

PARALYSIS, par-’al’i-sis, PARALYTIC, para-l'it'ik. See FALSY.

PARAMOUR, par’o-mōr (心仪的, πίλληγγος, “a concubine,” masc. or fem.): A term applied in Ezek 23:20 to the male lover, but elsewhere tr’ “concu-
bine.”

PARAN, pārān, El-PARAN ( Revelation 21:19; pārān, הַפִּךְ, הַפּוֹךְ, El-pārēn; ἡ φαράν, Phäran): (1) El-paran (Gen 14:6) was the point farthest S. reached by the kings. LXX renders הַפִּךְ by τετεβιόσ, τετεβίνθος, and reads, “unto the ter-
birth of Paran.” The evidence is slender, but it is not unreasonable to suppose that this is the place elsewhere (Dt 2:8; 1 K 9:26, etc) called Elath or Eloth (רְחֹּוך ויהו fem. termination), a seaport town which gave its name to the Atlantic Gulf (modern Gulf of ’Aqaba), not far from the wilderness of Paran (2).

(2) Many places named in the narrative of the wanderings lay within the Wilderness of Paran (S. 10:13; 21:13; 27:14; of 13:3.26, etc). It is identified with the high limestone plateau of El-
Tib, stretching from the S.W. of the Dead Sea to Sinai along the west side of the Arabah. This wilderness offered hospitality to Ismael when driven from his father’s tent (Gen 21:21). Hitler also came David when bereaved of Samuel’s pro-
tection (1 S 25:1).

(3) Mount Paran (Dt 33:2; Hab 3:3) may be either Jebel Maḥrah, 29 miles S. of ’Āin Kādis (Kadesh-barnea), and 130 miles N. of Sinai (Palmer, Desert of the Exodus, 510); or the higher and more imposing range of mountains W. of the Gulf of ’Aqaba. This is the more probable if El-paran is rightly identified with Elath.

(4) Some place named Paran would seem to be referred to in Dt 1:1; but no trace of such a city has yet been found. Paran in 1 K 11:18 doubtless refers to the district W. of the Arabah.

W. EWING

PARBAR, pār'bär (חֶפֶר, parbar [1 Ch 26:18]), and חֶפֶר, pār'ārām, tr’d “precincts” [AV ‘sub-
urbs’ in 2 K 23:11]; LXX φαραυρέα, pharoureia]: In 1 Ch 26:18 reference is made to the position of the gatekeepers, “for Parbar westward, four at the causeway, and two at Parbar.” The word is supposed to be of Pers origin, connected with Par-
ward, meaning “possessing light,” and hence the meaning has been suggested of ‘colonnade’ or “portico,” some place open to the light. In the pl
form (2 K 23:11) the situation of the house of

“Nathan-melech” is described, and the tr’ “in the colonnades,” should, if the above origin is accepted, be more clearly understood than E V. It is difficult to under-
stand the occurrence of a Pers word at this time, and it has been suggested (EB, col 3585) that the word is a description of the office of Nathan-melech, ba-parārdim being a misreading for ba-prārdhim, meaning “who was over the halls.”

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

PARCEL, pär’sel: Properly “a little part,” in Elizabethan Eng. being used in almost any sense. In Av of Gen 33:19; Josh 24:32; Ruth 4:3; 1 Ch 11:13.14 it is the tr’ of הִכָּה, heldhā; Ju 4:5 of שְׂפַר, chārōn both the Gr and Heb words meaning a “piece of land.” RV writes “plot” in 1 Ch 11:13.14, but if the change was needed at all, it should have been made throughout.

PARCHED, pärch’t: Four different root words have been tr’d “parched” in Ev:

(1) הָסַר, heldhā, “roasted.” This word is applied to corn or pulse. It is a common practice in Pal and Syria to roast the nearly ripe wheat for eating as a delicacy. A handful of heads of fully developed grain, with the stalks still attached, are gathered and bound together and then, holding the bunch by the lower ends of the stalks, the heads are roasted over a fire through the husk or through the burn of most of the sheaths are blackened the grain is toasted, and, after rubbing off the husks between the hands, is ready to eat (Lev 2:14). A form of pulse is toasted in the same way and is more sought after than the grain. In the larger towns and cities, vendors go about the streets selling bunches of toasted chick-peas. The Bible references, how-
ever, are probably to another form of roasted grain. The threshed wheat or pulse is roasted over a fire on an iron plate or on a flat stone, being kept in constant motion with a stirrer until the operation is finished. The grain thus prepared is a marketable article. Parched grain is not now so commonly met with as the pulse, which either roasted or un-
roasted is called hommos (from Arab. 자Rose) or “parsh”). Parched pulse is eaten not only plain, but is often made into confection by coating the seeds with sugar. In Bible times parched wheat or pulse was a common food, even taking the place of bread (Lev 23:14; Josh 2:14). It was a useful food supply for armies, as it re-
quired no further cooking (1 S 17:17). It was frequently included in gifts or hostages (1 S 26:18; 2 S 17:28).

(2) חַרֵך, harēr, “burned” or “parched” (of Arab. bārk, “burned”), is used in the sense of dried up or arid in Jer 17:6.

(3) כָּה, čēh, is used in Isa 5:13, AV “dried up,” RV “parched”; כָּה, čēhā, in Ps 68:6, AV “dry,” RV “parched.”

(4) שַׁרְדָּב, šārēdāb, rendered “parched” in AV, is “glowing” in RV. The word implies the peculiar wavy effect of the air above parched ground, usually accompanied by mirages (cf Arab. serdāb, “mirage”) (Isa 35:7; 49:10). In predicting a happy future for Zion the prophet could have chosen no greater contrast than that the hot glowing sands which produce illusive water effects should be changed into real pools. See MIRAGE. JAMES A. PATCH

PARCHED, pärcht, CORN. See Food.

PARCHMENT, pär’ch’mant (μπαβα, membrāna [2 Tim 4:13]): The word “parchment,” which occurs only once (2 Tim 4:13), is the name of a skin. By the late time la-
gera (Gr. μπαβα, Pergamenē), i.e. pertaining to Pergamum, the name of an ancient city in Asia
Minor where, it is believed, parchment was first used. Parchment is made from the skins of sheep, goats or young calves. The hair and fleshy portions of the skin are removed as in tanning by first soaking in lime and then in burning, scraping and washing. The skin is then stretched on a frame and treated with powdered chalk, or other absorbent agent, to remove the fatty substances, and is then dried. It is finally given a smooth surface by rubbing with powdered pumice. Parchment was extensively used at the time of the early Christians for scrolls, legal documents, etc., having replaced papyrus for that purpose. It was no doubt used at even a much earlier time. The roll mentioned in Jer 36 may have been of parchment. Scrolls were later placed by codices of the same material. After the Arabs introduced paper, parchment was still used for centuries for the book bindings. Diplomas printed on "sheepskins," still issued by many universities, represent the survival of an ancient use of parchment. See following articles.

JAMES A. PATCH

PARCHMENTS, parch'ments (μεμραναί, membrānai, "membranes," "parchments," "vellum"): The skins, chiefly of sheep, lambs, goats and calves, prepared so as to be used for writing on (2 Tim 4 13).

In Gr and Rom times parchment was much employed as a writing material. "At Rome, in the 1st cent. BC, and the 1st and 2d cents. AD, there is evidence of the use of vellum, but only for notebooks and rough drafts or inferior copies of literary works, ... A fragment of a vellum MS, which may belong to this period, is preserved in Brit. Mus. Add. Ms 34,478, consisting of two leaves of Demosthenes, De Foes. Leg., in a small hand, which appears to be of the 3d cent." (F. G. Kenyon in HDB, IV, 947).

Paul directs Timothy that, when he comes from Ephesus to Rome, he is to bring "the books, esp. the parchments." These, as well as the "cloak," which it is also mentioned, had evidently been "left at Troas with Carpus." What were these parchments? They are distinguished from "the books," which were probably a few choice volumes or rolls, some portions of the Scriptures of the OT, some volumes of the Law of Moses or of the Prophets or of the Ps. Among "the books" there might also be Jewish exegetical works, or heathen writings, with which, as is made evident by reference in his Epp., Paul was well acquainted.

The parchments were different from these, and were perhaps notebooks, in which the apostle had, from time to time, written what he had observed and wished to preserve as specially worthy of remembrance, facts which he had gathered in his study of the OT or of other books. These notes may have been the result of many years' reading and study, and he wished Timothy to bring them to him.

Various conjectures have been made in regard to the contents of the parchments. It has been suggested by Kenyon (HDB, III, 673) that they contained the OT in Gr; by Farrar, that the parchments were a diploma of Paul's Rom citizenship; by Bull, that they were his commonplace books; by Latham, that the parchments were a copy of the "Graeca" of the Gospels, a volume containing the all-important narrative of the Saviour's life and cross and resurrection. Workman (Persecution in the Early Church, 39) writes: "By tas membranaus I understand the proofs of his citizenship."

Whatever their contents may have been, they were of such importance as to have "remained with him in his prison at Rome, so that, if life were spared for even a few weeks, he could use the parchments and perhaps make a hint of his arrest by the Roman authorities took place at that city, and that it was the suddenness of his arrest that caused him to be unable to pass on the books and parchments to the clerk with him." "The police had not even allowed him time to find his overcoat or necessary documents" (Workman, op. cit., 39; see p. 1588, 14).

So this as it may, he is desired to have them now. His well-disciplined mind, even in the near prospect of death by public execution, could find the most joyous labor in the work of the gospel, wherever his influence reached, and could also find relaxation among "the books, esp. the parchments."
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I. THE APOSTOLIC DOCTRINES. — The Second Coming of Christ (a phrase not found in the Bible) is explained by the following  
1. Terms special terms: (1) "Parousia" (παρουσία, parousiа), a word fairly common in Gr, with the meaning "presence" (2 Cor 10 16; Phil 2 12). More esp. it may mean "presence after absence," "arrival" (but not "return," unless this is given by the context), as in 1 Cor 16 17; 2 Cor 7 6.7; Phil 1 26. And still more particularly it is applied to the Coming of Christ in 1 Cor 16 23; 1 Thess 2 20; 3 13; 4 14 15; 1 Tim 6 14; 2 Thess 3 12. Jn 2 24—25—in all 13 t. besides 2 Thess where the coming is predicted of Antichrist. This word for Christ's Second Coming passed into the early Patristic lit. (Dionysius, vii.6, etc.; cf. also 2 Tim). It is used as a verb, and this sense is not infrequent. For instance the word in Ignatius, Philadophilus, ix.2, means the Inearnation. Or the Inearnation is called the first Parousia, as in Justin, Trypho, xiv. But in modern theology it means invariably the Second Coming. Recent archaeological discoveries have explained why the word received such general Christian use in the special sense. In Hellenistic Gr it was used for the arrival of a ruler at a place, as is evidenced by inscriptions in Egypt, Asia Minor, etc. Indeed, in an Epiphanus inscription of the 3d cent. BC (Dittenberger, Synges, No. 803, 34), "Parousia" is applied to a manifestation of Asclepius. Consequently, the adoption by the Gr-speaking Christians of a word that already contained full regal and even Divine concepts was perfectly natural. (The evidence is well summarized in Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, 372-78, Ger. ed, 251-87.) (2) "Epiphany" (ἐπίφανες, epiphaneia), "manifestation," "used of the Incarnation in 1 Cor 15 40, but of the Second Coming in 2 Thess 2 5; 1 Tim 6 14; 2 Tim 4 1.5; Tit 2 13. The word was used like Parousia in Hellenistic Gr to denote the ceremonial arrival of rulers; cf. Deissmann, as above. (3) "Apotheosis" (ἀποθεώσεις, apokathasis), "revelation," denotes the Second Coming in 1 Cor 1 7; 2 Thess 1 7; 1 Pet 4 7; 13; 4 13. (4) "Day of the Lord," more or less modified, but referring to Christ in 1 Cor 1 5; 5 5; 2 Cor 1 4; Phil 1 6; 10; 1 Thess 5 2; 2 Thess 2 2. The phrase is used of the Father in the strict OT sense in Acts 2 20; 2 Pet 3 12; Rev 16 14, and probably in 2 Pet 3 10. Besides, as in the OT and the intermediate lit., "day of wrath," "last day," or simply "day" are used very frequently. See DAY OF THE LORD.  
Of the first three of the above terms, only Parousia is found in early church exegesis, and in Mt 24 (vs 37-39), and in the last three of these all the set phrase "so shall be the coming of the Son of Man at the consummation of the ages," spoken in Aram., the use of "Parousia" here is of course due to Matthew's adoption of the current Gr word.  
The last of the 4 terms above brings the apostolic doctrine of the Parousia into connection with the eschatology (Messianic or otherwise)  
2. Data and of the OT and of the intermediate Sources  
writes. But the connection is far closer than that supplied by this single term only, for nearly every feature in the apostolic doctrine can be paralleled directly from the Jewish sources. The following summary does not begin to give complete references to even such Jewish material as is extant, but enough is presented to show how closely allied are the eschatologies of Judaism and of early Christianity.  
The end is not to be expected instantly. There are still signs to come to pass (2 Thess 2 3), and it is especially a determined number of martyrs must be filled up (Rev 6 11; cf. 2 Esd 4 35.36). There is need of patience (Jas 5 7, etc.; cf. 2 Esd 4 34; Bar 83 4). But it is at hand (1 Pet 4 7; Rev 1 3; 22 10; cf. 2 Esd 14 17). "Yet a little while" (He 10 37.38), "the night is far spent" (Rom 13 11-12); "the Lord is at hand" is the beginning of "We that are alive" expect to see it (1 Thess 4 15; 1 Cor 15 51; cf Bar 76 5); the time is shortened henceforth (1 Cor 7 29; cf Bar 20 1; 2 Esd 4 26, and the comments on 1 Cor). Indeed, there is hardly time for repentance even (Rev 22 11, ironically), certainly there is no time left for self-indulgence (1 Thess 5 3; 1 Pet 4 2; 2 Pet 3 3; Rev 3 3; cf Bar 83 5), and watchfulness is urgently demanded (1 Thess 5 6; Rev 3 3).  
An outstanding feature of the prophecies of the end (Acts 2 17.18; of XII P, Test. Levi 18 11; Sib Or 4 46, always after the consummation in the Jewish sources). But the world is growing steadily worse, for the godly and intense trials are coming (passim), although this phrase is not found in the OT. For instance the Judgment (1 Pet 4 17; cf En 99 10). Iniquity increases and false teachers are multiplied (Jude verse 18; 2 Pet 3 3; 2 Tim 3 verse 18; cf En 80 7; Bar 70 5; 3 Bar 9 18.19). Above all there is to be an anathema of dubious_messes in the midst of Antichrist (1 Jn 2 18.22; 4 3; 2 Jn verse 7; 2 Thess 2 8—10; Rev 19 19; cf Bar 36 8—10; Sib Or 63 70, and see Antichrist), who will gather all nations to his ensign (Rev 19 19; 2 Thess 2 10 of 2 Esd 13 5; En 96). Plagues fall upon men (Rev, passim; cf esp. Philo, Euseb.), and natural portents occur (Acts 2 19.20; Rev, passim; cf 2 Esd 5 4.5; En 80 5—8). But the conversion of the Jew (Rom 11 20) is brought about by these plagues (Rev 11 13), and not of Jewish sources independently; the conversion of Gentiles, as in Sib Or 3 616—623; En 10 21). Then Christ is manifested and Antichrist is slain or captured (2 Thess 2 8; Rev 19 20; cf 2 Esd 13 10.11.), in Rev 3 the Millennium follows of 2 Esd 13 34.35, and often in rabbinical lit.; the "millennium" in Slavie, ch, is, of very dubious existence), but other traces of millennial doctrine in the NT are of the vaguest (cf the comments to 1 Cor 16 24, for instance, esp. Schmiedel, J. Weiss, and Lietzmann, and see MILLENNIUM). The general resurrection follows (see RESURRECTION for details).  
The Father holds the Judgment in He 10 30; 12 23; 13 4; Jas 4 11.12; 1 Pet 1 17; Rev 14 7; 20 11, and probably in Jude vs 14.15. Christ is Judge in Acts 17 31; Rom 2 16, and probably in Rom 2 2—6; 3 6. In 2 Thess Christ appears as the executor of punishment, but the detailed form and number of Jewish schemes, cf, for instance, 2 Esd 7 33 and En 45 3. For the fate of the wicked see ESCHATOLOGY; HELL; St. Paul, rather curiously, has very little to say about this (Rom 2 3; 1 Cor 3 17; 2 Thess 1 8). The Nature of the future is nowhere adequately presented in En 45 4.5 or completely destroyed (1 Cor 7 31; He 12 27; Rev 21 1; cf En 1 6; 2 Esd 7 30), by fire in 2 Pet 3 10 (cf Sib Or 4 172—77), so as to leave only the eternal torments (He 12 27; cf 2 Esd 7 30[?]), or to be replaced with a new heaven and
a new earth (Rev 21:1; cf. Slavonic En 33:1-2). And the righteous receive the New Jerusa (Gal 4:26; He 12:22; Rev 3:12; 21:2:10; cf. Bar 4:2-6; 2 Esdr 7:26). It is of course possible, as in the older works on dogmatics, to reconcile the slight divergences of the above details and to fit them all into a single scheme. But the propriety of such an undertaking is more than dubious, for the traditional nature of these details is abundantly clear—a tradition that is due solely to the fact that the Christian and the Jewish schemes have a common OT basis. That the Jewish writers realized that the eschatological details were only symbols is made obvious by the contradictions that every apocalypse contains—the contradictions that are the despair of the beginner in apocalyptic. No writer seems to have thought it worth while to reconcile his details, for they were purely figures of dimly comprehended forces. And the Christian symbolism must be interpreted on the same principle. No greater injustice, for instance, could be done St. Paul's thought than to suppose he would have been in any least disturbed by St. John's interpretation of the Synoptist's walking-ways to earth Incarnation, and to re-interpret all of them in other human beings (1 Jn 2:18;19).

The symbolism, then, in which the Parousia is described was simply that held by the apostles in the pre-Christian days. This symbolism, to be sure, has been thoroughly purified from such puerilities as the Symbolism feast on Leviathan and Behemoth of Bar 29, or the "thousand children" of En 10:17, and all the more remarkable as 2d-century Christianity has enough of this and more (e.g. Irenaeus, v.33). What is more important is that the symbolism of the Parousia is simply in the Jewish sources the symbolism of the coming of the Messiah (of or in such schemes as have no Messiah). Now it is to be observed that among the apostles the Kingdom of God is almost uniformly regarded as a future quantity (1 Cor 6:9-10; 15:50; Gal 6:21; Eph 5:5; 2 Tim 4:1:18; 2 Pet 1:11; Rev 11:15; 12:10), with a definitely present idea only in Col 1:13. Rembrandt said that the term "Messiah" means simply "the Bringer of the Kingdom," the case becomes entirely clear. No apostle, of course, ever thought of Christ as anything but the Messiah. But not only did they think of the Messiah as work as completed, or, if the problem of eschatological "interpretation" be pressed, of the strict Messianic work as done at all. Even the Atonement belonged to the preliminary acts, viewed perhaps somewhat as En 39:6 views the preexistent Messiah's residence among the "church expectant." This could come to pass more readily as the traditions generally were silent as to what the Messiah was to do before He brought the Kingdom, while they all agreed that He was not to be created only at that moment. In the blank, esp. with the help of Isa 63:et, our Lord's earthly life and Passion fitted naturally, leaving the fact of His Second Coming to be identified with the coming of the Messiah as originally conceived.

II. The Teaching of Jesus.—It will be found helpful, in studying the bitter controversies that have raged around Christ's teaching about the future, to remember that the apocalyptic idea of the word "Messiah" is the same as that of "King"; that, for instance, "Messiah" and "Saviour of the world" are not quite convertible terms, or that a redefinition of the Messiah as a moral teacher or an expounder of the will of God does not rest on a "spiritualizing" of the term, but on a destruction of it in favor of "prophet." Now the three expressions, "Messianic work," "coming of the Kingdom," and "Parousia" are only three titles for one and the same thing, while the addition of "Son of Man" to them merely involves their being in the most traditional form possible. In fact, this is the state of affairs found in the Synoptists. Christ predicts the coming of the Kingdom. He claims the title of his kingdom (or Regent under the Father). The realization of this expectation He placed on the other side of the grave, i.e. in a glorified state. And in connection with this evidence we find His use of the title Son of Man. From all this the doctrine of the Parousia follows immediately, even apart from the passages in which the regular apocalyptic symbolism is used. The contention may be made that this symbolism in the Gospels has been drawn out of other sources by the evangelists (the so-called "Little Apocalypse" of Mk 13:7-11; 20-24; 27-30; 31 is the usual point of attack), but even if the contention could be made out (and agreement in this regard is anything but attained), no really vital part of the case would be touched. Of course, it is possible to begin with the a priori assumption that "no sane man could conceive of himself as an apocalyptic dynamo walking on earth..." from the standpoint of later testimony the Gospels that contradicts this assumption. But then there are difficulties. The various concepts involved are mentioned directly or indirectly and so often that the number of passages be reproduced grows alarmingly large. Then the concepts interlock in such a way as to present a remarkably firm resistance to the critical knife; the picture is much too consistent for an artificial product. Thus there are a number of indirect references (the tree of the Cross, the "new creation," etc.) that contradict all we know of later growths. And, finally, the most unskilled critic finds himself confronted with a last stubborn difficulty, the unwavering conviction of the earliest church that Christ made the eschatological claims. It is conceivable that the apostles may have misunderstood Christ in other matters, but an error in this central point of all (as the apostles appraised things) is hardly in the realms of critical possibility. On the other hand, such an attempt to force the whole evidence of the documents would seem something surprisingly like the violence done to history by the most perverse of the older dogmatists.

The number of relevant passages involved is so large and the problems so complex that any detailed discussion is prohibited here.

1. Critical Problems

1. Fall of Jerusalem 24 with Mk 13 and Lk 17:20-37; or Lk 17:31 with Mk 13:15.16 (noting the inappropriateness of Lk 17:31 in its present context). The critical discussions of Mk 13 are familiar and those of Lk 21 (a still more complex problem) only less so. Remembering what the
fall of Jesus or its immediate prospect would have meant to the apostles, the tendency to group the statements of Christ will be resolved. Consequently, not too much stress should be laid on the connection of this with the Parousia, and in no case can the fall of Jesus be considered to exhaust the meaning of the Parousia.

A second question is that of the time of the Parousia. Here Mk 13 30 | Lk 21 32 | Mt 24 34 place it within Christ's generation, while Mt 10 23 before all the cities of Judaea are closed to Christ's apostles (cf. the argument for any reference to the fall of Jerusalem). Then there is "ye shall see" of Mk 14 62; Lk 13 35 | Mt 23 39. Agreeing with this are the exhortations to watchfulness (Mk 13 33-37; Lk 12 40 | Mt 24 44, etc., with many parables, such as the Ten Virgins). Now Mk 13 32 | Mt 24 36 do not quite contradict this, for knowledge of the generation is quite consistent with ignorance of the day and hour; "It will be within your generation, but nothing more can be told you, so watch!" The real difficulty lies in Mt 13 10 | Mt 24 14, the necessity of all Gentiles hearing the gospel (Lk 21 24 is hardly relevant). To leave the question here, as most conservative scholars do, is unsatisfactory, for Mk 13 10-13 (cf. Mt 24 18) is a new combination of service and this value is far outweighed by the real contradiction with the other passages. The key, probably, lies in Mt 10 18, from which Mk 13 10 differs only in insisting on all Gentiles, perhaps with the apostles thought the 'world' and "Roye Empire" were practically coextensive. With this assumption the data yield a uniform result.

III. St. John's Evaluation.—It appears, then, that Christ predicted that shortly after His death an apostasy would take place (cf. 3 18), and not He only but the Spirit (14 23), and even the whole world (14 18). When the disciples are so equipped, their presence in the world subjects the world to a continual sinning process of judgment (16 11). The fate of men by this process is to be eternally fixed (3 18), while the disciples newly made are assured that they have already entered into their eternal condition of blessedness (11 25-26; 5 24; 10 28; 17 23). Equally directly the presence of Christ is conceived in Rev 3 20. So in St. Paul, the glorified Christ has returned to His own to dwell in them (Rom 8 30, etc.), uniting them into a body vitally connected with Him (Col 1 18), so supernatural that it is the teacher of 'angels' (Eph 3 10), a body whose members are already in the Kingdom (Col 1 13), who even sit already in heavenly places (Eph 2 6). The same thought is found in such synoptic passages (Lk 7 28 | Mt 11 11; Lk 17 21[?]; see Kingdom or Gon) as represent the Kingdom as present. Already the eschatological promises were realized in a small group of men, even though they lacked the transforming influence of the Spirit. Compare the continuous coming of Mt 26 64 (Lk 22 69). It is on these lines of the church as a supernatural quantity (of course not to be confused with any particular denomination) that the immediate realization of the Parous would occur of so transcendental quantity, through which a Divine Head works, whose reaction on men settles their eternal destiny, and which in turn is secured by the fall of the world. Did the quantity of history be "injected" a supernatural quantity, through which a Divine Head works, whose reaction on men settles their eternal destiny, and which in turn is secured by the fall of the world.

2. The Church a Body.

a. Divine Quantity. The Church a body is felt at the crisis of human history, perhaps esp. after the catastrophe of the primitive community. This conception of the church as a Divine quantity, so, to speak, a part of heaven extended into earth, is faithful to the essentials of the predictions. Yet is it a rationalization of them, if the idea of the church itself be not closely connected with all realms of Christian activity take on a transcendent significance, both in life and (esp.) death, giving to the individual the confidence that he is building better than he knows, for even the apostle could not realize the full significance of what they were doing. Generally speaking, the details in the symbolism must not be pressed. The purpose of revelation is to minister to life, not to curiosity, and, in teaching the future, Christ simply taught with "watchfulness," for the day, with the one change that in the supernatural process He Himself was to be the central figure. Still, the end is not yet. "The hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, to the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, to the resurrection of condemnation." (Jn 6 28; cf. Mt 25 31-46). The impression that human destiny is drawing to a climax that can be expressed only in spiritual terms that transcend our conceptions. See, further, ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NT.

LITERATURE.—This is overwhelming. For the presuppositions, GJV (HJP is antiquated); Voltz, Jüdische Eschatologie; Boureet, Religion des Judenaumen; General discussion: see Lobsieht, Jesus Rezzent, Holtzmann, Das messianische Bewusstsein Jesu (a classic); von Dobschütz, The Eschatology of the Gospels (popular, but very sound). Eschatological extreme: Schweizer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus; (Von Reimarus zu Wrede), is quite indispensable; Tyrell, Christianiaity at the Cross Roads (perverse, but valuable in parts); Loby, Gospel and the Church (of his Evangelies synoptiques). Anti-eschatological: Shamer, The Teaching of Jesus about the Future (minute criticism, inadequate premises, some astounding exegetals); Bacon, The Beginning of Gospel Story (based on Holtzmann). For the older literature, see Schweizer, Sunday, Holtzmann above, and of Fairweather, The Background of the Gospels, and Brown, "Parousia," in HIB.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

PARSHANDATHA, pār-shan-dātha, pār-'shan-dā-tha (NT); "parshanda" (V); PARSHANDATHA; LXX Παρσανάθ, Παρσανάθα, or Παρσανάθα, Parthanaesthen; perhaps from the Pers. franga-data (given by prayer); One of the sons of Haman (Est 9 7).

PART, pārt: As a vb. is no longer in good use (except in a few special phrases, of Ruth 1 17), but is obscure only in Prov 18 15, where the meaning is "break up their quarrel" (cf. 2 S 14 20). Part has not changed AV's usage, except (strangely) in 1 S 30 24, where "share" is written. For the noun see PORTION.

PARTHIANS, pār-thi-ans (Παρθοί, Pārthoi): A people mentioned in Acts 2 9 only, in connection with other strangers present at Jesus

1. Country at Pentecost, from which we infer that and Early they were Jews or proselytes from the regions included in the Parthian empire (for which see the Euphrates to the confines of India and the Oxus, and for centuries was the rival of Rome, and more than once proved her match on the battlefield. The Parthians are not mentioned in the OT, but are frequently in the NT, and they have connection with the history of the Jews, on account of the large colonies of the latter in Mesopotamia, and
the interference of the Parthians in the affairs of Judaea, once making it a vassal state.

Parthia proper was a small territory to the S.E. of the Caspian Sea, about 300 miles long by 120 wide, a fertile though mountainous region, bordering on the desert tract of Eastern Persia. The origin of the Parthians is rather uncertain, though the prevailing opinion is that they were of Scythic stock or of the great Tartar race. We have no reference to them earlier than the time of Darius the Great, but they were doubtless among the tribes subdued by Cyrus, as they are mentioned by Darius as being in revolt. They seem to have remained faithful to the Persians after that, and submitted to Alexander without resistance.

They next came under the rule of the Seleucid kings of Syria, but revolted about 250 BC, in the reign of Antiochus II (Theos), and gained their independence under the lead of Arsaces I who established the dynasty of the Arsacidae, which continued for nearly 5 centuries. His capital was Hecatompylos, but his reign continued only about 3 years, and his brother Tridates succeeded him as Arsaces II and he consolidated the kingdom. The war between the Seleucids and the Ptolemies freed him from interference from that quarter until 237 BC, when Seleucus II (Callinicus) marched against him, but was completely defeated, and Parthia independent remained. Antiochus I, who followed him, extended his dominions westward to the Zagros Mountains, but Antiochus III would not permit such an encroachment with impunity, and led an expedition against him, driving him back and even invading his ancestral dominion. But after a struggle of some years the Parthians remained still unsubdued, and the difficulties of the contest led Antiochus to conclude peace with him in which he acknowledged the independence of Parthia. For about a quarter of a century the king of Parthia remained quiet, but Phraates I (181–174 BC) recommenced aggressions on the Seleucid empire which were continued by Mithridates I (174–137), who added to his dominions a part of Bactria, on the E., and Media, Persia and Babylon on the W. This was a challenge to Demetrius II, of Syria, to whose empire the provinces belonged, and he marched against him with a large force, but was defeated and taken prisoner. He remained in Parthia some years, well treated by Phraates II, whose sister he married, and when Phraates wished to create a diversion against Antiochus Sidetes, he set Demetrius at liberty and sent him back to Syria. Antiochus was at first successful, as his force of 300,000 men far outnumbered the Parthians, but he was at last defeated and slain in 229 BC and his army destroyed. This was the last attempt of the Seleucid kings to subdue Parthia, and it was acknowledged as the dominant power in Western Asia. But Phraates fell in conflict with the Scyths, whom he called in to aid him in his war with Sidetes, and his successor likewise, and it was only on the accession of Mithridates in 124 BC that these barbarians were checked. The king then turned his attention toward Armenia, which he probably brought under his control, but, being long engaged in war with the Romans, subjugated its independence and even attacked the Parthians, and took from them two provinces in Mesopotamia.

Not long after, the power of Rome came into contact with Armenia and Parthia. In 66 BC when, in subduing Mithridates of Pontus, Pompey came into Syria, Phraates III made an alliance with him against Armenia, but was offended by the way in which he was treated and thought of turning against his ally, but refrained for the time being. It was only a question of time when the two powers would come to blows, for Parthia had become an empire and could ill brook the intrusion of Rome into Western Asia. It was the ambition and greed of Crassus that brought about the clash of Rome and Parthia. When he took the East as his share of the Roman world as apportioned among the triumvirs, he determined to rival Caesar in fame and wealth by subduing Parthia, and advanced across the Euphrates in 53 BC, with the intention of subduing Armenia in 53 BC. The story of his defeat and death and the destruction of the army and loss of the Roman eagles is familiar to all readers of Roman history. It revealed Parthia to the world as the formidable rival of Rome, which she continued to be for nearly 3 centuries. After the death of Crassus, the Parthians crossed the Euphrates and ravaged Northern Syria, but retired the following year without securing any portion of the country, and thus ended the first war with Rome. In 40 BC, after the battle of Philippi, Pescorus, who was then king, invaded Syria a second time and took possession of it together with all Pal, Tyre alone escaping subjection. He set Antigonus on the throne of Judaea, deposing Hyrcanus for the purpose. Syria and Pal was remained in the hands of Parthia for 3 years, but the coming of Ventidius gave a new turn to affairs. He drove the Parthians out of Syria, and when they returned the following year, he defeated them again and took Pescorus as a hostage. Parthia had to retire within its own borders and remained abstemious. Antony's attempt to subdue them proved abortive, and his struggle with Octavian compelled him to relinquish the project. The Parthians were unable to take advantage of the strife in the Roman empire on account of troubles at home. An insurrection led by Tridates drove the king Phraates IV from the throne, but he recovered it by the aid of the Scyths, and Tridates took refuge in Syria with the youngest son of the king. Augustus afterward restored him without ransom, and obtained the lost standards of Crassus, and thus peace was established between the rival empires. Each had learned to respect the power of the other, and, although contention arose regarding the suzerainty of Armenia, peace was not seriously disturbed between them for about 130 years, until the reign of Trajan. Parthia was not at peace with herself, however. Dynastic troubles were frequent, and the reigns of the kings were short. Artabanus III, who reigned 107–122 AD, and when Phraates wished to create a diversion against Antiochus Sidetes, he set Demetrius at liberty and sent him back to Syria. Antiochus was at first successful, as his force of 300,000 men far outnumbered the Parthians, but he was at last defeated and slain in 129 BC and his army destroyed. This was the last
50 years. The ambition of Trajan led him to disregard the policy inaugurated by Augustus, adhered to, for the most part, by his successors, not to extend the limits of the empire. After the conquest of Dacia he turned his attention to the East and resolved on the invasion of Parthia. The Parthian king, Chosroes, endeavored to placate Trajan by embassy bearing presents and proposals of peace, but Trajan rejected them and carried out his purpose. He subjugated Armenia, took Upper Mesopotamia, Adiabene (Assyria), Ctesiphon, the capital, and reached the Pers Gulf, but was obliged to turn back by revolts in his rear and far away. To secure the Parthian provinces were restored, however, by Hadrian, and the Parthians did not recommit until the reign of Aurelius, when they overran Syria, and in 162 AD, Lucius Verus sent to punish them. In the following year he drove them back and advanced into the heart of the Parthian empire, inflicting the severest blow it had yet received. It was evident that the empire was on the decline, and the Romans did not meet with the resistance they had expected. Fortunatus, Caracalla, and Severus, with Caracalla both made expeditions into the country, and the latter took the capital and massacred the inhabitants, but after his assassination his successor, Macrinus, fought a three days' battle with the Parthians in which he was killed. This was what he was worsted and was glad to conclude a peace by paying an indemnity of some £1,500,000 (217 AD).

But this was the last achievement of the Parthians. It is evident that Artabanus had suffered severely in his conflict with the Romans, and but one more national expedition, led by Artaxerxes, who overthrew the Parthian empire and established the dynasty of the Sassamides in its place (226 AD).

4. Full of the Empire

The Parthians were not a cultured people, but displayed a rude magnificence, making use, to some extent, of remains of Gr culture which they found within the regions they seized from the empire of Alexander. They had no native lit., as far as known, but made use of Gr in writing and on their coins. They were familiar with Heb or Syro-Chaldaic, and the later kings had Sem legends on their coins. Jos is said to have written his history of the Jewish War in Parthian languages. In no method of government they seem to have left the different provinces pretty much to themselves, so long as they paid tribute and furnished the necessary contingents.

H. F. Porter

PARTICULAR, parrē-k'tlar, par-tik'-tlar, PARTICULARLY: the adverbial phrase "in particular" occurs twice in AV (1 Cor 12 27, 2 k μέρους, εκ μέρους, RV "severally," RVm "each in its part"); and Epp 5 33, εκ αὐτοῦ, καὶ καθ' ἑαυτόν, RV "severally," RVm "individually"); in both cases it has the absolute meaning of "severally," "individually." The advb, "particularly" occurs in the same sense in Acts 21 19 AV, καθ' εἰς τὰ κρατῖα, καθ' ἑαυτόν, RVm "each in its part"; and 1 Pet 3 16, εκ αὐτοῦ, εκ καθορίσεως, RVm "formally." The phrase "in detail," in 2 Mac 2:30, "to be curious in particulars"; 11:20 (AV "of the particulars I have given order," RV "I have given order in detail"); and the adj, "particular," in the sense of "in detail" in the first Prologue to Sirach (AV, Vulg peculiare; the whole section omitted in RV).

D. Miall Edwards

PARTITION, parr-ish'un, par-tish'un, THE MIDDLE WALL OF (πῆλος του εἰς τοῦ φραγμοῦ, τῆς μεσοδομίας τοῦ φραγμοῦ (Epp 2:14)): What Paul here asserts is that Christ is our peace, the peace of both Jewish and Gentile believers. He has made them both to be one in Himself, and has broken down the barrier which divided them from one another. Then the apostle regards Jew and Gentile as two, who by a fresh act of creation in Christ are made into one new man. Any attempt of this simile he refers to an actual wall in the temple which between which no one was allowed to pass unless he were a Jew, the balustrade or barrier which marked the limit up to which a Gentile might advance but no further. Curiously, this middle wall of partition had a great deal to do with the Partho-Syrian Partition, for the multitude of the Jews became infuriated, not merely because of their general hostility to him as an apostle of Christ and a preacher of the gospel for the world, but specially because it was erroneously supposed that he had brought Therismos to Ephesus past this barrier into the temple (Acts 21:29), and that he had in this manner profaned the temple (24:6), or, as it is put in 21:28, he had brought Greeks into the temple and polluted this holy place.

2. Herod's Partition of the Temple; Its Divisions; the Courts of the Jews; the Consecration of the Temple.

The temple was built on a nucleus which had already been made on Paul they violently seized and dragged him out of the temple—dragged him outside the balustrade. The Levites at once shut the gates, to prevent the possibility of any further profanation, and Paul in a piece of typical Greek gallantry as Roman commander and his soldiers forcibly prevented.

In building the temple Herod the Great had included a large area to form the various courts. The temple proper consisted of the Holy Place, entered by the priests every year, and the Holy Place, into which the high priest entered alone once every year; Divisions: year immediately outside the temple was the Court of the Gentiles, and in it was placed the great altar of burnt offering. Outside of this, near the bottom of the Sons of Israel, and beyond this the Court of the Women. The site of the temple itself and the space occupied by the various courts already mentioned formed a raised plateau or platform. "From it you descended at various points down 5 steps and through gates in a lofty wall, to find yourself overlooking another large court—the outer court to which Gentiles, who desired to see something of the glories of the temple and to offer gifts and sacrifices to the God of the Jews, were freely admitted. Further in than this court they were forbidden, on pain of death, to go. The actual boundary line was not the high wall with its gates, but a low stone barrier about 14 ft. in height, marked by a marble "bottom of 14 more steps" (J. Armitage Robinson, D.D., Sir John's "History of the Epiphany; see also, Ederseh, The Temple, Its Ministry and Services as They were at the time of Jesus Christ, 46).

The middle wall of partition was called ἀναβάσθαι, and was built of marble beautifully ornamented. The Court of the Gentiles formed the lowest and the outermost enclosure of all the courts of the sanctuary. It was paved with the finest variegated marble. Its name signified that it was open to all, Jews or Gentiles alike. It was very large, and is said by Jewish tradition to have formed a square of 785 ft.

It was in this court that the oxen and sheep and the dove for the sacrifices were sold as in the old court. It was in this court too that there were the tables of the money-changers, which Christ Himself overthrew when He drove out the sheep and oxen and them that bought and sold in His Father's house. The multitudes assembling in this court must have had plenty of space on occasions such as the Passover and Pentecost and at the other great feasts, and the din of voices must sometimes have been deafening. And if any Gentile in this court no Gentile might go. See TEMPLE.

In the year 70, while excavations were being made on the site of the temple by the Palestine Exploration Fund, M. Clermont-Ganneau discovered one of the pillars which have been described as belonging to the very barrier or middle wall of partition, to which Paul refers. The pillar is now preserved at Constantiople and is inscribed with a Gr inscription in capital or uncials letters, which is translated as follows: NO MAN OF ANOTHER NATION ENTER WITHIN THE FENCE AND ENCLOSURE AROUND THE TEMPLE AND WHOMSOEVER IS CAUGHT WILL HAVE HIMSELF TO BLAME THAT HIS DEATH ENDURE.
While Paul was writing the Ep. to the Eph at Rome, this barrier in the temple at Jerusalem was still standing, yet the chained prisoner of Jesus Christ was not afraid to write that Christ had broken down the middle wall of partition, and had thus admitted Gentiles who were far off, strangers and foreigners, to all the privileges of access to God ancienly possessed by Israel alone; that separation between Jew and Gentile was done away with forever in Christ.

If Paul wrote the Ep. to the Eph in 60 or 61 AD, then the actual barrier of stone remained in its position in the Court of the Gentiles not more than some 10 years.

4. The Throwing Down of the Barrier

for it was thrown down in the burning of the temple by the Roman army. And out of those ruins a fragment has been excavated in our own day, containing the very inscription threatening death to the gentile intruder, and reminding us that it is only in Christ Jesus that we now draw nigh unto God, and that we are thus one body in Christ, one new man. Christ has broken down the middle wall of partition, for He, in His own person, is our peace.

John Rutherfrud

PARTRIDGE, pār'trij (נַפְרֵדֵן, נפרד; Lat. perdix; LXX. 1 S 26 20, νυκτικόραξ, νυκτικόραξ; "owl," Jer 17 11, περδίξ, perdix): A bird of the family Tetraonidae. The Heb word for this bird, נפרד, means "a caller," and the Lat perdix is supposed to be an imitation of its cry, and as all other nations base their name for the bird on the Lat, it becomes quite evident that it was originally named in imitation of its call. The commonest partridge of Palestine, very numerous in the wilderness and hill country, was a bird almost as large as a pheasant. It had a clear, exquisite cry that attracted attention, esp. in the mating season. The partridge of the wilderness was smaller and of beautifully marked plumage. It made its home around the Dead Sea, in the Wilderness of Judaea and in rocky caverns. Its eggs were creamy white; its cry very similar to its relatives'. The partridge and its eggs were used for food from time immemorial.

The first reference to it is found in 1 S 26 20: "Now therefore, let not my blood fall to the earth away from the presence of Jeh: for the king of Israel is come out to seek a flea, as when one doth hunt a partridge in the mountains." David in this dialogue with Saul clearly indicates that if he did not hunt the partridge himself, he knew how it was done. The birds were commonly chased up the mountains and stunned or killed with "throw sticks." David knew how best these birds were at hiding beside logs and under dry leaves colored so like them as to afford splendid protection; how swiftly they could run; what expert dodgers they were; so he compared taking them with catching a flea. The other reference is found in Jer 17 11: "As the partridge that sitteth on eggs which she hath not laid, so is he that getteth riches, and not by right; in the midst of his days he shall leave him, and at his end he shall be a fool." If this reference is supposed to indicate that partridges are in the habit of brooding on the nest of their kind or of different birds, it fails wholly to take into consideration the history of the bird. Partridges select a location, carefully deposit an egg a day for from 10 to 15 days, sometimes 20, and then brood, so that all the young emerge at one time. But each bird knows and returns to its nest with unfailing regularity. It would require the proverbial "Philadelphia lawyer" to explain this reference to a "partridge sitting on eggs she had not laid." No ornithologist ever could reconcile it to the habits or characteristics of the birds. AV & the lines, "As the partridge sitteth on eggs, and hatcheth them not." This was easy to explain clearly. The eggs of the partridge were delicious food, and any brooding bird whose nest was discovered after only a few days of incubation did not hatch, because she lost her eggs. Also the eggs frequently fall prey to other birds or small animals. Again, they are at the mercy of the elements, sometimes being spoiled by extremely wet cold weather. Poultry fanciers assert that a heavy thunderstorm will spoil chicken eggs when hatching time is close; the same might be true with eggs of the wild. And almost any wild bird will desert its
nest and make its former brooding useless, if the location is visited too frequently by man or beast.

There is also a partridge reference in the Book of Eccles (11 29 ff RV): "Bring not every man into thine house; for many are the plots of the deceitful man. As a decoy partridge in a cage, so is the heart of a proud man; and as one that is a spy, he looketh upon thy falling. For he lieth in wait to turn things that are good into evil, and in things that are praiseworthy he will lay blame." The reference is to confining a tame partridge in a hidden cage so that its calls would lure many of its family within range of arrows or "throw sticks" used by concealed hunters.

Gene Stratton-Porter

PARUAH, pa-ro'ō-a (תְּפֻרָה, pär'ēh, "blooming"): Father of Jehoshaphat, who was one of Solomon's twelve victualers or providers, and had charge in Issachar of this function (1 K 4 17).

PARVAIM, pār-vā'īm (תְּפָרֵיִם, par'ē'im): The word occurs only in 2 Ch 3 6, as the place from which Solomon obtained gold for the decoration of his Temple. A derivation is given from the Sanskrit pāra, "eastern," so that the name might be a vague term for the East (Genesius, Thesaurus, 1125). Whether there was such a place in Arabia is doubtful. Farwa in Yemen has been suggested, and also Sak el Parwain in Yemenah. Some have considered the name a shortened form of Saphrō'ānim which occurs in the Syr and Tg Jonathan for the "Sephar" of Gen 10 30.

A. S. Fulton

PAS-DAMMIM, pas-dam'mīm. See Ephes-dammim.

PASEAH, pa-sē'ā, pas'ē-a (תְּפָשֵׁא, pāshēh, "divider"): Son of Japhlet, descendant of Asher (1 Ch 7 33).

PASSING, pas'ing, PASSAGES, pas'ing-s. See Apocryphal Gospels.

PASSING OF MARY, THE. See Apocryphal Gospels.

PASSING, pash'ūn, PASSIONS, pash'un: "Passion" is derived from Lat passio, which in turn
is derived from the vb. *patior*, with the √ *pat*. The Lat words are connected with the Gr √ *παθ*, *path*, which appears in a large number of derivatives. And Gr. *pathos* and with other languages in addition* words connected with this √ *pat, path*, are often susceptible of a great variety of meanings, for which the dicta, must be consulted. For "*passion, *" however, as it appears in EV only three of these meanings need be considered. (1) Close to what seems to be the primary force of the root is the meaning "*suffer, *" and in this sense "*passion *" is used in Acts 1 3, "to whom he also showed himself alive after his passion." This is a paraphrase (Gr *παθήματα*; due to the Vulg (post passionem suam), and in Eng. as old as Vycliff, whom the subsequent EV has followed. This is the only case in AV and RV where "*passion *" has this meaning, and it can be so used in modern Eng. only when referring (as here) to the sufferings of Christ (cf. "*Passion play"). (2) "*Suffering," when applied to the mind, came to denote the state that is controlled by some emotion, and so "*passion *" was applied to the emotion itself. This is the meaning of the word in Acts 14 15, "men of like passions," Gr *συμμίσθις, homoioopathēs*; RV "of like nature" gives the meaning exactly; "men with the same emotions as we." (3) From "emotion" a transition took place to the "passion" itself and this is the normal force of "passion" in modern Eng. AV does not use this meaning, but in RV "passion" in this sense is the Gr of *φαλάκρινον, pathēma*; in its three occurrences: Rom 2 20 (AV "affection"); Col 3 5 (AV "passion"); 1 Thess 5 15 (AV "lust"). It is used also for two occurrences of *παθώνα, pathēma* (closely allied to *pathos*) in Rom 7 5 (AV "movtions," AVM "passions") and in Gal 5 24 (AV "affection"). The fixing of the exact force in any of these cases is a delicate problem fully discussed in the comms. In Col 3 5 only does "passion" stand as an isolated term. The context here perhaps gives the word a slight sexual reference, but this must not be overstressed; the warning probably includes any violent over-emotion that robs a man of his self-control. See Affection; Motion, BURTON SCOTT EASTON.

PASSION, GOSPEL OF THE. See Apocryphal Gospels.

PASSOVER, pas'o-ver (πάσχα, *pesah*, from *pasha*, "to pass" or "spring over" or "to spare") [Ex 12 13-23:27; cf Isa 31 5]. Other conjectures connect the word with the "passing over" into a new year, with Asyer *pasah*, meaning "to placate," with Heb *pasha*, meaning "to dance," and even with the skipping motions of a young lamb; Arab. *nitsa*, *pasa*, whence Gr *πάσχα, Pæschas*; whence Eng. "paschal." In early Christian centuries folk-etymology connected *pæschas* with Gr *pæschas*, "to suffer" [see Passion], and the word was taken to refer to Good Friday rather than the Passover: 1. *Pessa* and *Maçcath* 2. *Pessa* *mikayim* 3. *Pessa* *dörath* 4. *Maçcath* 5. The *Omery* 6. To-traditional Theories 7. The Higher Criticism 8. Historical Celebrations: OT Times 9. Historical Celebrations: NT Times 10. The Jewish Passover.

The Passover was the annual Heb festival on the evening of the 14th day of the month of 'Abibh or Nisan, as it was called in later times. It was for 4000 years could be done. And *pæschas*, a 7 days festival of *maçcath*, or unleavened bread, to which the name Passover was also applied by extension (Lev 23 5). Both were distinctly connected with the Exodus, which, according to tradition, they commemorate; the Passover in in commemoration of Egypt, eaten in preparation for the journey, while Jeh, passing over the houses of the Hebrews, was slaying the firstborn of Egypt (Ex 12 12; 13 2-12 it); the *maçcath* festival being in memory of the first days of the journey during which this bread of haste was eaten (Ex 12 14-20).

The ordinance of *pesah mikayim*, the last meal in Egypt, included the following provisions: (1) the taking of a lamb, or butt of blemish, for each household on the 10th of the month; (2) the killing of the lamb on the 14th at even; (3) the sprinkling of the blood on doorposts and lintels of the houses in which it was to be eaten; (4) the roasting of the lamb with fire, its head with its legs and inwards—the lamb was not to be eaten raw or sodden (bâshal) with water; (5) the eating of unleavened bread and bitter herbs; (6) eating in haste, with lions brought, shoes on the feet, and all in hand; (7) and remaining in the house until the morning; (8) the burning of all that remained; the Passover could be eaten only during the night (Ex 12 1-23).

This service was to be observed as an ordinance forever (Ex 12 14-24), and the night was to be lôl shîmûrîm, "a night of vigils," or, at least, "to be much observed" of all the children of Israel throughout their generations (Ex 12 42). The details, however, of the *pesah dörath*, or later observances of the Passover, seem to have differed slightly from those of the Eng Passover (Mish, *Pâghûm*, ix.5). Thus it is probable that the victim could be taken from the flock or from the herd (Dt 16 2; cf Ex 4 22). (3), (6) and (7) disappeared entirely, and even from Dt 16 7, the prohibition against eating (Hcb *bâshal*) was not understood to apply (unless, indeed, the omission of the expression "with water" gives a more general sense to the Heb word *bâshal*, making it include roasting). New details were also added: for example, that the Passover could be sacrificed only at the central sanctuary (Dt 16 5); that no alien or uncircumcised person, or unclean person, could partake of it, and that one prevented by uncleanness or some other cause from celebrating the Passover in season could do so a month later (Nu 9 9f). The singing of the Hallel (Ps 113-115), both while the Passover was being sung and at the meal, and other details were no doubt added from time to time.

Unleavened bread was eaten with the Passover meal, just as with all sacrificial meals of later times (Ex 23 18; 34 25; Lev 7 12), independently and generally the fact that the Passover came in such close proximity with the Feast of Unleavened Bread (Ex 12 8). Jewish tradition distinguishes, at any rate, between the first night and the rest of the festival in that the eating of *maçcath* is an obligation on the first night and optional during the rest of the week (*Pâghûm 120*), although the eating of unleavened bread is commanded in general terms (Ex 12 15; 18; 13 6.7; 23 15; 34 18; Lev 23 6; Nu 28 17). The eating of leavened bread is strictly prohibited, however, during the entire week under penalty of kârîth, "excision" (Ex 12 15.19.14; 13 7; 13 14.15 3), and this prohibition has been observed traditionally with great care. The 1st and 7th days are holy convocations, days on which no labor is done. These were so regarded as necessary in the preparation of food. The festival of *Maçcath*, is reckoned as one of the three pilgrimage festivals,
though strictly the pilgrimage was connected with the Passover portion and the first day of the festival.

During the entire week additional sacrifices were offered in the temple: an offering for sin and burnt offering, 2 young bullocks, 1 ram, 7 lambs of the first year, 1 young goat as a sin offering, and drink offerings and a goat for a sin offering.

During the week of the **mâsôt** festival comes the beginning of the barley harvest in Pal (Mô'âdôth 650) which lasts from the end of March in the low Jordan valley to the beginning of May in the elevated portions.

Next day, the offering is made to the standing corn (Dt 16:9) and of bringing the sheaf of the peace offering is spoken of as the morning of the Sabbath (Lev 23:15), that is, according to the Jewish tradition, the day after the first day, or rest-day, of the Passover (Mô'âdôth 650; My T'an, 1; Jos, Ant, III, x, 5), and according to Samaritan and Boethusian traditions and the modern Karites the Sunday after the Passover. At this time a wave offering is made of a sheaf, followed by a meal offering with a meal and drink offering, and only thereafter might the new corn be eaten. From this day 7 weeks are counted to fix the date of Pentecost, the celebration connected with the wheat harvest. It is of course perfectly natural for the agricultural people to celebrate the turning-points of the agricultural year in connection with their traditional festivals. Indeed, the Jewish liturgy of today retains in the Passover service the Prayer of Dél (âl) which grew up in Pal on the basis of the needs of an agricultural people.

Many writers, however, eager to explain the entire festival of the Passover, go back to an agricultural origin (presumably a Canaanite one, though there is not a shred of evidence that the Canaanites had such a festival), have seized upon the word the priests offer towards the end of the sacrifice of the firstborn of man and beast (both institutions being traditionally traced to the judgment on the firstborn of the Egyptians in Ex 13:11-15; Ps 110:5; P 134:19; P 135:20), so as to characterize the Passover as a festival of the firstborn. Here, however, is the difference. The firstborn of the flocks of the Hebrews, were of course very valuable, and therefore exceptional from the point of view of the Hebrews, but this is not positive evidence that has been added to our knowledge of the Passover by this theory.

The Pent speaks of the Passover in many contexts and naturally with constantly varying emphasis. Thus in the Pentateuch itself the observance of the festival is naturally to be expected in the next verse. The Pent and Hût, in both of which the word sacrifices is used, thus introduce the idea of the sacrifices, and according to the view here taken, we must distinguish between the pesah mîca'â'âm and the pesah mîkatim. Nevertheless, great stress is laid in the Pent and Ps 80 and Hût on the variations in the several accounts, but no certain groups of critics, on the basis of which they seek to support their several theories of the composition of the Pent or Hût. Without entering into this controversy, it will be sufficient here to enumerate and classify all the discrepancies said to exist in the several Passover passages, together with such explanations as have been suggested. These discrepancies may be called, (1) omissions, (2) differences of emphasis, and (3) conflicts of statements.

The writers of the Passover, because of their lack of historical insight into the past, were here to be used to designate passages assigned to the various sources by the higher criticism of today merely for the sake of convenience. There is nothing remarkable about the omission of the daily sacrifices from all passages except Lev 23:8 (H) and Nu 28:19 (P), nor is there any mention of the dry bread in the highy holy communion on the first day in the contexts of Dt 16:8 and Ex 23:16. There is no omission of notices to a central sanctuary in passages other than Dt 16. Neither can any significance be attached to the fact that the passover is mentioned in Ex 23:16 (P), the historical importance of which is that the date is spoken of, and in Lev 23:15 (H) where the date can be interpreted as that of Pentecost there. (2) As to emphasis, it is said that the so-called Elohist Covenant (E) (Ex 33) has no reference to the Passover; it speaks only of Yahweh in which this festival is spoken of together with the other.

The children of Israel began the keeping of the Passover in its due season according to all its ordinances in the wilderness of Sinai (Nu 8:5). In the very beginning of their national life in Pal we find them celebrating the Passover under the leadership of Moses (Josh 5 10). History records few but later celebrations in Pal, but there are enough intimations to indicate that it was frequently if not regularly observed. Thus Solomon offered sacrifices three times a year upon the altar which he had built to Jeh, at the appointed seasons, including the Feast of Unleavened Bread (1 K 9 25-26 Ch 8 13). The later prophets speak of appointed seasons for pilgrimages and sacrifices (cf Isa 1 12-14), and occasionally perhaps the Passover celebration (cf Isa 30 29), bearing in mind that the Passover is the only night-feast of which we have any record. In Hezekiah's time the Passover had fallen into such a state of desuetude that neither the priests nor the people were prepared for the king's urgent appeal to observe it. Nevertheless, he was able to bring together a large concourse in Jerus during the 2d month and institute a more joyful observance than any other record since the days of the Judges. Notice, however, that Josiah, however, there was celebrated the most memorable Passover, presumably in the matter of conformity to rule, since the days of the Judges (2 K 23 21; 2 Ch 30 1 ff.). The continued observance of the Passover is thus attested by Ezekiel's interest in it (Ezk 45 18). In post-exilic times it was probably observed more scrupulously than ever before (Ezr 6 19 ff).

Further evidence, if any were needed, of the importance of the Passover in the life of the Jews of the second temple is found in the NT Times.

9. Historical Celebrations: We have both Bab and Pal g'mârâ. NT Times.

The NT Times speak of the sacrifice and to the sacrificing side and to the ministration of offering out and destroying leaven, what constitutes leaven, and similar questions, instruction in which the children of Israel sought, for 30 days before the Passover. Jos speaks of the festival often (Avd, I, iv, v, 6; III, 1, 13; IX, 4, 8; XIV, 2, 27; XV, 3; B, II, 1, 3; V, iii, 1; VI, ix, 3). Besides repeating the details already explained in the Bible, he tells of the innumerable multitudes that came for the Passover to Jerus out of the country and coming from beyond the borders of all Pal in the year in the days of Cestius, 256,500 lambs were slaughtered and that at least 20 men were counted to each. (This estimate of course includes the regular
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Various authors have accepted recognition of the Passover. At this great festival even the Roman officers released prisoners in recognition of the people's celebration. Travel and other ordinary pursuits were no doubt suspended (cf Acts 12:3; 20:15). The details were impressed on the minds of the people and lent themselves to symbolic and homiletic purposes (cf 1 Cor 5:7; Jn 19:34–36, where the paschal lamb is made to typify Jesus; and He 11:28). The best-known instance of such symbolic use is the institution of the Eucharist. The basis of the paschal meal still holds. Some doubt exists as to whether the Last Supper was the paschal meal or not. According to the Synoptic Gospels, it was (Lk 22:7; Mt 26:17; Mk 14:12); while according to John, the Passover was to be eaten some time following the Last Supper (Jn 18:28). Various harmonizations of these passages have been suggested, the most ingenious, probably, being on the theory that when the Passover fell on Friday night, the Pharirees ate the meal on Thursday and the Sadducees on Friday, and that Jesus followed the custom of the Pharisees (Chwolson, Das letzte Passahmal Jesu, 2d ed., St. Petersburg, 1904). Up to the Nicene Council in the year 325, the church observed Easter on the Jewish Passover. It took Paul to Caesarea in order to separate the two, condemning their confusion as Arianism.

After the destruction of the temple the Passover became a home service. The paschal lamb was no longer included. On the other hand, parts of the Samaritans have continued this rite to this day. In the Jewish home a roasted bone is placed on the table in memory of the rite, and other articles symbolic of the Passover are placed beside it: such as a roasted egg, said to be in memory of the free-will offering; a sauce called haroseth, said to resemble the mortar of Egypt; salt water, for the symbolic dipping (cf Mt 26:23); the bitter herbs and the maror. The sefer (program) is as follows: sanctification; washing of the hands; dipping and dividing the paschal; breaking and setting aside a piece of maror to be distributed and eaten at the end of the supper; reading of the haggadah shel pesah, a poetic narrative in answer to the four questions asked by the youngest child in compliance with the Bib. command found 3 t in Ex and once in Dt, "Thou shalt tell thy son on that day"; washing the hands for eating; grace before eating; tasting the maror; eating the bitter herbs; eating of them together; the meal; partaking of the maror that had been set aside as 'apikoren or dessert; grace after meat; Hal'el; request that the service be accepted. Thereafter folk-songs are sung, traditional melodies, and poems recited, many of which have allegorical meanings. A cup of wine is used at the sanctification and another at grace, in addition to which two other cups have been added, the 4 according to the Mish (Pesh. xxvi) symbolizing the 4 words employed in Ex 6:6.7 for the delivery of Israel from Egypt. Instead of eating in haste, as in the Egyptian Passover, it is customary to recline or lean at this meal in token of Israel's freedom.

The prohibition against leaven is strictly observed. The searching for hidden leaven on the evening before the Passover and its destruction in the morning have become formal ceremonies for which appropriate blessings and declarations have been included in the liturgy since the days when leaven was the normal bread of the Jews. As in the case of other festivals, the Jews have doubled the days of holy convocation, and have added a semi-holiday after the last day, the so-called 'segur' hagig, in token of their love for the ordained celebration and their loathness to depart from it.

NATHAN ISAACS

PASTORAL, pa'stor-ol', Epistles, The:

I. genuineness

1. external evidence

2. genuineness questioned

II. alleged difficulties against pauline authorship

1. relative to Paul's experiences (1) data in 1 Cor (2) data in 2 Cor (3) data in 1 Thess.

2. subject-matter post-Pauline (1) the clergy or the church organization (2) the doctrinal difficulty (3) the language

3. the authenticity of the epistles not Paul's

III. date and order

1. date of the epistles

2. their order

LITERATURE

The First and Second Ep. to Tim, and the Ep. to Tit form a distinct group among the letters written by Paul, and are now known as the Pastoral Epistles, because they were addressed to two Christian ministers. When Timothy and Titus received these epistles, they were not acting, as they had previously done, as missionaries or itinerant evangelists, but had been left by Paul in charge of churches; the former having the oversight of the church in Ephesus, and the latter having the care of the churches in the island of Crete. The Pastoral Epistles were written to guide them in the discharge of the duties devolving upon them as Christian pastors. Such is a general description of these epistles. In each of them, however, there is a great deal more than is covered or implied by the designation "Pastoral"—much that is personal, and much also that is concerned with Christian faith and doctrine and practice generally.

I. genuineness

In regard to the genuineness of the epistles, there is abundant external attestation. Allusions to them are found in the external writings of Clement and Polycarp. In evidence of this the middle of the 2d cent. the epistles were recognized as Pauline in authorship, and were frequently among the New Testament canon. "Marcion indeed rejected them, and Tatian is supposed to have rejected those to Timothy. But, as Jerome states in the preface to his Comm. on Tit., these heretics rejected the epistles, not on critical grounds, but merely because they disliked their teaching. He says they used no argument, but merely asserted, 'This is Paul's. This is not Paul's. It is obvious that men holding such opinions as Marcion and Tatian held, would not willingly ascribe authority to epistles which condemned asceticism. So far, then, as the early church can guarantee to us the authenticity of the epistles ascribed to Paul, the Pastoral Epistles are guaranteed' (Marcus Dods, Intro to the NT, 167).

The external evidence is all in favor of the reception of these epistles, which were known not only to Clement and Polycarp, but also to Irenaeus, Tertullian, the author of the Ep. to the churches of Vienne and Lyons, and Theophilus of Antioch. The evidence of Polycarp, which is dated in 167 AD, is remarkably strong. He says, "The love of money is the beginning of all trouble, knowing . . . that we brought nothing into the world, neither can carry anything out" (1 Tim 6:10). It would be difficult to overthrow testimony of this nature.

The decision of certain critics to reject the Pastoral Epistles, as documents not from the hand of Paul, is not
reached on the external evidence, which is perhaps as early an attestation as can be reasonably expected. They are included in the Muratorian Canon, and quoted by Tertullian and Irenæus and even Tertullian is satisfied with Paul's" (A. S. Peake, A Critical Intro to the Acts, 3). This受理 is admitted by many others. Baur asserted that they were written for the purpose of vindicating the Christianism of the period, and of defending the church from it by means of ecclesiastical organization, and that the date of their composition was the year 150. This

II. Alleged Difficulties against Pauline Authorship. — Various difficulties have been alleged against the reception of the Pastoral Epp., as Pauline. The chief of these are: (1) the difficulty of finding any place for these letters in the life of Paul, as that is recorded in the Acts and in the Pauline Epp. written before the Pastoral; (2) the fact that there are said to be in them indications of an ecclesiastical organization, and of a development of doctrine, both orthodox and heretical, considerably in advance of the Pauline age; (3) that the language of the epp. is on large extents, different from that in the accepted epp.; (4) the "most decisive" of all the arguments against the Pauline authorship—so speaks Dr. A. C. McGiffert (A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age, 402)—is that "the Christianity of the Pastoral Epp. is not the Christianity of Paul."

Where can a place be found for these epp., in the life of Paul? The indications of the date of their composition given in the epp. them- to Paul's

1. Relative solves are these:

(1) Data in 1 Tim.—In 1 Tim. 3, experiences Paul had gone from Ephesus to Macedonia, and had left Timothy in Ephesus in charge of the church there. In the Pastoral Epp. and in the previously written parts of the Acts, it is impossible to find such events or such a state of matters as will satisfy these requirements. Paul had previously been in Ephesus, on several occasions. His 1st visit to that city is recorded in Acts 18 19-21. On that occasion he went from Ephesus, not into Macedonia, but into Syria. His 2d visit was his 3 years' residence in Ephesus, as narrated in Acts 19; and when he left the city, he had, previous to his own departure from it, already sent Timothy to Macedonia. In 2 Tim. 1 3, the reverse of that described in 1 Tim. 3. Timo- thy soon rejoined Paul, and so far was he from being left in Ephesus then, that he was in Paul's company on the remainder of his journey toward Rome (Acts 27-28). But does the Cor 3

No place therefore in Paul's life, previous to his arrest in Jerusalem, and his first Rom imprisonment, can be found, which satisfies the requirements of the situation described in 1 Tim. 3. "It is impossible, unless we assume a second Rom imprisonment, to reconcile the various historical notices which the epp. [2 Tim] contains" (McGiffert, op. cit., 407).

In addition to this, the language used by the apostle at Miletus, when he addressed the elders of the Ephesian church (Acts 20 30) about the men speaking pernicious things, who should arise among them, showed that these false teachers had not made their appearance at that time. There is, for this reason alone, no place for the Pastoral Epp. in Paul's life, previous to his arrest in Jerusalem. But Paul's life is a blank at the termination of his first Rom imprisonment; and this one fact gives ample room to satisfy all the conditions, as these are found in the three Pastoral Epp.

Those who deny the Pauline authorship of these epp. also deny that he was released from what, in this article, I term his 1st Rom imprisonment. But a denial of this latter statement is an assumption quite unwarranted and unproved. It assumes that Paul was not set free, simply because there is no record of this in the Acts. But the Acts is, on the very face of it, an incomplete or unfinished record; that is, it brings the narrative to a certain point, and then breaks off, evidently for the reason which Sir W. M. Ramsay demonstrates, that Luke must needs — however, which he was unable, owing to some cause now unknown, to carry into execution. The purpose of the Acts, as Ramsay shows (St. Paul the Traveller and the Rom Citizen, 23, 308), is to lead up to the release of Paul, and to show that the Christian faith was not an forbidden or illegal religion, but that the formal imprisonment of the apostle before the supreme court of the empire ended in his being set at liberty, and thus there was established the fact that the faith of Jesus Christ was not, at that time, contrary to Rom law. "The Pauline authorship . . . can be maintained only on the basis of a hypothetical reconstruction, either of an entire period subsequent to the Rom imprisonment, or of the events within some period known to us" (McGiffert, op. cit., 410). The one fact that Paul was set free after his 1st Rom imprisonment gives the environment which fits exactly all the requirements of the Pastoral Epp.

Attention should first be directed to the facts and to the conclusion stated in the art. Pastoral Epistles (4). Mommsen having shown that the words, "My bonds became manifest in Christ throughout the whole prastorian guard" (Phil 1 13), mean that at the time when Paul wrote the Ep. to the Phil, the case against him had already come before the supreme court of appeal in Rome, it had been partly heard, and that the impression made by the prisoner upon his judges was so favorable, that he expected soon to be set free. The indications are to be drawn from other expressions in three of the epp. of the Rom captivity—Phil, Col and Philem—are to the same effect. Thus, writing to the Philippians, he says that he hopes to send Timothy to them, so soon as he sees how matters go with him, and that he trusts in the Lord that he himself will visit them shortly. And again, writing to his friend Philemon in the city of Colossa, he asks him to prepare him a lodging, for he trusts that through the prayers of the Colossians, he will be granted to them.

These anticipations of acquittal and of departure from Rome are remarkable, and do not in any degree coincide with the idea that Paul was not set free but was under arrest at that time. "It is obvious that the importance of the trial is intelligible only if Paul was acquitted. That he was acquitted follows from the Pastoral Epp. with certainty for all who admit their genuineness; while even they who deny their Pauline origin must allow that they imply an early belief in historical details which are not consistent with Paul's journeys before his trial, and must either be pure inventions or events that occurred on later journeys. . . . If he was acquitted, the issue of the trial was a formal decision by the supreme court of the empire that it was permissible to preach Christianity; the trial, therefore, was really a charter of religious liberty, and therein lies its immense importance. It was indeed overturned by later decisions of the supreme court; but its existence was a highly important fact for the Christians" (Ramsay, op. cit., 308). "That he was acquitted is demanded both by the plan evident in Acts and by other reasons well stated by others" (ib, 380).

It should be observed that there is the direct and corroborative evidence of Paul's release, afforded by such writers as Cyril of Jerusalem, Ephrem Syr., Chrysostom and Theodoret, all of whom speak of Paul's going to Spain. Jerome (Vir. Ill., 5) gives it as
a matter of personal knowledge that Paul traveled as far as Spain. But there is more important evidence. The Muratorian Canon, in 1:37, says the words, "profectionem Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam proficiscens" ("the journey of Paul as he journeyed from Rome to Spain"). Clement also in the ep, from the church in Rome to the church in Corinth, which was written not later than the year 96 AD, says in reference to Paul, "Having taught righteousness to the whole world, and having gone to the extremity of the west [ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς διάστασις ἔδην] and having borne witness before the rulers, so many years he resided there, but to these, being the greatest example of endurance." The words, "having gone to the extremity of the west," should be specially noticed. Clement was in Rome when he wrote this, and, accordingly, the natural import of the words is that Paul went to the limit of the western half of the then known world, or in other words, to the western boundary of the lands bordering the Mediterranean, that is, to Spain.

Now Paul never had been in Spain previous to his arrest in Jesus, but in Rom 15:24-28 he had twice expressed his intention to go there. These independent testimonies of Clement and of the Muratorian Canon, of the fact that after Paul's arrest in Jerusalem and earlier than the purpose to visit Spain, are entitled to great weight. They involve, of course, the fact that he was acquitted after his 1st Roman imprisonment.

Having been set free, Paul could not do other than to spend some time in Philadelphia and himself also go there, as he had already promised when he wrote to the Philippian church (Phil 2:19-24). As a matter of course he would also resume his apostolic journeys for the purpose of proclaiming the gospel. There is now ample room in his life for the Pastoral Epp., and they give most interesting details of his further labors. The historical and geographical requirements in 1 Tim are, in this way, easily satisfied. It was no great distance to Ephesus from Philippi and Colosse, where he had promised that he would "come shortly."

(2) Data in 2 Tim.—The requirements in 2 Tim are (a) that Paul had recently been at Troas, at Corinth, and at Miletus, each of which he mentions (2 Tim. 4:9-10); (b) that the man he wrote the ep. to was in Rome (1:17); (c) that he was a prisoner for the cause of the gospel (1:8; 2:9), and had once already appeared before the emperor's supreme court (4:16,17); (d) that he had then emerged, but that a second and more serious case, which he believed that on the next hearing of his case the verdict would be given against him, and that he expected it could not be long till execution took place (4:6); (e) that he hoped that Timothy would be able to come from Ephesus to see him at Rome before the end (4:9,21). These requirements cannot be made to agree or coincide with the first Rom captivity, but they do agree perfectly with the facts of the apostle's release and subsequent second imprisonment in that city.

(3) Data in Tit.—The data given in the Ep. to Tit are (a) that Paul had been in Crete, and that Titus had been with him there, and had been left behind in that island, when Paul sailed from its shores, Titus being charged with the oversight of the churches there (Tit 1:5); and (b) that Paul meant to spend the next winter at Nicopolis (3.12). It is simply impossible to locate these events in the recorded life of Paul, as that is found in the other ep.,. But they agree perfectly with his liberation after his first Roman imprisonment.

As there is then no historical evidence that Paul did not survive the year 64, and as these Pastoral Epp. were recognized as Pauline in the immediately succeeding age, we may legitimately accept them as evidence that Paul did survive the year 64—that he was acquitted after his second imprisonment, and was again arrested and brought to Rome, and from this second imprisonment wrote the Second Ep. to Tit—his last extant writing" (Dods, Intro to the NT, 172).

The second difficulty alleged against the acceptance of these epp. as Pauline is that there are said to exist in them indications of an ecclesiastical organization and of a doctrinal development, both orthodox and heretical. The Pastorals, as it was called, is considerably later than the Titus, and some have thought that there is a special attempt to introduce an orthodox ecclesiastical idea of the episcopacy into the existing church.
clearly stated in the Ep. to the Col., certainly point to an incipient Gnosticicism. But had the writer of the Pastoral Epp. been combating the Gnosticism of the 2d cent., he could not now use such phrases as these that he would have employed, but others much more definite. Godet, quoted by Dods (Intro., 175), writes, "The danger here is of substituting intellectualism in religion for piety of heart and life. Had the writer been a Christian of the 2d cent., he would not have used expressions like those who were without parallel in the earlier epp. of Paul, who expressed himself in language without apparent purpose or meaning" (Zahn, Intro., II, 117). A comparison of the statements in these epp. about various kinds of false doctrine, and of those portions of the same that deal with the organization and officers of the church, with conditions actually existing in the church, esp. the church of Asia Minor, at the beginning and during the course of the 2d cent., proves, just as conclusively as do external evidence and historical fact, that they must have been written at least before the year 100. But this would not necessarily have been done as early as the first cent. after Paul's death; because of the character of the references to persons, facts and conditions in Paul's life, his personal history, and because of the impossibility on this assumption of discovering a plausible motive for their forgery. Consequently the claim that they are post-Pauline, and contain matter which is un-Pauline, is to be treated with the greatest suspicion" (Zahn, op. cit., II, 118).

The third difficulty alleged against the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epp. is the language employed, which is said to be, to a large extent, different from that in the accepted epp. The facts in regard to this matter are that in 1 Tim there are 82 words not found elsewhere in the New Testament, and in Tit. there are 33. But, while the total of such words in 1 Tim is 168, the total number, large though it appears, may be compared with the words used only once in the other Epp. of Paul. In Rom. 1, Cor. 3, Gal. 2, 3, Eph. 2, Phil. 2, 2 Thess. 2, Tit., Col. 1, words of this description are 627 in number. No such contrast can be made, however, in the 10 leading words of the Pastoral Epp., that can safely he alleged as proof against their Pauline authorship. The special subjects treated in these epp. required adequate language, a requirement and a claim which could not be refused in the case of any ordinary author.

The objections to the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epp. based upon the dissimilarity of diction in them and in Eph.Phil., are based upon the same reason as to the existence of the 3d cent. Epp., and cannot now be considered when the theory of the 3rd cent. origin is no longer persisted in, that the nucleus of the Pastoral Epp. was composed during the 3rd cent. imprisonment, which, according to this theory ended, not in the apostle's release, but in his execution. The fact that he was written by false, unenlightened friends, who were not imbued with the spirit of the divine Father, and with the truths of the gospel, should, to a large extent, weaken the authority of the Pastoral Epp. as to the character of the references to persons, facts and conditions in Paul's life, his personal history, and because of the impossibility on this assumption of discovering a plausible motive for their forgery. Consequently the claim that they are post-Pauline, and contain matter which is un-Pauline, is to be treated with the greatest suspicion (Zahn, op. cit., II, 118).

In 1 Tim there are 82 words not found elsewhere in the New Testament, and in Tit. there are 33. But, while the total of such words in 1 Tim is 168, the total number, large though it appears, may be compared with the words used only once in the other Epp. of Paul. In Rom. 1, Cor. 3, Gal. 2, 3, Eph. 2, Phil. 2, 2 Thess. 2, Tit., Col. 1, words of this description are 627 in number. No such contrast can be made, however, in the 10 leading words of the Pastoral Epp., that can safely he alleged as proof against their Pauline authorship. The special subjects treated in these epp. required adequate language, a requirement and a claim which could not be refused in the case of any ordinary author.

The objections to the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epp. based upon the dissimilarity of diction in them and in Eph. Phil., are based upon the same reason as to the existence of the 3rd cent. Epp., and cannot now be considered when the theory of the 3rd cent. origin is no longer persisted in, that the nucleus of the Pastoral Epp. was composed during the 3rd cent. imprisonment, which, according to this theory ended, not in the apostle's release, but in his execution. The fact that he was written by false, unenlightened friends, who were not imbued with the spirit of the divine Father, and with the truths of the gospel, should, to a large extent, weaken the authority of the Pastoral Epp. as to the character of the references to persons, facts and conditions in Paul's life, his personal history, and because of the impossibility on this assumption of discovering a plausible motive for their forgery. Consequently the claim that they are post-Pauline, and contain matter which is un-Pauline, is to be treated with the greatest suspicion (Zahn, op. cit., II, 118).

3. Difficulty of the Language Connected with the Text of the Pastoral Epp.

The "most decisive" of all the arguments against the Pauline authorship is that the "Christianity of the Pastoral Epp. is quite different from the Christianity of the New Testament," Dr. McGiffert himself gives in a footnote (2 Tim 1 9-11; 211 ff.; Tit 3 4-7), as well as other references, do most certainly refer to this very aspect of the Church. For example, themselves in 2 Thess. 2 contains these words, "If we died with him [Christ], we shall also live with him." What is the matter? The truth is the union of the Christian believer with Christ? The believer is one with Christ in His death, one with Him now as He lives and reigns. This notion, therefore, which is "most decisive of all," is one which is not true in point of fact. Dr. McGiffert also charges the author of the Pastoral Epp. as being "one who understood by resurrection nothing else than the resurrection of the flesh, not of the body" (op. cit., 405). But in view of the Lord was raised from the dead, but how very unjust this accusation is, is evident from such a passage as 1 Tim 3 16, "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness. He was manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached among the nations, believed on in the world, received up in glory.

Charges of this nature are unsupported by evidence, and are of the kind on which Dr. A. S. Peake (A Critical Intro. to the NT, 71) bases his rejection of the Pauline authorship—except for a Pauline nucleus—that he "feels clear." More than an "evisceration" of this sort is needed.

The theory that the Pastoral Epp. are based upon genuine letters or notes of Paul to Timothy and Titus is thus advocated by Peake, McGiffert, Moffatt and many others. It bears very hard upon 1 Tim. "In 1 Tim not a single verse can be indicated which he has not or does not employ" (Peake, op. cit., 70). We may fairly conclude then in agreement with many modern scholars that we have here, in the Pastoral Epp., authentic letters of Paul to Timothy and Titus, worked over and enlarged by another hand" (McGiffert, op. cit., 405). In regard to 1 Tim he writes, "It is very likely that there are scattered fragments of the original ep. in 1 Tim, as for instance in ver 23. But it is difficult to find anything which we can be confident was written post-Tim. (op. cit., p. 407)."

Dr. McGiffert also alleges that in the Pastoral Epp., the word "faith," "is not employed in its profound Pauline sense, but is used to signify one of the cardinal virtues, along with love, peace, purity, righteousness, leisure, patience and meekness." One of the Pauline references to this contrasts the Pastoral, the Ep. to the Gal; and the groundlessness of this charge is evident from Gal 5 22, where "faith" is included in the list there given of the fruit of the Spirit, along with love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, meekness and self-control.

If the Pastoral Epp. are the work of Paul, then. Dr. McGiffert concludes, Paul had given up that form of the gospel which he had been taught and which had been for Paul. He had been for Paul. He had been descended from the lofty religious plane upon which he had always moved, to the level of mere pieté and morality (op. cit., 404). But this charge is not just or reasonable, in view of the fact that the apostle is inquiring throughout these two Epistles into the character of the persons and practices of immoral teachers. Or again, in such a passage as 1 Tim 1 12-17 AV, the author of the ep. has not descended from the lofty religious plane upon which he had always moved, to the level of mere pieté and morality, when he writes, "The grace of our Lord was exceeding abundant with faith and love which is in Christ Jesus." This is a faithful saying, worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief."

If such be the "most decisive" objection against the Pauline authorship, the other difficulties, as already seen, need not cause alarm. For they resolve themselves into the equally groundless charges that the historical requirements of the epp. cannot be fitted into any part of Paul's life, and that the doctrine and ecclesiastical organization...
do not suit the Apostolic age. These objections have been already referred to.

The real difficulty writes Dr. Peake (A Critical Intro., 68.) is that "the old energy of thought and expression is gone, and the greater smoothness and continuity in the sense of Christian men and the lack of grip and of continuity in the thought." Dr. Peake well and truly summed up the position does not admit of detailed proof. Lack of grip and lack of continuity in thought are not the characteristics of such passages as 1 Tim. 1 9-17, a passage which has no connection with anything in the acknowledged Pauline Epp.; and there are many other similar passages, e.g. Tit. 2 11-3 7.

What must be said of the dulness of the intelligence which has been made now for several generations more positively than in the case of any other Pauline epp.—has no support from tradition. . . .

To sum up, the evidence of the early reception of the Pastoral Epp, as Pauline is very strong. The confident denial of the genuineness of these letters—"It is impossible to suppose that Paul was the author of such compositions."—is therefore corroborated as this is by their reception in the church, dating from the very earliest period. The Pastoral Epp. may be used by it for the utmost confidence, as having genuinely come from the hand of Paul.

LITERATURE.—R. D. Shaw, The Pauline Epp.; A. S. Peake, A Critical Intro. to the NT; A. C. Gifford, A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age; Theodor Zahn, An Intro to the NT; Marcus Dods, Intro to the NT; Weiss, Einleitung in das NT (ET); G. J. Kittel, A Critical and Exegetical Handbook of the Epp. of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus; George Salmon, A Historical Intro to the Study of the Books of the NT; James Moffat, The Historical NT Intro to the Lit., Crit., II, 2d ed. Adolf Jülicher, An Intro to the NT; Caspar René Gregory, Canon and Text of the NT.

The "lives" of Paul may also be consulted, as they contain much that refers to these epp., i.e. those by Conybeare and Howson, Lewin, Farrar and others. See also Ramsay's St. Paul the Traveller and the Rom Citizen.

PASTURAGE, pastur·age, pastur·age, pas'tir-aj. PASTURE, pas'tur. See SHEEP-TEENING.

PATARa, pa'ta-ra (rā Ἡλλα, tā Patarā): A coast city of ancient Lycia, from which, according to Acts 21 18, St. Paul said he was to set sail from. Because of its excellent harbor, many of the coast trading ships stopped at Patara, which therefore became an important and wealthy port of entry to the towns of the interior. As early as 440 BC an autonomous city was struck there; during the 4th and the 3d cents. the coinage was interrupted, but was again resumed in 168 BC when Patara joined the Lycian league. Ptolemy Philadelphus enlarged the city, and changed its name to Arsinoe in honor of his wife. The city was celebrated not only as a trading center, but esp. for its celebrated oracle of Apollo which is said to have spoken only during the six winter months of the year. Among the ruins there is still to be seen a deep pit with circular steps leading to a seat at the bottom; it is supposed that the pit is the place of the oracle. In the history of early Christianity, Patara took but little part, but it was the home of a bishop, and the birthplace of St. Nicholas, the patron saint of the sailors of the E. Though born at Patara, St. Nicholas was a bishop and saint of Myra, a neighboring Lycian city, and there he is said to have been buried.

Gedemish is the modern name of the ruin. The walls of the ancient city may still be traced, and the foundations of the temple and castle and other
public buildings are visible. The most imposing of the ruins is a triumphal arch bearing the inscription: "Pata the Metropolis of the Lycian Nation." Outside the city walls many sarcophagi may be seen, but the harbor, long ago choked by sand, has been converted into a useless swamp. See also MYRA.

E. J. BANKS

PATH, pāth (πάθος, ἐνδοιχθῆτι): The word usually tr. "crown," "crown of the head" (Gen 49:26; Dt 32:35; 33:13-20; 2 S 14:25; Job 2:7; Isa 3:17; Jer 5:16; 43:45) and "path" (Ps 68:21) is rendered "pate" in Ps 7:16 in agreement with earlier Eng. translators since Coverdale: "His mischief shall return upon his own head, and his violence shall come down upon his own pate." The reason for the choice of the word lies evidently in the desire to make the Heb parallelism with "head" (rō'sh) apparent. The same object has, however, been achieved differently in another poetical passage (Gen 49:26 | Dt 33:16), viz. by the juxtaposition of "head" and "crown of the head".

H. L. E. LERING

PATH, path, PATHWAY, path'wā (παθα, περα, παθω, νάνθ, τροχος, τρόχου, τροχία):

(1) In the OT.—In addition to its obvious literal sense (e.g. Gen 49:17), it has very frequently a figurative meaning. (a) As applied to man, a course or manner of life: (i) man's outward lot in life, his career or destiny, whether of the just man (Isa 26:7) or of the ungodly (Job 8:13); (ii) frequently in an ethical sense, of men's conduct or inward life-purpose, whether it be good or evil (e.g. Prov 2:15), generally accompanied by a term defining the moral quality of the conduct, either an abstract noun (e.g. "the paths of uprightness," Prov 2:13; 4:11; "the paths of justice," Prov 2:8; Isa 40:14; "the paths of life," Ps 16:11; Ps 29:19), or a concrete adj. or noun (e.g. "crooked paths," Isa 59:8; "the paths of the righteous," Prov 20:20; 4:18). (b) The term is also applied to God either (i) of the methods of the Divine Providence, God's dealings with men (Ps 26:10; 65:11), or (ii) of the principles and maxims of religion and morality Diviney revealed to men. (c) The usual AV, "O Jehovah, teach me thy paths," Ps 25:4; cf Isa 2:3.

(2) In the Apoc we have the "paths" of Wisdom (tribos, Bar 3:21.31); the "path" shown to men by the Law (semita, 2 Esd 14:22); and a man's "path" (tribos, Tob 4:10).

In the NT the word occurs only in Mt 3:3 and passages Mk 1:3; Lk 3:4 (of the forerunner's work), and in He 12:13 (in the OT ethical sense).

Pathway occurs in Prov 12:28 (dereth wnhthbkh) and Wisd 5:10 (atpwrh). See Way.

D. M. ALL EDWARDS

PATHUS, pa-thus (Παθαος, Pathaος, Pathoς, Patháos): One of the Levites who had married a foreign wife (1 Esd 9:23) = "Pethahiah" of Ezr 10:23.

PATHROS, path'ros (Παθρος, patris, Παθρος): The name of two cities in the 1st Egyptian province of Lower Egypt (Isa 11:11; Jer 44:1.15; Ezek 29:14; 30:14).

PATHUSIM, path-woo-sim, path-ruw-sim (πατρισμ, πατροσίμ): "an inhabitant of Pathros"; LXX of Ephesians 2:20, "an inhabitant of Pathros." The name appears in the Greek name of the area of Egypt north of the Nile Delta (Gen 10:13f; 1 Ch 1:11f).

PATIENCE, pāshens (παθήσεως, pæthos, παθομα, παθοματια, παθοματια): "Patiency" implies suffering, enduring or waiting, as a determination of the will and not simply under necessity. As such it is an essential Christian virtue to the exercise of which there are many exhortations. The word "wait patiently" is the tr of ἦνοι, one of the meanings of ὅνο "to wait" or "to hope for" or "to expect" (cf Job 14:24); "patient" occurs (Eccl 7:8) as the tr of ἔρηκ ρε, "long of spirit," and (Job 6:11) "that I should be patient" (ha'drikh nechk). Cf "impatient" (Job 21:4).

"Patience" occurs frequently in the Apoc, esp. in Ecclus, e.g. 2:14; 16:13; 17:24; 41:2 (hupomone); 5:11 (makrothuma); 29:8 (makrothumot, RV "long patience") (in Wisd 2:19, the Gr word is aneraxia).

Patience is often hard to gain and to maintain, but, in Rom 5:5, 5, God is called "the God of patience" (ARV "steadfastness") as being able to grant that grace to those who look to Him and depend on Him for it. It is in reliance on God and acceptance of His will, with trust in His goodness, wisdom and faithfulness, that we are enabled to endure and to hope steadfastly. See also God.

W. L. WALKER

PATMOS, pat'mos (Πατμος, Patmos; Ital. San Giovanni di Patiio): A Turkish island of the group Sperones, near Samos, NE of Bodrum, on the Aegean coast of the old Asia Minor. The island of Patmos is the one described in the Apocalypse, Rev 1:9, "I, John ... was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus" (G2 τον λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦν, did ἐπάνω ἐν τῷ θεῷ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦν). The island is 10 miles long, and about 6 broad along the northern coast. It is for the most part rocky. The highest part in Mt. St. Elias, which rises to a height of over 800 ft. As in Greece, and in the adjacent mainland of Asia Minor, the land is treeless. Patmos, the city of Patmos, there is a good harbor. A famous monastery, St. Christodoulos, was founded on the island in 1088. Near this is a thriving school attended by students from all parts of the Archipelago. The population of the island numbers 3,000, almost entirely Gr. The ancient capital was on an isthmus between the inlets of La Scala and Merika. Many ruins can still be seen. The huge walls of Cyclopean masonry, similar to those at Tynys, attest their great age. In Rom times Patmos was one of the many places to which Rome banished her enemies, cf Acts 28:15, according to the tradition preserved by Irenaeus, Eusebius, Jerome and others. St. John was exiled here—in the 14th year of the reign of Domitian—whence he returned to Ephesus under Nerva (96 AD). The cave in
which he is said to have seen his visions is still pointed out to the traveler. Only a small part of the once valuable library in the monastery of St. Christodoulos is left. Just 100 years ago (1814) Mr. E. D. Clark purchased here the manuscript of Plato which is now in the Bodleian Library, the celebrated Clarkianus, a parchment written in the year 895, and admittedly the best of all for the 1st of the 2 vols into which the works of Plato were divided for convenience. Patmos is mentioned by Thucydides (iii.23), by Pliny (NH, iv.23), and by Strabo (x.3). See also JOHN THE APOSTLE; REVELATION OF JOHN.


J. E. HARRY

PATRIARCH, πάτριαρχός, πατριάρχης: The word occurs in the NT in application to Abraham (He 7 4), to the sons of Jacob (Acts 7 80), and to David (Acts 2 29). In LXX it is used as the equivalent of the head of the fathers’ house, or of a tribe (1 Ch 24 31; 27 32; 2 Ch 26 12). Commonly now the term is used of the persons whose names appear in the genealogies and covenants in the periods preceding Moses (Gen 5, 11, histories of Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, etc; of “patrician” dispensation”). The problems connected with the longevity ascribed to the patriarchs in the genealogies and narratives in Gen are dealt with in special articles. See ANTE-DILUVIAN PATRIARCHS; ANTEDILUVIANS; GENEALOGY.

JAMES OUR

PATRIARCHS, TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE. See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, IV. 1.

PATRMONY, πατρώμοι (πάτρινον, ἡ-ἀ-βοθάθη), “the fathers”: A word occurring once in EV (Dt 18 8), meaning lit. “the fathers,” which, however, is obscure, probably by reason of abbreviation for some phrase, e.g. “house of the fathers.” It may indicate “some private source of income possessed by the Levite [who has come up from a country district to the central sanctuary] distinct from what he is given first by officiating in the central sanctuary” (Driver, “Dt,” ICC, in loc.). Beyond this one occurrence of the word the same idea is conveyed often by other words or phrases: “He divided unto them his living” (Lk 19 13); “Teacher, give me the inheritance with which thou hast provided me” (Lk 12 13). Full and specific directions were given in the Law for the division of the patrimony (Nu 27; Dt 21, etc) and for its redemption (Ruth 4 1–12). The idea was frequently used with figurative and spiritual application: the land of Canaan was Israel’s patrimony, being inherited from Jeh (Ps 105 11); salvation because of its origin in grace was the believer’s patrimony (Gal 3 26–4 7). Contrariwise Israel was Jeh’s inheritance (Isa 19 25; 21; 14; of Ps 110 14); and the whole earth is the Messianic inheritance: “Father’s Eternal Father” (Ps 2 8). See BIRTHRIGHT; FAMILY; INHERITANCE; PROPERTY.

EDWARD MACK

PATRONAS, pa tro’nas (Πατρονάς, Patrobas): The name of a member of the Christian community at Rome to whom Paul sent greetings (Rom 16 14). The name is an abbreviation form of “Patrobus.” There was a wealthy freedman of Nero of the same name who was put to death by Galba (Tac. Hist. 1.49; 11.90); he was a patronas of St. Paul may have been a dependent of his.

PAULCLOS, pa trō’klos (Πατρόκλουσ, Patroklos): The father of the Syrian general Nicanor (2 Macc 8 9).

PATTERN, pat’er-n (πατρόν, tabhāth, “model,” πάτρινος, mor’eh, “a vision” or “view”): The OT words tr “pattern” do not necessarily indicate a drawing such as a modern constructor begins with, or the patterns made from these drawings for the guidance of workmen. In Ex 25 9.40 the word “idea” or “suggestion” would possibly indicate more distinctly than “pattern” what Moses received in regard to the building of the tabernacle, etc. It is doubtful if any architect’s drawing was ever made of the temple. It is not the custom in Pal and Syria today to work from any pattern more concrete than an idea. A man who wants a house calls the builder and says he wants to build so many rooms of such and such dimensions, for example, a court 10 drabs (arm’s lengths) wide and 15 drabs long, made of sandstone and plastered inside and out. With these meager instructions the builder starts. The details are worked out as the building proceeds. When a piece of iron or brass work is to be made, the customer by gestures with his hands outlines the form the piece should take. “I want it hāk wa hāk” (“thus and thus”), he says, and leaves the metal worker to conceive the exact form. It is probable that directions similar to these were given by David to Solomon. “Then David gave to his son [his concept of] the porch of the temple,” etc (1 Ch 28 11). The above does not apply to Gr and Rom work in Syria. Their workmen, probably mostly native, were trained to work from models. Williams in the Architect, January, 1913, says of the works at Baalbek and Palmyra, “There is a machine-like resemblance betokening slavish copying.” At the present time native workmen coming under the influence of foreigners are beginning to work from models and plans, but they show little tendency to create models of their own.

Three Gr words have been tr in the NT: τός, τύπος, “type,” occurs in Tit 2 7 and He 8 5. In the first instance RV reads “ensample.” ὁμοίωσις, ὑποτύπωσις, “outline,” has been similarly tr in 1 Tim 1 16, but “pattern” in 2 Tim 1 13. In He 9 24 ARV ἀντίτυπος, antitupos, is rendered “like in pattern.” ὑπόδειγμα, ὑποδείγμα, AV “pattern,” is tr in ARV “copy” (He 8 5), “copies” (He 9 23). At the time of the tr of AV the word “pattern” meant either the thing to be copied or the copy.

JAMES A. PATCH

PAUL, pa’l. See PAI.
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VII. How the Acts Say
gives an able, but unconvincing, presentation of the arguments for the addition of the chapter by a later hand. Deissmann (St. Paul, 19) calls Rom 16 'a little epistle from Pauline Christians and the Rom community, and to show that he had not written to them quite exclusively in his own name.' A common-sense explanation of Paul's personal ties in Rome is the fact that as the center of the world's life the city drew people thither from all parts of the earth. So today many a man has friends in New York or London who has never been to either city. A much more serious controversy rages as to the integrity of 2 Cor. Semler took 2 Cor 10-13 to be a separate and later ep., because of its difference in tone from 2 Cor 1-9, but Haurwitz put it earlier than chs 1-9, and made it the letter referred to in 2 4. He has been followed by many scholars like Schmiedel, Cone, McGiffert, Bacon, Moulton, Regel, Reuss, Weiss, Menzies. The precision of date and place turns on its date. Lightfoot (loc. cit.) argues for Corinth, since it was probably written shortly before Rom. But Moffatt (Intro., 102) holds tentatively to Ephesus, soon after Paul's arrival there from Galatia. So he gives the order: Ga., 1 and 2, Rom. In so much doubt it is well to follow Lightfoot's logical argument. Gal leads naturally to Rom, the one hot and passionate, the other calm and contemplative, but both on the same general theme.

(c) Third group: Phil, Philem, Col, Eph. Date 61-63, unless Paul reached Rome several years earlier. This matter depends on the date of the coming of Festus to success Felix (Acts 24, 27). It was once thought to be 60 AD beyond any doubt, but many are of the opinion that it is uncertain. See "Chronology," III, 2, (2), below. At any rate these four ep. were written during the first Rom imprisonment, assuming that he was set free.

But it must be noted that quite a respectable group of scholars hold that one or all of these ep. were written from Caesarea (Schnurr, Thiersch, Meyer, Haurwitz, Sabatier, Reuss, Weiss, Hupt, Spitta, McPherson, Hick). But the arguments are more specious than convincing. See HORT, Rom and Eph, 101-10. There is a growing opinion that Philem, Col and Eph were written from Ephesus during a public imprisonment in Paul's stay of 3 years there. So Deissmann (Light from the East, 223) and ST. PAUL, 101; ST. LUCAS (Vinylca Sancntorit, 1900). M. A. Albertz (Theol. Studien und Kritiken, 1910, 551 ff.). B. W. Bacon (Journal of Bnt. Lit. 1910, 181 ff.). The strongest argument for this position is that Paul apparently did not know personally the arrival of Eph. He is not willing to allow that he had written to Colaph in counter to his written to Galatia. So he gives the order: Ga., 1 and 2, Rom. But this objection need not apply if the so-called Ephesian Ep. was a circular letter and if Paul did not visit Colossae and Laodicea together (cf. Acts 19:10). But these two points are more attractive at first than on reflection. He throws this group before Rome—a difficult view to concede.

But even so, the order of these ep. is by no means clear that Col, 1st, Rom, 2nd, Eph were sent together. Tycheius was the bearer of Col (4 7 f) and Eph (6 21 f). Onesimus bore Philem (vs 10 13) and was also the companion of Tycheius to Colossae (Col 4 9). So these three ep. from Rome and Galatia commonly assumed that Phil was the last of the group of four, and hence later than the other three, because Paul is balancing life and death (Phil 2 12 f) and is expecting to be set free (1 25), but he has the same expectation of freedom when he writes Philem (ver 12). The absence at Ephesus (Phil 2 20) has to be explained on either hypothesis. Moffatt (Intro., 159) is dogmatic, "as Phil was certainly the last letter that he wrote," ruling out of court Eph, not to say the later Pastoral Epp. But this conclusion given in Moffatt trouble with the Ep. to the Laodi-ceans (Col 4 16) which he can only call "the enigmatic reference" and cannot follow Rutherford (St. Paul's Epp. to Colossae and Laodicea, 1908) in identifying the Laodicean Ep. with Eph, as indeed Marson seems to have done. But the notion that Paul's letters to the Laodi-ceans are to the Ephesians, or to any other church more than one church (hence without personalities) still holds the bulk of modern opinion.

Von Soden (Hist of Early Christian Lit., 294) is as dogmatic as Wrede or Van Manen: "All which has hitherto been stated is a hypothesis; it has no real being. It is an attractive idea, but it makes the Pauline letters too late, and it gives us an attractive story of the life of the Apostle." He admits "verbal echoes of Pauline epp.

Lightfoot puts Phil before the other three because of its doctrinal affinity with the second group in ch 3 as a reminiscence, and because of its anticipation of the Christological controversy with incipient Gnosticism in ch 2. This great discussion is purely central in character in the theory that it is a consistent and coherent interpretation of the group. Philem, though purely personal, is wonderfully vital as a sociological document. Paul is in this group at the height of his powers in his grasp of the Person of Christ.

(d) Fourth group: 1 Tim, Tit, 2 Tim The Pastoral Epp. are still hotly disputed, but there is a growing willingness in Britain and Germany to make a place for them in Paul's life. Von Soden bluntly says that it is impossible that these epp. as they stand can have been written by St. Paul (Hist of Early Christian Lit., 310). He finds no room for the heresy here combated, or for the details in Paul's life, or for the linguistic peculiarities in Paul's style. But he sees a "literary unity" in this group that binds them together and separates them from Paul. Thus tersely he puts the case against the Pauline authorship. So Moffatt argues for the sub-Pauline environment and the sub-Pauline atmosphere of these epp. They have been accused of pseudocray (Intro to the Lit. of the NT, 410). But this thrusts aside the personal details and argues that the epp. give merely the tendency of early Christianity (Ueber Aufgabe und Methode der Sorgen. NT Theologische, 1927). The Hacht-Van Manen art. in EB admits only that "the Pastoral Epp. occupy themselves chiefly with the various affairs of the churches within Pauline circles."

Moffatt has a vigorous attack on these letters in EB, but he "almost entirely ignores the external evidence, while he has been unconcerned to say to its form, its content, its ideas, its presuppositions, absolutely excludes the possibility of a Pauline authorship." He admits "verbal echoes of Pauline epp."
groups had shown no change in vocabulary and style. The case of Shakespeare is quite pertinent, for the various groups of plays stand more or less apart. The Pauline documents to Paul's old school and deal with personal and ecclesiastical matters in a more or less reminiscence of vehemence than with wisdom. In the earlier epistles, but this situation is what one would reasonably expect. The "eclesiastical organization" arrangement is a matter of fact, "the organization in the Pastoral Ep. is not appar- ently advanced beyond that of the church in 1 and 2 Thess. at Philippi in 61 AD." (Ramsay, _Expos. VII, viii, 17._) The "gnoths" by these epistles (1 Tim 6 20; Tit 1 14) have been developed type since the Ignatian Ep. of the 2d cent. Indeed, Bultmann ("Historic Setting of the Pastoral Ep._, _Expos._, January, 1913, 20) pointedly says of the "Churches and "Christian Ecclesiastical and Ramsay's "Historical Commentary on 1 Timotheo. are of the 6th cent. (VII, viii, i.), "one feels the subject has been lifted to a new level of reality and that much criticism between Bauer and Juelicher is out of date and irrelevant." It is now shown that the Pastoral Ep. are not directed against Gnosticism of advanced type, but even of a more Jewish type (Tit 1 14) than that in Col. Ramsay (_Expos._, VIII, i, 263) sweeps this stock criticism aside as "from the wrong point of view." It falls to the ground.

Lightfoot ("Note on the Heresy Committed in the Pastoral Ep._, _Bib. Essays._, 415) has insisted on the Jewish char- acter of the Gnostic attack here. As a matter of fact, the main objection to these epistles is that they do not fit into any of the types which break abruptly with Paul in Rome. But it is a false premise to assume that they do not fit into any of the types at all. Harnack turns the objection that Paul in Acts 26 predicted that he would never see the Epiphanius aged again that no one else could do the Lord's work after 2 Tim 4 21 (The Date of Acts and Synoptic Gospel) that Paul may not have visited Epipha- nus after all, but may have seen Timothy at Miletus also (1 Tim 1 3). Harnack frankly admits the acquisit and pseudo Pauline and thus free play for the Pastoral Ep. Blass (_Apostolus, 24_) acknowledges the _Pastoral_ Ep. as genuine. In _BD,_ _Morrow,_ etc., Col. H.B. Deane in _Standard BD._, Sunday (Inspiration, 364) comments on the _standard view_ of the evidence for the Pastoral Ep. Even Holtzmann (Ri, 291) appears to admit echoes of the Pastoral Ep. in the Ignatian Ep. Lightfoot (Bib. Essays, p. 220) points out, with much justice, the complete ‘acceptance of the Pauline authorship. Deissmann (St. Paul, 15) has a nodding word: 'The deduction is still current in certain circles that the _scientific distinction of a Bible scholar may be estimated in the form of a percentual according to the proportion of his verdicts of spuriousness. . . . The extant letters of St. Paul have been innocently obliged to endure again a fair share of the martyrdom suffered by the historic St. Paul." See further _Pastoral Epistles._

(3) _Paul’s conception of his Ep._—Assuming, therefore, the Pauline authorship of the thirteen epw., we are on one hand, though it were the day of our death, the growth in Paul's apprehension of Christ and Christianity, his adaptation to varied situations, his grasp of world-problems and the eternal values of life. Paul wrote other ep., we know. In 1 Cor 1 10, 14 on a clear point, now known to us otherwise, earlier than 1 Cor. In the use of "every epistle" in 2 Thess 3 1 naturally implies that Paul had written more than two already. It is not certain to what letter Paul refers in 2 Cor 2 4—most probably to one between 1 and 2 Cor., though, as already shown, some scholars find that letter in 2 Cor 10 13. More than Paul (Col 4 16) mentions an ep. addressed to the church at Laodicea. This ep. is almost certainly that which we know as Eph. Indeed, at least two apocryphal Ep. to the Laodiceans were written to supply this deficiency. As early as 2 Thess 2 2 forgers were at work to palm off ep. in Paul's name, "or by ep. as from us," to attack and pervert Paul's real views, whom Paul denounced as false. Admittedly, that this "mis-
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take to limit Paul's Epp. to the local and temporary sphere given them by Duissmann.

(4) Development in Paul's Epp.—For Paul's gospel theology see later. Here we must stress the fact that all four groups of Paul's Epp. are legitimate developments from his fundamental experience of grace as conditioned by his previous training and later work. He met each new problem with the same basic truth that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, revealed to Paul on his way to Damascus. The reality of this great experience must here be assumed (see discussion later). It may be admitted that the Acts does not stand upon the same plane as the Pauline Epp. as a witness concerning Paul's conversion (Fletcher, The Conversion of St. Paul, 1910, 5). But even so, the Epp. amply confirm Luke's report of the essential fact that Jesus appeared to Paul in the same sense that He did to the apostles and other Christians (1 Cor 15:4-9). The revelation of Christ to Paul and in Paul (ék proswp., en émou, Gal 1:16) and the specific call connected therewith to preach to the Gentiles gave Paul a place independent of and on a par with the other apostles (1:16; 2:1-10). Paul’s first preaching (Acts 9:20) "proclaimed Jesus the Christ, and the Son of God." This "primitive Paulinism" (Sabatier, The Apostle Paul, 1893, 113) lay at the heart of Paul's message in his sermons and speeches in Acts. Professor P. Casey regards Luke as a "careless" historian ("The Speech of St. Paul in Acts," Cambridge Bib. Essays, 1909, 336), but he quite admits the central place of Paul's conversion, both in the Acts and the Epp. (6b; cf also The Religious Experience of St. Paul).

We cannot here trace in detail the growth of Paulinism. Let Wernle speak (Beginnings of Christianity, 1903, I, 221) for us: "The decisive factor in the genius of St. Paul's theology was his personal experience, his conversion on the road to Damascus. This 'primitive Paulinism' (Sabatier, The Apostle Paul, 1893, 113) lay at the heart of Paul's message in his sermons and speeches in Acts. Professor P. Casey regards Luke as a 'careless' historian ("The Speech of St. Paul in Acts," Cambridge Bib. Essays, 1909, 336), but he quite admits the central place of Paul's conversion, both in the Acts and the Epp. (6b; cf also The Religious Experience of St. Paul.)

We cannot here trace in detail the growth of Paulinism. Let Wernle speak (Beginnings of Christianity, 1903, I, 221) for us: "The decisive factor in the genius of St. Paul's theology was his personal experience, his conversion on the road to Damascus. This 'primitive Paulinism' (Sabatier, The Apostle Paul, 1893, 113) lay at the heart of Paul's message in his sermons and speeches in Acts. Professor P. Casey regards Luke as a 'careless' historian ("The Speech of St. Paul in Acts," Cambridge Bib. Essays, 1909, 336), but he quite admits the central place of Paul's conversion, both in the Acts and the Epp. (6b; cf also The Religious Experience of St. Paul.)
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His atoning death, not by works of the Law (Acts 13:38 f). In the first group there are allusions to the "work of faith and labor of love and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ," etc. (2 Thess 1:3) and he speaks of "election" (1:4) and "our gospel" (1:5) and the resurrection of Jesus (1:10). The Father, Son and Spirit cooperate in the work of salvation (2 Thess 3:14), which includes election, belief, sanctification, glorification. It is not necessary to stress the argument for the conception of salvation by faith in Christ, grace as opposed to works, in the second group. It is obviously present in the third and the fourth. We seem forced to the view therefore that Paul's experience was revolutionary, not evolutionary. If we consider the whole history of Paul as it is disclosed to us in his letters, are we not forced to the conclusion that his was a catastrophic or explosive, rather than a slowly progressive personality? (Garvie, Studies of Paul and His Gospel, 1911, 32). "His gospel was included in his conversion, and it was meditation that made explicit what was thus implicit in his experience." (ib). This is not to say that there was no "spiritual development of St. Paul" (Matheson, 1906). There was growth of expression in the successive application of the fundamental Christian conception. The accent upon this or that phase of truth at different stages in Paul's career does not necessarily mean that the others were without expression. The occasion has arisen for emphasis and elaboration.

In a broad generalization the first group of the epp. is eschatological, the second soteriological, the third Christological, and the fourth pastoral (Garvie, Studies of Paul and His Gospel, 22). But one must not get the notion that Paul did not have a full gospel of salvation in the first group, and did not come to the true motive of the person of Christ as Lord till the second, or understand the pastoral office till the fourth. See emphasis on Paul's work as pastor and preacher in 1 Thess 2 (first group), and the Lordship of Christ also (1 Thess 1:13; 2 Thess 1:1; 2 Thess 3:1), on a par with the Father.

There was a change of accent in each group on questions of eschatology, but in each one Paul cherishes the hope of the second coming of Christ up to the very end when he speaks of his own death. In 1 Cor 15:1-11, Paul pointedly alludes to his conversion: "I was laid hold of by Jesus Christ," as giving him the goal of his ambition, "that I may lay hold;" "I count not myself yet to have laid hold." This concentration of effort to come up to Christ's purpose in him is the key to Paul's life and letters, "I press on toward the mark," as he put it in Phil 3:14. "What is the..." (Phil 2:5). See also 2 Cor 13:10 and Gal 1:2, for Paul's formal defense of his apostolic authority. The pleasantry in Rom 15:14 does not displace the claim in 15:16-23 f. In the third group note the great passage in Phil 3:12-14, where Paul pointedly alludes to his conversion: "I was laid hold of by Jesus Christ," as giving him the goal of his ambition, "that I may lay hold;" "I count not myself yet to have laid hold." This concentration of effort to come up to Christ's purpose in him is the key to Paul's life and letters, "I press on toward the mark," as he put it in Phil 3:14. "What is the..." (Phil 2:5). See also 2 Cor 13:10 and Gal 1:2, for Paul's formal defense of his apostolic authority. The pleasantry in Rom 15:14 does not displace the claim in 15:16-23 f. In the third group note the great passage in Phil 3:12-14, where Paul pointedly alludes to his conversion: "I was laid hold of by Jesus Christ," as giving him the goal of his ambition, "that I may lay hold;" "I count not myself yet to have laid hold." This concentration of effort to come up to Christ's purpose in him is the key to Paul's life and letters, "I press on toward the mark," as he put it in Phil 3:14. "What is the..." (Phil 2:5). See also 2 Cor 13:10 and Gal 1:2, for Paul's formal defense of his apostolic authority. The pleasantry in Rom 15:14 does not displace the claim in 15:16-23 f. In the third group note the great passage in Phil 3:12-14, where Paul pointedly alludes to his conversion: "I was laid hold of by Jesus Christ," as giving him the goal of his ambition, "that I may lay hold;" "I count not myself yet to have laid hold." This concentration of effort to come up to Christ's purpose in him is the key to Paul's life and letters, "I press on toward the mark," as he put it in Phil 3:14. "What is the..." (Phil 2:5). See also 2 Cor 13:10 and Gal 1:2, for Paul's formal defense of his apostolic authority. The pleasantry in Rom 15:14 does not displace the claim in 15:16-23 f. In the third group note the great passage in Phil 3:12-14, where Paul pointedly alludes to his conversion: "I was laid hold of by Jesus Christ," as giving him the goal of his ambition, "that I may lay hold;" "I count not myself yet to have laid hold." This concentration of effort to come up to Christ's purpose in him is the key to Paul's life and letters, "I press on toward the mark," as he put it in Phil 3:14. "What is the..." (Phil 2:5). See also 2 Cor 13:10 and Gal 1:2, for Paul's formal defense of his apostolic authority. The pleasantry in Rom 15:14 does not displace the claim in 15:16-23 f. In the third group note the great passage in Phil 3:12-14, where Paul pointedly alludes to his conversion: "I was laid hold of by Jesus Christ," as giving him the goal of his ambition, "that I may lay hold;" "I count not myself yet to have laid hold." This concentration of effort to come up to Christ's purpose in him is the key to Paul's life and letters, "I press on toward the mark," as he put it in Phil 3:14. "What is the..." (Phil 2:5). See also 2 Cor 13:10 and Gal 1:2, for Paul's formal defense of his apostolic authority. The pleasantry in Rom 15:14 does not
with due emphasis on the soteriological aspects of Christ's work and on Christian life. Bruce (St. Paul: Concept and Christianity) conceives that Paul gives us his entire conception of Christianity in the four great epp. of the second group, while B. Weiss (Bib. Theol. of the NT) sees a more developed doctrine in the third group. He is in his prime in both groups. In the fourth group the same struggleingers on with variations in Crete and even in Ephesus. The Jewish phase of the heresy is more decided (perhaps Pharisaic), and recalls to some extent the Judaistic controversy in the second group. Paul's view of the Church and Christianity has enemies within and without. He turns to young ministers as the hope of the future in the propagation of the gospel of the happy God. The fires have burned lower, and there is less passion and heat. The tone is now fiercer, now tender. The style is broken and reminiscent, and personal, though not with the rush of torrential emotion in 2 Cor., nor the power of logic in Gal and Rom. Each ep. fits into its niche in the group. Each group falls into proper relation to the stage in Paul's life and writing reveals the changes of thought and feeling in the great apostle. It is essential that one study Paul's Epp. in their actual historical order if one wishes to understand the mind of Paul. Scholars are not agreed, to be sure on this point. They agree on nothing for the most part. There are two methods of presenting Paul's Epp. in Robertson, Chronological NT (1904), and Moffatt, Historical NT (1901).

2. Modern Theories about Paul—Findlay (HDB, "Paul") offers a needed warning when he reminds us that the modern historical 1. Criticism and psychological method of study is not infallible prejudice as the older categories of scholastic and dogmatic theology. "The focus of the picture may be displaced and its colors falsified by philosophical no less than by ecclesiastical spectacles." (ib.) Deissmann (St. Paul, 4th) sympathizes with this protest against the infallibility of modern subjective criticism: "That really and properly is the task of the modern student of St. Paul: to come back from the paper St. Paul of our western libraries, Germanized, dogmatized, modernized, to the historic St. Paul; to penetrate to Paulinian Christianity as it comes to the St. Paul of ancient reality." He admits the thoroughness and the magnitude of the work accomplished in the 19th cent. concerning the literary questions connected with Paul's letters, but it is a "philological method... that cannot go farther astray." Deissmann conceives of Paul as a "hero of piety first and foremost," not as a theologian. "As a religious genius St. Paul's outlook is forward into a future of universal history." This position of Deissmann has been attacked by the pre-Baur time. Deissmann would like to get past all the schools of criticism, back to Paul himself. Baur started the modern critical attitude by his Pastoralbriehe (1855, p. 79), in which he remarked that there were only four epp. of Paul (Gal. 1 and 2 Cor. and Rom.) which could be the 2. Tübingen Theory (1845) he expounded this thesis. He also rejected the Acts. From the four great epp. and from the pseudo-Clementine literature of the 2nd cent., Baur argued that Paul and Peter were bitter antagonists. Peter and the other apostles were held fast in the grip of the legalistic conception of Christianity, a sort of Christianized Pharisaism. Paul, when one comes to a violent against this view, and became the exponent of gentle freedom. Christianity was divided into two factions, Jewish Christians (Petrinists) and gentile Christians (Paulinists). With this key Baur ruled out the other Pauline epp. and Acts as spurious, because they did not show the bitterness of this controversy. He called them "tendency" writings, designed to cover up the strife and to show that peace reigned in the camp. This arbitrary theory cut a wide swath for 50 years, and became a fetish with many scholars, but it is now dead. "It has been seen that it is bad criticism to make a theory on insecure grounds, and then to reject all the literature which contradicts it" (Mac-

3. Protest in Germany is Th. Zahn (cf his against Eind in das NT, 2 vols., 1895–99; Intro to Baur's View to 1899). Zahn saw the true successor of Lightfoot as the chief antagonist of the Tübingen School is Dr W. M. Ramsey, whose numerous volumes (Church in the Rm Empire, 1895; Critics and Bishops of Phrygia, 1895; St. Paul the Tübinger and Other Studies, 1906; Cities of St. Paul, 1908; Luke the Physician and Other Studies, 1908; Pictures of the Apostolic Church, 1910; The First Christian Century, 1911) have given the finishing touches to the overthrow of Baur's contention. But even so, already the Baur school had split into two parts. The ablest representatives, like H. J. Holtzmann, Pflueger, Harnack, were sors to Baur compelled to admit more of Paul's Epp. as genuine than the four principal ones, till there are left practically none to fight over. Even the Baurite Epp. This protest eliminated completely Baur's thesis of the 19th cent. near to that of Lightfoot, Ramsay and Zahn. Von Soden (Early Christian Lit., 324) still stands out against B Thess, but Harnack has deserted him on that point. But the old narrow view of Baur is gone, and Von Soden, who, at first, was his enthusiastic admirer, has signed the death warrant of his great literary memorial of the Greeks we may well question whether these Pauline letters are not equal to these.—Indeed, do not surpass them—in spiritual significance, in psychological depth, and loftiness of ideal, above all in the realm of complete and forcible expression." The other wing of Baur's school Findlay (HDB) calls "ultra-Baurians." It is mainly a Dutch school with Loman and Van Manen as its main exponents, though it has support in Germany from Steck and Volter, and in America from W. B. Smith. These writers do not say that Paul is a myth, but that our sources (Acts and the 13 epp.) are all legendary. It is a relentless carrying of Baur's thesis to a redicuo absurdum. Van Manen (EB) says of the "historical Paul" as distinct from "the legendary Paul": "It does not appear that Paul's ideas differed widely from those of the other disciples, or that he had emancipated himself from Judaism, or had outgrown the habits of more than 2000 years. The). We have disposed of all the evidence he is entirely free to reconstruct the picture to suit himself. Quite arbitrarily, Van Manen accepts the "we-sections
in Acts as authoritative. But these give glimpses of the historical Jesus quite as truly as the Pauline Epp., and should therefore be regarded by advocates of the mythical Jesus. So the pendulum swings back and forth. One school destroy the other, but the fact of Paul's personality remains. "The new start is one of such importance that we must distinguish the pre-Pauline from the post-Pauline Christianity." (C. Anderson, "Jewish Christianity," the same thing, the Palestinian sect and the world-religion?" (Werne, Beginnings of Christianity, I, 159).

In his Paulus (1904), Wrede finds the explanation of Paul's theology in late Jewish apocalyptic views and in the oriental mystery-religions. Byzantine "Religion des Kyrieus" (the Holy Father) seeks to find in the "late Jewish apocalyptic" "conceptions from the Bab and the Irano-Zarathushtrian religions" (Schweitzer, Paul and His Message, 179). According to Wrede's view, Paul is one of the creators of "Christ" as distinct from the Jesus of history (cf. "Jesus or Christ," HJ, suppl., January, 1909).

Wrede's object is to overthrow the view predominant in modern theology, that Paul loyally and consistently expounded and developed the theology of Jesus" (J. Weiss, Paul and Jesus, 1909, 2). J. Weiss in this book makes a careful reply to Wrede as others have done; cf. A. Meyer, Jesus or Paul (1909), who concludes (p. 134) dramatically: "Paul — just one who points the way to Jesus and to God! See also Jülicher, Paulus and Jesus (1907); Kaftan, Jesus and Paulus (1906); Kölling, Die geistige Einwirkung der Person Jesu und Paulus (1906). The best reply to Wrede's arguments about the mystery-religion is found in articles in the Epos for 1912-13 (now in book form) by H. A. A. Kennedy on "St. Paul and the Irving Family" (1912) and "The Chinese Mission in Persia" (1913) in the Kautský-Bibl. Zeitschriften. The position of Wrede is carried to its logical conclusion by Drews (Die Christus-Mythe, 1909), who makes Paul the creator of Christianity. W. B. Smith (Der vorchristliche Jesus, 1906) tries to show that "Jesus was a pre-Christian myth, not a god." Schweitzer (Paul and His Interpreters, 255) sums the matter up thus: "Drews' thesis is not merely a curiosity; it indicates the natural limit at which the hypothesis advanced by the advocates of comparative religion, when left to its own momentum, finally comes to rest." Schweitzer himself may be accepted as the best exponent of the rigid application of this view to Paul (Paul and His Interpreters, 1912) that he had made to Jesus (The Quest of the Historical Jesus, 1910). He glories in the ability to answer the interpretation absurdities of Steck, Loman and Van Manen and Drews by showing that the eschatological conceptions of Paul in his epp. are primitive, not late, as belonging to the 1st cent., not to the 2d (Paul and His Interpreters, 249). He thus claims to be the true pupil of Baur, though reaching conclusions utterly different. There is undoubtedly an element of truth in this contention of Schweitzer, but he loses his case, when he insists that nothing but eschatology must be allowed to figure. "The edifice constructed by Baur has fallen," he proclaims (p. viii), but he demands that in its place the "exclusively Jewish-eschatological" (p. ix) interpretation. There he slips, and his theory will go the same way as that of F. C. H. M. Scott ("Jesus and Paul," Cambridge Bibl. Essays, 365) admits that Paul has the same eschatological outlook as Jesus, but also the same ethical interest. It is not "either . . . or," but both in each case. See a complete bibliography of the "Jesus and Paul" controversy in J. G. Machens' Paulus und Jesus und Paul" in Bibl. and Theol. Studies (1912, 547 f.) As Ramsay insists, we are now in the 20th cent. of insight and sanity, and Paul has come to his own. Even Werne (Beginnings of Christianity, I, 163) sees that Paul is not the creator of Christianity, but the interpreter of historical facts. God—Christ—Paul, such is the order." Sataurbury (History of Criticism, 152) says: "It has been the mission of the 19th cent. to prove that everybody's work was written by somebody else, and it will not be the most useless task of the 20th to betake itself to more profitable inquiries."

III. Chronology of Paul's Career. — There is not a single date in the life of Paul that is beyond dispute, though several are narrowed a little. There are a fine point, and the general course and relative proportion of events are clear enough. Luke gave careful data for the time of the birth of Jesus (Lk 2 1 f.), for the entrance of the Baptist on his ministry (3 1 f.), and the age of Jesus when he began his work (3 25), but he takes no such pains in the events in chronology. But we are left with a number of incidental allusions and notes of time which call for some discussion. For fuller treatment see Chronology of the NT. Garvie (Life and Teaching of Paul, 1910, 181) gives a comparative table of the views of Harnack, Turner, Ramsay, and Lightfoot for the events from the crucifixion of Christ to the close of Acts. The general scheme is nearly the same, differing only from one to four years here and there. Shaw (The Pauline Epp., xi) gives a good chronological scheme. Moffatt (Intro to the Lit. of the NT, 62 f.) gives the theories of 23 scholars:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turner</th>
<th>Bartlet</th>
<th>Har-</th>
<th>McGiffert</th>
<th>Zahn</th>
<th>Ramsay</th>
<th>Light-</th>
<th>Clemen</th>
<th>Findlay</th>
<th>Hoe-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion</td>
<td>35-36</td>
<td>31-32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31-32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First visit to Jerusalem</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34-35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34-35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second visit to Jerusalem</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41-43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First missionary tour</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>50-51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference at Jerusalem</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49-50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionary tour</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47-48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest in Jerusalem</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51-52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed to Rome</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52-53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Paul</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54-62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let us look at the dates given by ten of this list:
This table shows very well the present diversity of opinion on the main points in Paul's life. Before expressing an opinion on the points at issue it is best to examine a few details. Paul himself gives some notes of time. He gives "after 3 years" (Gal 1:18) as the period between his conversion and first visit to Jerusalem, though he does not necessarily mean 3 full years. In Gal 2:1, Paul speaks of another visit to Jerusalem "after the space of 14 years." Then again Luke quotes him as saying to the Ephesian elders at Miletus that he had spent "3 years" at Ephesus (Acts 20:31). The point is that these were times when Peter's mission was in going forth from Jerusalem, and in that connection we know from Acts 11 that Barnabas had been in Syrian, or Galatian, or Antiochian, or perhaps Cilician, regions during the same period. There is also mentioned a time when Paul was present at Jerusalem, and they do not embrace the time between his conversion and arrest. There is also another note of time in 2 Cor 12:2, where he speaks in an enigmatic way of experiences of his "14 years" ago from the writing of this ep. from Macedonia on the third visit. This will take him back to Tarsus before coming to Antioch at the request of Barnabas, and so overlaps a bit the other "14" above, and includes the "3 years" at Ephesus. We cannot, therefore, add these figures together for the total. But some light may be obtained from further details from Acts and the Epistles.

(1) The death of Stephen.—Saul, "a young man" (Acts 7:58) when this event occurs. Like other rabbis, he was in the prime of life. A rabbi in the age of sixty. Points had probably been thus active several years, esp. as he was now in a position of leadership, and may even have been a member of the Sanhedrin (Acts 26:10). Pontius Pilate was not deposed from his procuratorship till 36 AD, but was in a state of uneasiness for a couple of years. It is more probable, therefore, that the stoning of Stephen would take place after his deposition in the interest of the state. Many years before, when he would be afraid to protest against the lawlessness of the Jewish leaders. He had shown timidity at the death of Jesus, 29 or 30 AD, but some of the forms of law were observed. So nothing decisive is here obtained, though 35 AD seems more probable than 32 or 33.

(2) The flight from Damascus.—Paul locates this humiliating experience (2 Cor 11:32) when "the governor under Aretas the king guarded the city of the Damascenes." Aretas, the Arabian, and not the Roman, has now control when Paul is writing. The likelihood is that Aretas did not get possession of Damascus till 37 AD, when Tiberius died and was succeeded by Caligula. It is argued by some that the expression "reign a many years before, when he would be afraid to protest against the lawlessness of the Jewish leaders. He had shown timidity at the death of Jesus, 29 or 30 AD, but some of the forms of law were observed. So nothing decisive is here obtained, though 35 AD seems more probable than 32 or 33.

(3) The death of Herod Agrippa I.—Here the point of contact between the Acts (12:1-4; 19:9-23) and Jos (Ant, XIX, viii) is beyond dispute, since both record and describe in somewhat similar vein the death of this king. Jos says that at the time of his death he had already completed the 3d year of his reign over Judaea over (Acts 12:19, 22). He received this dignity soon after Claudius began to reign in 41 AD, so that makes the date 44 AD. He died after the Passover in that year (44), for Peter was imprisoned by him during that feast John 11:52; Acts 12:3). Fortunately Luke sandwiches the narrative about Herod Agrippa I. between the visit of Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem from Aretas (Acts 11:29) and their return to Antioch (12:25). He does not say that the events here recorded were exactly synchronous with this visit, for he says merely "about that time." We are allowed therefore to place this visit before 44 AD or after, just as the facts require. The mention of "elders" in Acts 11:30 instead of apostles (cf both in 15:4) may mean that the apostles are absent when the visit is made. After the death of James (1:15) and the return of Peter we note that Peter "went to another place" (12:17). But the apostles are back again in Jerusalem in 15:4 ff. Lightfoot (Bib. Essays, 216) therefore places the visit "at the end of 44, or in 45." Once more we find that the text may be fixed by the historical facts, and that is by the death of Paul. It is disputed also whether this 2d visit to Jerusalem according to Acts (9:26; 11:29 f) is the same as the "again" in Gal 2:1. Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveller, 59) identifies the visit in Gal 2:1 with that in Acts 11:26, but Lightfoot (op. cit, p. 221) holds that it "must be identified with the third of the Acts" (15:4 f). In Gal 1 and 2 Paul is not recording his visits to Jerusalem, but showing his independence of the chief apostles who met them there. There is no reason given that he should have missed the occasion of the visit in Acts 11:29 f. The point of Lightfoot is well taken, but we have no point of contact with the outside history for locating more precisely the date of the visit of Gal 2:1 and Acts 15:4 ff., except that it was after the first missionary tour of Acts 13 and 14.

(4) The first missionary tour.—Sergius Paulus is procurus of Cyprus when Barnabas and Saul visit the island (Acts 13:7). The procurus Paulus is mentioned in a letter from the city of Soli (Hag. XIX, 80, 114) and Lucius Sergius Paulus in CIL, VI, 31, 545, but, as no mention of his being procurus is here made, it is probably earlier than that time. The Soloi inscription bears the date 55 or 56 AD, but Sergius was procurus of Cyprus from 46 to 52. Hence he may have been procurus in 50 or the early part of 51 AD. It could not be later and may have been earlier.

(5) The first visit to Corinth.—The point to note here is that Gallio becomes procurus of Achaia (Acts 18:12). Paul has been apparently in Corinth a year and six months when Gallio appears on the scene (Acts 18:11). Aquila and Priscilla had "lately come from Italy" (18:2) when Paul arrived there. They had been expelled from Rome by the emperor Claudius (18:2). On the arrival of Gallio the Jews at once accuse Paul before him; he refuses to interfere, and Paul stays on for a while and then leaves for Syria with Aquila and Priscilla (18:18). Deissmann (St. Paul, Appendix, 1, "The Proconsulate of L. Junius Gallio") has shown beyond reasonable doubt that Gallio, the brother of Seneca, became procurus of Achaia about July, 51 AD (or possibly 52). On a stone found at Delphi, Gallio is mentioned as procurus of Achaia according to the inscription, or at the beginning of the text. The stone mentions the fact that Claudius had been acclaimed imperator 26 times. By means of another inscription we get the 27th proclamation as
imperator in connection with the dedication of an aqueduct on August 1, 52 AD. So thus the 26th time is before this date, some time in the earlier part of Paul's second journey. This year could well be the year of the argument (see Deissmann, op. cit.). Once more we do not get a certain date as to the year. It is either the summer of 51 or 52 AD, when Gallio comes. And Paul has already been in Corinth a year and a half. But the terminus ad quem for the close of Paul's two years' stay in Corinth would be the early autumn of 52 AD, and more probably 51 AD. Hence the 2 Thessalonian Epq cannot be later than this date. Before the close of 52 AD, and before the summer of 51 AD, the second missionary tour, the conference at Jerusalem, the first missionary tour, etc. Deissmann is justified in his enthusiasm on this point. He is positive that 51 AD is the date of the arrival of Gallio.

(6) Paul at Troas according to Acts 20 6 f. On this occasion Luke gives the days and the time of year (Passover). Ramsay figures (St. Paul the Traveller, 289 f) that Paul had his closing service at Troas on Sunday evening and the party left early Monday morning. Hence he argues back to the Passover at Philippi and concludes that the days as given by Luke will not fit into 56, 58, or 59 AD, but will suit 57. If he is correct in this matter, then we should have a definite year for the last trip to Jerusalem. Ramsay insists, over 180 (see), that this year reaches the same conclusion. The logical conclusion is that Luke is exact in his use of days in this passage. Yet Lightfoot insists on 58 AD, but Ramsay has the advantage on this point. See Pauline and Other Studies 264 f.

(7) Festus succeeding Felix.—When was Felix recalled? He was appointed procurator in 52 AD (Schurer, Jewish People in the Time of Christ, I, ii, 174). He was already ruler "many years" (Acts 24 10) when Paul appears before him in Caesarea. He holds on "two years" when he is succeeded by Festus (Acts 24 27). But in the Chronicle of Eusebius (Armenian text) it is stated that the recall of Felix took place in the last year of Claudius, or 54 AD. But this is clearly an error, in spite of the support given to it by Harnack (Chronologie d. Paulus), since Jos puts most of the rule of Felix in the reign of Nero (Ant, XX, viii, 1-9; BJ, II, xii, 8-14), not to mention the "many years" of Paul in Nero's reign. Hence this "two years" has been explained by Erbes in his Tiodadte Pauli und Petri, and made perfectly clear by Ramsay in Pauline and Other Studies, 349 f. Eusebius overlooked the interregnum of 6 years between the death of Herod Agrippa I in 44 AD, and the first year of Herod Agrippa II in 50 AD. Eusebius learned that Festus came in the 10th year of Herod Agrippa II. Counting from 50 AD, that gives us 59 AD as the date of the recall of Felix. This date harmonizes with all the known facts. The great majority of scholars accept the date 60 for Festus; but they confess that it is only an approximate date, and there is no decisive argument for it" (Ramsay, Pauline and Other Studies, 351). For minute discussion of the old arguments see Nash, ar. o. Paulus in the Schweiz Hist of the Jewish People, I, ii, 182 f. But if Erbes and Ramsay are correct, we have at last a date that will stand. So then Paul sails for Rome in the late summer of 59 AD and arrives at his destination in the early spring (third winter, Acts 20 11). He stayed 2 years (Acts 20 10). He had been "two whole years in his own hired dwelling" (28 30) when Luke closes the Acts. On the basis of his release in 63 or early 64 and the journeys of the Pastoral Epis., Paul's death would come in this year. The first mission begins in 67. On this point see later. We can now count back from 59 AD with reasonable clearance to 57 as the date of Paul's arrest in Jerusalem. Paul spent at least a year and three months (Acts 19 8.10) in Ephesus (called in round numbers three years in Acts 20 31), and then we keep the year and a half (from Pentecost (1 Cor 16 8) to Pentecost (Acts 20 16). From the spring of 57 AD we thus get back to the end of 53 as the time of his arrival in Ephesus (Acts 19 1). We have seen that Gallio came to Corinth in the summer of 51 AD (or 52), after Paul had been there a year and a half (Acts 18 11), leaving ample time in either case for the journeys from Corinth to Ephesus, to Caesarea, to Jerusalem apparently (Acts 18 21 f), and to Ephesus (Acts 19 1) from Caesarea. It is then the 2nd missionary tour, the conference at Jerusalem, the first missionary tour, etc.

IV. His Equipment.—Ramsay chooses as the title of ch ii, in his St. Paul the Traveller, the words "The Origin of St. Paul!" It is not possible to explain the work and teaching of Paul without a just conception of the forces that entered into his life. Paul himself is still woefully misunderstood by some. Thus A. Meyer (Jesus or Paul, 1909, 119) says: "In spite of all that has been said, there is no doubt that St. Paul, with his peculiar personality, with his tendency to reconcile gestes speculation and the rabbinic argument, has heavily encumbered the cause of Christianity. For many simple souls, and for many natures that are otherwise constituted than himself, he has barred the way to the simple Gospel story. That is a serious charge to make against the man who claimed to have done more than all the other apostles, and rightly, so far as we can tell (1 Cor 15 10), and who claimed that his interpretation of Jesus was the only true one (Gal 1 7-9)." Mowforth (Pauline and Paulanism, 1910, 70) minimizes the effect of Paulanism: "The majority of Paul's distinctive conceptions were either misunderstood, or dropped, or modified, as the case might be, in the course of a few decades." "Paulanism as a whole stood almost as far apart from the Christianity that followed it as from that which preceded it" (ib, 73). "The aim of some scholars seems to be to rob every great thinker of his originality" (Garvie, Studies of Paul and His Gospel, 1). Ramsay (Pauline and Other Studies, 3 f) boldly challenges the modern prejudice of some scholars against Paul by asking, "Shall we hear evidence or not?" Every successive age must study afresh the life and work of Paul (ib, 27) if it would understand him. Deissmann (St. Paul, 3 f) rightly says that "the whole of Paul's life is the great power of the apostolic age." Hence "the historian cannot begin his chronological account with the beginnings of Christianity, etc. St. Paul as first after Jesus." Feine (Jesus Christus and Paulus, 1902, 298) claims that Paul grasped the essence of the kingdom before Nicodemus in 51 AD, and then was the first to use Ramsay's phrase (Pauline and Other Studies,
the crowning glory of Tarsus, the reason for its undying interest to the whole world, is that it produced the apostle Paul; that it was the one city which was respected and in which the Asiatic and the Western spirit to mold the character of the great Hellenist Jew; and that it nourished in him a strong source of loyalty and patriotism as the citizen of no mean city" (Ramsay, op. cit. 235). The city gave him a schooling in his social, political, intellectual, moral, and religious life, but in varying degrees, as we shall see. It was because Tarsus was a cosmopolitan city with "an amalgamated society" that it possessed the peculiar suitability to educate and mold the mind of him who would in due time make the religion of the Jewish race intelligible to the Gr-Rom world" (ib. 88). As a citizen of Tarsus Paul was a citizen of the whole world.

It was no idle boast with Paul when he said, "But I am a Roman born" (Acts 22:28). The chief captain might well be "afraid when he knew that he was a Roman, and became Citizen cause he had bound him" (22:29).

Likewise the magistrates at Philippippi feared what the Roman who was "an amalgamated society" (Acts 16:39), and promptly released Paul and Silas and "asked them to go away from the city." "To the Roman his citizenship was his passport in distant lands, his talisman in seasons of difficulties and danger" (Lightfoot, Cities of St. Paul 70 ff). A citizen of Rome, therefore, Paul stood above the common herd. He ranked with the aristocracy in any provincial town (Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller, 20). He would naturally have a kindly feeling for the Roman government in return for this high privilege and protection. In its pessimism the Rom empire had come to be the world's hope, as seen in the Fourth Eulogium of Virgil (Ramsay, Cities of St. Paul, 49). Paul would seize upon the Roman empire as a fit symbol of the kingdom of heaven. "Our citizenship is in heaven" (Phil 3:20); "Ye are no more strangers and sojourners, but ye are fellow-citizens with the saints" ( Eph 2:19). So he interprets the church in terms of the body politic as well as in terms of the Israelite theocracy ( Col 2:19). "All this shows the deep impression which the Rom institutions made on St. Paul" (Lightfoot, Bib. Essays, 203). Hence, the apostle, under the heading, "Paulinism in the Rom Empire" (Cities of St. Paul, 70 ff). "A universal Paulinism and a universal Empire must either coalesce, or the one must destroy the other." It was Paul's knowledge of the Rom empire that gave him the imperialism and statesmanlike grasp of the problems of Christianity in relation to the Rom empire. Paul was a statesman of the highest type, as Ramsay has conclusively shown (Pauline and Other Studies, 49). He was an educator, a teacher, but remembered as a sort of revivification of the old pagan gods" (Cities of St. Paul, 78). But, as Ramsay says, "it was not dead; it was only waiting its opportunity; it revived when freedom of thought and freedom of life began to stir in Europe; and it guided and stimulated the Protestants of the Reformation."
Suffer Ramsey once more (Pauline and Other Studies, 100): “Barbarism proved too powerful for the Gr-Rom civilization unaided by the new religious bond; and every channel through which that civilization was preserved or interest in it maintained, either directly or through its influence on the Church, has been essential part of its course Christian after the Pauline form.” Paul would show the Roman genius for organizing the churches established by him. Many of his churches would be in Rom colonies (Antioch in Pisidia, Philippoi, Corinth etc). He would address his most studied ep. to the church in Rome, and Rome would be the goal of his ministry for many years (Findlay, HDB). He would show his convergence with Rom law, not merely in knowing how to take advantage of his right as a citizen, but also in the use of legal terms like “adoption” (Gal 4 5 f), where the adopted heir becomes son, and heir and son are interchangeable. This was the obsolete Rom law and the Gr law left in force in the provinces (cf Gal 3 15). But in Rom 8 15 f the actual revolt against Rom law is referred to by which “heirship is now duced from sonship, whereas in Gal sonship is derived from heirship; for at Rome a son must be an heir, but an heir need not be a son (cf He 9 15 ff). This presupposes Rom 9 3), and as Nowry to the right of a Roman citizen (Meyer in 1-vo l HDB). So in Gal 3 24 the tutor or pedagogue presents a Gr custom preserved by the Romans. This personal guardian of the child (often a slave) led him to school, and was not the guardian of the child’s person (Gal 4 14). See Ramsey, Gal, 327-93; Ball, St. Paul and the Rom Law, 1901, for further discussion. As a Roman, Paul would have “nomen and praenomen, probably taken from the Rom officer who gave his family civitas; but Luke, a Graec, gives to Paul. Paulus, his cognomen, was not determined by his nomen; there is no reason to think he was an Ἠρωδίουs (Ramsey, St. Paul the Traveller, 31). It is probable, though not certain, that Paul spoke Latin (see Souter, Ephe, April, 1911). As a Roman citizen, according to tradition, he was beheaded with the sword and not subjected to crucifixion, the traditional fate of Simon Peter. He saw the true χάρις Romana to be the peace that passeth all understanding (Phil 4 7) cf Rostron, The Christology of St. Paul, 1912, 19). It is not possible “to specify all the influences that worked on Paul in his youth” (Ramsey, Cities of St. Paul, 76). We do not know all the personal or educational influences of his time. He turned to his profit and to the advancement of the great purpose of the resources of civilization” (Ramsey, Pauline and Other Studies, 285). Heartily agree with this conception of Paul’s ability to assimilate the life of his time, but one must not be led astray so far as Schrann who, in 1710, wrote De stupenda eruditione Pauli (“On the Stupendous Erudition of Paul”). This is, of course, absurd, as Lightfoot shows (Bib. Essays, 206). But we must not forget Paul lived in a Gr city and possessed Gr citizenship also (Ramsey, St. Paul the Traveller, 31). Certainly did not feel constrained in the use of the distributio and with the ease and familiarity displayed by no other NT writer save Luke and the author of He. He has a “poet’s mastery of language,” though with the passion of a soul on fire, rather than with the artifice of the rhetoricians of the day (Diansmann, Light from the Ancient East, 230 f). Bliss (Die Rhythmen der asiatischen und römischen Kunst prosa, 1905) holds that Paul wrote “rhythmically elaborated artistic prose—a singular instance of the great scholar’s having gone astray” (Deissmann, Light, etc, 64). But there is evidence that Paul was familiar with the use of the distributio and other common rhetorical devices, though he was very far from being tinged with Atticism or Asanism. It is certain that Paul did not attend any of the schools of rhetoric and that he avoided the rhetoricians (cf also Schramm, Philo u. d. kyriakisch-staat. Diatribe, Berlin and Heks, “ποιεῖς P. and Hellenism” in Stud. Bib, IV. How extensive was his acquaintance with Gr lit. is in doubt. Lightfoot says: “There is no ground for saying that St. Paul was a very erudite or highly-cultivated man. An obvious maxim of practical life from Menander 1 Cor 15 34; a resonant home of the Athenian schools. The repeated by Aratus, himself a native of Tarsus (Acts 17 28), a pungent satire of Epimenides (Tit 1 12), with possibly a passage here and there which dimly reflects some classical writer, these are very slender grounds on which to build the supposition of vast learning” (Bib. Essays, 206); but Lightfoot admits that he obtained directly or indirectly from contact with Gr thought and learning lessons far wider and more useful for his work than a perfect knowledge of Atticism and knowledge of the better writers of antiquity. Even so, there is no reason to say that he made his few quotations from hearsay and read no Gr books (cf Zahn, Intro to NT, 52). Certainly he knew the Gr OT and the Jewish Tanakh, and could quote passages in it. He would not admit to had such knowledge of Gr lit. and philosophy as any Jew, living among Greeks, might pick up (Life and Teaching of Paul, 2), and charges Ramsey with “overstating the influence of the gentle environment on Paul’s development” (Studies of Paul and His Gospel, 8). Ramsey holds that it is quite possible that the philosophical school at Tarsus had exercised more influence on Paul than is commonly allowed” (St. Paul the Traveller, 324), a response to the home of the Athenian doctrines. It was a stronghold of Stoic thought. “At least five of the most eminent teachers of that philosophy were in the university” (Alexander, Ethics of St. Paul, 47). It is not possible to say whether Paul attended these or any lectures at the university, though it is hard to conceive that a brilliant youth like Saul could grow up in Tarsus with no mental stimulus from such a university. Garvie (ib, 6) asks when Paul could have studied at the university of Tarsus. He was probably too young before he went to Jerusalem to study under Gamaliel. It is not probable that he remained in Jerusalem continuously after completing his studies till we see him at the death of Stephen (Acts 7 58). He may have returned to Tarsus meanwhile and taken such
studies. Another possibility is that he took advantage of the years in Tarsus after his conversion (Acts 9:30; Gal 1:21) to equip himself better for his mission to which he had been called. There is no real difficulty on the score of time. The world was saturated with Gr ideas, and Paul could not escape them. He could not escape it unless he was innocent of all culture. Ramsay sees in Paul a man who could not escape the truth and reality "wholly inconceivable in a more narrow Hebrew, and wholly inexplicable without an education in Gr philosophy" ("St. Paul and Hellenism," Cities of St. Paul, 34).

Paul exhibited a freedom and universalism that he shared with the ancient Greeks. He had thought of the time which was not so decayed as some think. For the discussion between Garvie and Ramsay see Expos, April and December, 1911. Pfeiderer (Urchristentum, Vorwort, 174–75) finds a "double root" of Paulinism, a Christianized Hellenism and a Christianized Pharisaism. Harnack is more nearly correct in saying that "notwithstanding Paul's Gr culture, his conception of Christianity is, in its deepest ground, independent of Hellenism." The Hellenistic influence on Paul was relative and subordinate (Wendland, Die Religion der ersten Jahrhunderte nach Christi Geburt in der Erinnerung des Urchristentum und Christentum, 3te Aufl. 1912, 245), but it was real, as Köhler shows (Zum Verständniss des Apostels Paulus, 9) that Paul had a "Gr inheritance" beyond a doubt, and it was not all unconscious or subconscious as Green has argued (Crowther, The Christian Dogmas, 17). It is true that in Athens the Stoics and Epicureans ridiculed Paul as a "picker up of learning's erubescens"—Browning's rendering (An Epistle of St. Paul, 30) of στυχωμένος, σερμωλογος. Paul shows a fine scorn of the sophistries and verbal histrionics of the more philosophers and orators in 1 Cor 1 and 2, but all the same he reveals a real apprehension of the true significance of knowledge and life. Dr. James Adam (The Religious Teachers of Greece, 360) shows instances of "the real kinship of thought between Plato and St. Paul." He does not undertake to say how it came about. He has a Platonic expression, τά διὰ τοῦ σώματος, τά διὰ τοῦ σώματος, in 2 Cor 6:10, and uses a Stoic and cynic word in 2 Cor 9:8, αἰθρίοι, αὐθρίοι. Indeed, there are so many similarities between Paul and Seneca in language and thought that some scholars actually predicate an acquaintance or dependence of the one on the other. It is far more likely that Paul and Seneca discussed many common topics, and were influenced by the same sources, than that Seneca had seen Paul's Ep., or knew him personally. Lightfoot has a classic discussion of the matter in his essay on "St. Paul and Seneca" in the Comm. on Phil (see also Carr, St. Paul's Attitude to Gr Philosophy, Expos, v. ix). Alexander finds four Stoic ideas (Divine Immanence, Wisdom, Freedom, Brotherhood) taken and glorified by Paul to do service for Christ (Ethics of St. Paul, 49–55). Often Paul uses a Stoic phrase with a Christian content. Lightfoot suggests (Bible Essays, 207) that the later Gr lit. was a fitter handmaid for the diffusion of the gospel than the earlier.

Paul as the apostle to the Gr-Rom world had to "understand the bearings of the moral and religious life of Greece as expressed in her literature, and this lesson he could learn more impartially and more fully at Tarsus in the days of her decline than at Athens in the freshness of her glory" (ib). Ramsay waxes bold enough to discuss "the Pauline philosophy of history" (Cities of St. Paul, 10–13). I confess to sympathy with him in his rejection and finding all the Pauline ep., esp. in Rom. Moffatt (Paul and Paulinism, 66) finds "a religious philosophy of history" in Rom 9–11, throbbing with strong personal emotion. Paul rose to the height of the true Christian philosopher, though not a technical philosopher of the schools. Deissmann (St. Paul, 83) admits his language assigns him "to an elevated class," and yet he insists that he wrote "large letters" (Gal 6:11) because he had "the clumsy, awkward writing of a workman's hand" (p. 51). I can not agree that here Deissmann understands Paul. He makes "the world of St. Paul" on too narrow a scale.

Was Paul influenced by Mithraism? H. A. A. Kennedy has given the subject very careful and thorough treatment in a series of papers in Expos for 1912–13, already mentioned (see II, 5, above). His arguments are conclusive on the whole but he fails of the wild notions of W. B. Smith, Der vorschrichtliche Jesus; J. M. Robertson, Pagan Chrest, A. Drews, Die Christus-Mythe; and Lublinski, Die Entstehung des Christentums aus der antiken Kultur. A magic papyrus about 300 AD has "I adjure thee in the god the Hebrew Jesus" (II, 3019 f.), but Deissmann (Light from the Ancient East, 256) refuses to believe this line genuine: "No Christian, still less a Jew, would have called Jesus 'the god of the Hebrews.'" Clemen (Primitive Christianity and Its Monoy-Jewish Sources, 1912, 336) has made the same discovery that Paul was the author of those "Mithraic" epistles which he mentions in 1 Cor. 15:31. He rests his case on what he found in the 1st cent. AD "one cannot speak of non-Jewish influences on Christianity." One may dismiss at once the notion that Paul "defied" Jesus into a god and made Him Christ under the influence of pagan mystagogues (cf. 1 Cor. 15). One can read Rom 1 and 2 and believe that Paul was carried away by the philosophy of vain deceit of his time. He does use the words "wisdom" and "mystery" often in 1 Cor, Col, and Eph, and in Phil 4:12, "I have learned the secret," he uses a word employed in the mystic cults of the time. It is quite possible that Paul took up some of the phrases of these mystery-religions and gave them a richer content for his own purposes, as he did with some of the gnostic phraseology (Pitarome, "fulness," for instance). But Schweitzer (Paul and His Interpreters, 191 f.) deals a fatal blow against the notion that the mystery-religions had a formative influence on Paul. He urges, with point, that it is only in the 2d cent. that these current Gentile sects were set up as a rival to the empire. The dates and development are obscure, but it is "certain that Paul cannot have known the mystery-religions in the form in which they are known to us, because in this fully developed form they did not exist." Cumont (Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain, 2d ed. 1909 [ET]) insists repeatedly on the difficulties in the way of assuming without proof that Mithraism had any influence on Paul. But in particular it is urged that Paul drew on the "mystery religions," but not on the Lord's Supper as having magical effects. Appeal is made to the magical use of the name of Jesus by the strolling Jewish exorcists in Ephesus (Acts 18:13 ff.). Kirsopp Lake (Earlier Ep. of St. Paul, 253) holds that at Corinth they all accepted Christianity as a mystery-religion and Jesus as "the Redeemer-God, who had passed through death to life, and offered participation in this new life to those who shared in the mysteries which He offered," viz. baptism and the Lord's Supper. Tomlinson (Expos, December, 1912, 545) easily shows how with Paul baptism and the Lord's Supper are not magical sacraments producing new life, but symbolic pictures of death to sin and new life in Christ which the believer has already experienced. The experience is still raging on the subject of the mystery-religions, but it is safe to say that so far nothing more than
Paul, the Apostle
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illustrative material has been shown to be true of Paul's teaching from this source.

There is nothing incongruous in the notion that Paul knew not only the philosophy of the Stoics and the Cynics but also the Gnostics. Indeed the two things may have been to some extent combined in some places. A passage in 2 Cor. 11:38 has long been considered a quotation from Rabbinic literature, "dwelling in things which he hath seen." or (m) "taking him for a god," etc. One explanation is that Paul was influenced by his teacher, Gamaliel, who was educated in the schools of the Sages of Hillel. This is supported by the fact that Paul himself, in addition to his knowledge of the religious life of the Jews (cf Independent, 1913, 376). Clearly, then, Paul uses the word in that sense in Col 2 18.

For further discussion see Jacoby, Die hellenistischen Mysterierritgen und das Christentum; Glover, Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire; Friedlander, Die hellenistischen Mysterieritgen; Friedländer, Rom Life, and Manners under the Early Empire, III: Thorburn, Jesus Christ, Historical or Mythical.

M. Brückner (Der sterbende und aufstehende Gotttheil in den orientalischen Religions und ihr Verhältnis zu Christentum, 1908) says: "As in Christianity, so in many oriental religions, a belief in the resurrection of a Redeemer-God (sometimes as His Son) occupied a central place in the worship and cultus." To this Schweitzer (Paul and His Interpreters, 193) replies: "What manipulations the myths and rites of the cults in question must have undergone before his general statement could become possible! Where is there anything about dying and resurrection in Mitthra?" There we may leave the matter.

Paul was Gr and Rom, but not "pan-Bab," though he was always free to all the winds of doctrine that blew about, as we see it.


But he was most of all the Jew, that is, before his conversion. He remained a Jew, even though he learned how to be all things to all men (1 Cor 9 22). Even though glowing in his mission as apostle to the Gentiles (Eph 3 8), he yet always put the Jew first in opportunity and peril (Rom 2 9 f). He loved the Jews almost to the point of death (Rom 9 3). He was proud of his Jewish lineage and boasted of it (2 Cor 11 16 22; Acts 22 3 ff; 36 4 ff; Phil 3 4 6). "His religious patriotism flickered up within his Christianity" (Moffatt, Paul and Paulinism, 60). Had he been a Pharisee in the cities of Galilee and his rich endowments of mind, he would probably have not been the "chosen vessel" for the work of Christ among the Gentiles (Garvie, Studies of Paul and His Gospel, 15). Had he not been the thorough Jew, he could not have meditated Christianity from Jew to Greek. "In the mind of Paul a universalized Hellenism coalesced with a universalized Hebraism" (Ramsay, Cities of St. Paul, 43). Ramsay strongly opposes the notion of Harnack and others that Paul can be understood "as purely a Hebrew." So Paul both Hebraism and Hellenism meet, though Hebraism is the main stock. He is a Jew in the Gr-Rom world and a part of it, not a mere spectator. He is the Hellenistic Jew, not the Aram. Jew of Pal (cf Simon Peter's vision on the house-top at Joppa, for instance). But Paul is not a Hellenizing Jew after the fashion of Jason and Menelaus in the beginning of the Maccabean conflict. Findlay (HDh) tersely says: "The Jew in him was the foundation of everything that he was, that he did, that he thought. It was the supreme type of Judaism in spite of his persecution of the Christians. He belonged to the Judaism of the Dispersion. As a Rom citizen in a Gr city he had departed from the narrowest lines of his people (Ramsay, Cities of St. Paul, 47). His Judaism was pure, in fact, as he gives it to us in Phil 3 5. He was a Jew of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin. He was a Hebrew, of the seed of Abraham (2 Cor 11 22). He shared in full all the covenant blessings and promises of Israel (Rom 15 13)." But this, whose crowning glory was, that of them came Jesus the Messiah. He was proud of the piety of his ancestors (2 Tim 1 3), and made progress as a student of Jewish Aheadness of his fellows (Gal 1 14). His ancestry was pure, Hebrew of the Hebrews (Phil 2 5), and so his family preserved the native Palestinian traditions in Tarsus. His name Saul was a proof of loyalty to the tribe of Benjamin as his cognomen Paul was evidence of his Rom citizenship. In his home he would be taught the law by his mother (cf Gal 1 14), and called Timothy by his mother and grandmother (2 Tim 1 5). In Tarsus he would go to the synagogue also. We know little of his father, save that he was a Rom citizen and so a man of position in Tarsus and possibly of some wealth; that he was a tent-maker and taught his son the same trade, as all Jewish fathers did, whatever their rank in life; that he was a Pharisee and brought up his son as a Pharisee (Acts 23 6), and that he sent the young Saul to Jerusalem to study at the feet of Gamaliel. This Paul had considered himself a Pharisee as distinct from the Suddaica scoeciasm (23 6). Many of the Pharisaic doctrines were identical with those of Christianity. That Paul did not consider himself a Pharisee in all respects is shown by his comparison with the Pharisees (Gal 2; Acts 15; 2 Cor 10 13). Paul says that he was reared as a strict Pharisee (Acts 26 5), though the school of Gamaliel (grandson of Hillel) was not so hard and narrow as that of Shammai. But all Pharisaic readings of the Pentateuch are present in Acts 22. Paul was fortunate in his great teacher Gamaliel, who was liberal enough to encourage the study of Gr lit. But his liberality in defending the apostles against the Sadducees in Acts 5 34 39 must not be misinterpreted in comparison with the persecuting zeal of his brilliant pupil against Stephen (7 58). Stephen had opened war on the Pharisees themselves, and there is no evidence that Gamaliel made a defence of Stephen against the lawless rage of the Sanhedrin. It is common for pupils to go farther than their teachers, but it does not come to the rescue. Still Gamaliel helped Saul, who was undoubtedly his most brilliant pupil and probably the hope of his heart for the future of Judaism. Harnack (History of Dogma, I, 94) says: "Pharisaism had fulfilled its mission in the world when it produced this man." Unfortunately, Pharisaism did not die; in truth has never died, not even from Christianity. But young Saul was the crowning glory of Pharais. An effort has recently been made to restore Pharaism to its former dignity. Herford (Pharaism, Its Aim and Method, 1912) undertakes to show that the Gospels have slandered Pharaism, that it was the one hope of the ancient world, etc. He has a chapter on "Pharaism and Paul," in which he claims that Paul has not attacked the real Pharaism, but has aimed his blow at an unreal creation of his own brain (p. 222). But, if Paul did not understand Pharaism, he did not understand anything. He knew not merely the OT but the Heb, and quotes from both, though usually from the LXX, but he also knew the Jewish Apoc and apocalypses, as is shown in various ways in his writings (see arts. on these subjects). Schweitzer (Paul and His Interpreters) carries too far his idea that Paul and Jesus merely moved in the circle of Jews eschatology. He
makes it explain everything, and that it cannot do. But Paul does show acquaintance with some of these books. See Kennedy, St. Paul’s Concept of the Last Things (1904), for a sane and adequate discussion of this phase of the subject. Pfeiderer pursues the subject in his Paulinism, as does Kabisch in his Eschatologie. So Sanday and Headlam use this book on Rom. Paul knew Wied, also, a book from the Jewish-Alexandrian theology with a tinge of Gr philosophy (see Goodrick, Book of Wied, 398-403; cf also Jowett’s essay on “St. Paul and Philo” in his Epp. of St. Paul). Paul seems to use allegory (Gal 4:24) in accord with the method of Philo, but he knew how to use the Stoic diatribe, the rabbinic diatribe and the Alexandrian allegory. “In his cosmology, angelology, and demonology, as well as eschatology, he remains essentially Jewish” (Garvie, Studies of Paul and His Gospel, 17). When he becomes a Christian he will change many of his views, for Christ must become central in his thinking, but his method learned in the rabbinic schools remains with him (Kohler, Zum Verständnis, etc.). Here, then, is a man with a wonderfully cultured mind. What of his mental gifts?

Much as we can learn about the times of Paul (cf Selden, In the Time of Paul, 1900, for a brief sketch of Paul’s world), we know something of the personality of the 1st cent. AD, the religious condition of the age, the moral standards of the time, the intellectual tendencies of the period. New discoveries continue to throw fresh light on the life of the middle and lower classes among whom Paul chiefly labored. And, if Deissmann in his brilliant study (St. Paul, A Study in Social and Religious History) has pressed too far the notion that Paul the tent-maker ranks not with Origen, but with Amos the herdman (p. 6, on p. 52 he calls it a mistake “to speak of St. Paul the artisan as a proletarian in the sense which the word usually bears with us”), yet he is right in insisting that Paul is “a religious genius” and “a hero of piety” (p. 6). It is not possible to explain the personality and work of a man like Paul by his past and to refer with precision this or that trait to his Jewish or Gr training (Alexander, Ethics of St. Paul, 58). “We must allow something to remain in a sense the children of the past, but some men have much more the power of initiative than others. Paul is not mere ‘eclectic patchwork’ (Bruce, St. Paul’s Conception of Christ, 218). Even if Paul was acquainted with Philo, the fact by no means explains his use of Philo, the representative Jew of the Hellenistic age. “Both are Jews of the Dispersion, city-dwellers, with marked cosmopolitan traits. Both live and move in the LXX Bible. Both are capable of mystical experience, and have many points of contact in detail. And yet they stand in very strong contrast to one another, a contrast which reminds us of the opposition between Seneca and St. Paul. . . . Philo is a philosopher, St. Paul the fool pours out the vials of his irony upon the wisdom of the world” (Deissmann, St. Paul, 110). Deissmann, indeed, cares most for “the living man, Paul, whom we hear speaking and see gesticulating, here player, but a father, and tenderly coaxing, so as to win the heart, the inner soul, there thundering and lightning with the passionate wrath of a Luther, with cutting irony and bitter sarcasm on his lips” (ib, 16 f.).

1. Personal appearance.—We have no reliable description of Paul’s stature and features. The Acts of St. Paul (§ 83) have a protracted thus: “Baldheaded, bowlegged, strongly built, a man small in size, with meeting eyebrows, with a rather large nose, full of grace, for at times he looked like a man and at times he looked like a god. Paul and Ramsay (Church in the Rom Empire, 32) adds: “This plain and unflattering account of the apostle’s personal appearance seems to embody a very early tradition, and in ch xvi he argues that this story goes back to the documentary evidence. We may not agree with all the details, but in some respects it harmonizes with what we gather from Paul’s Epp. Findlay (HDB) notes that this description is confirmed by “the life-like and unconventional figure of the Rom ivory diptych, supposed to date not later than the 4th cent. We see a Paul who knew how to use the Stoic diatribe, the rabbinic diatribe and the Alexandrian allegory. “In his cosmology, angelology, and demonology, as well as eschatology, he remains essentially Jewish” (Garvie, Studies of Paul and His Gospel, 17). When he becomes a Christian he will change many of his views, for Christ must become central in his thinking, but his method learned in the rabbinic schools remains with him (Kohler, Zum Verständnis, etc.). Here, then, is a man with a wonderfully cultured mind. What of his mental gifts?

Much as we can learn about the times of Paul (cf Selden, In the Time of Paul, 1900, for a brief sketch of Paul’s world), we know something of the personality of the 1st cent. AD, the religious condition of the age, the moral standards of the time, the intellectual tendencies of the period. New discoveries continue to throw fresh light on the life of the middle and lower classes among whom Paul chiefly labored. And, if Deissmann in his brilliant study (St. Paul, A Study in Social and Religious History) has pressed too far the notion that Paul the tent-maker ranks not with Origen, but with Amos the herdman (p. 6, on p. 52 he calls it a mistake “to speak of St. Paul the artisan as a proletarian in the sense which the word usually bears with us”), yet he is right in insisting that Paul is “a religious genius” and “a hero of piety” (p. 6). It is not possible to explain the personality and work of a man like Paul by his past and to refer with precision this or that trait to his Jewish or Gr training (Alexander, Ethics of St. Paul, 58). “We must allow something to remain in a sense the children of the past, but some men have much more the power of initiative than others. Paul is not mere ‘eclectic patchwork’ (Bruce, St. Paul’s Conception of Christ, 218). Even if Paul was acquainted with Philo, the fact by no means explains his use of Philo, the representative Jew of the Hellenistic age. “Both are Jews of the Dispersion, city-dwellers, with marked cosmopolitan traits. Both live and move in the LXX Bible. Both are capable of mystical experience, and have many points of contact in detail. And yet they stand in very strong contrast to one another, a contrast which reminds us of the opposition between Seneca and St. Paul. . . . Philo is a philosopher, St. Paul the fool pours out the vials of his irony upon the wisdom of the world” (Deissmann, St. Paul, 110). Deissmann, indeed, cares most for “the living man, Paul, whom we hear speaking and see gesticulating, here player, but a father, and tenderly coaxing, so as to win the heart, the inner soul, there thundering and lightning with the passionate wrath of a Luther, with cutting irony and bitter sarcasm on his lips” (ib, 16 f.).

1. Personal appearance.—We have no reliable description of Paul’s stature and features. The Acts of St. Paul (§ 83) have a protracted thus: “Baldheaded, bowlegged, strongly built, a man
nor struggle with lust (Roman Catholic, *stimulus carnis*). Garvie (*Studies of Paul and His Gospel*, 65, 80) thinks it not unlikely that "it was the recurrence of an old violent temptation, rather than mere lust..." There is still no doubt that this form of temptation is more likely to assail the man of intense emotion and intense affection, as Paul was?"

But enough of what can never be settled. "St. Paul's own scanty hints admonish to caution" (Deissmann, *St. Paul, 63*). It is a blessing for us not to know, since we can all cherish a close bond with Paul. Ramsey (*St. Paul the Traveller*, 37 f) calls special attention to the look of Paul. He "fastened his eyes on" the man (Acts 13:19) and argues that he had a penetrating, powerful gaze, and hence eye trouble. He calls attention also to gestures of Paul (Acts 20:24; 26:2). There were artists in marble and color at the court of Caesar, but no one of them could preserve a likeness of the intense preacher who turned out to be the chief man of the age (Deissmann, *St. Paul*, 58). "We are like the Christians of Colossae and Laodicea, who had not seen his face in the flesh" (Col 2:1).

(2) *His natural endowments.*—In respect to his moral nature we can do much better, for his epp. reveal the mind and soul of the man. He is difficult to comprehend, not because he conceals himself, but because he reveals so much of himself in his epp. He seems to some a man of contradictions. He had a many-sided nature, and his very humanness is in one sense the greatest thing about him. There are "great polar contradictions" in his nature. Deissmann (*St. Paul*, 62 f) notes his ailing body and his tremendous powers for work, his impulsive, self-confident, his periods of depression and of intoxication with victory, his tenderness and his sternness; he was ardently loved and furiously hated; he was an ancient man of his time, but he is cosmopolitan and modern enough for today. Findlay (*HBD*) adds that he was a man possessed of dialectical power and religious inspiration. He was keenly intellectual and profoundly mystical (cf Campbell, *Paul the Mystic*, 1907). He was a theologian and a man of affairs. He was a man of vision with a supreme task to which he held himself. He was a scholar, a sage, a statesman, a seer, a saint (Garvie, *Studies in Paul and His Gospel*, 68-84). He was a man of heart, of passion, of imagination, of sensibility, of will, of courage, of sincerity, of subtlety, of humor, of audacity, of tact, of genius for organization, of power for command, of gift of expression, of leadership—"All these qualities and powers went to the making of Jesus Christ's apostle to the nations, the master-builder of the universal church and of Christian theology" (Findlay, *HDB*; see Lock, *St. Paul the Master Builder*, 1905; and M. Jones, *St. Paul the Orator*, 1910).

I cannot agree with Garvie's charge of cowardice (Love and Teaching of Paul, 175) in the matter of the putting to death (Acts 26) and the writing of the *Sanhedrin* (23 6). The one was a mere matter of prudence, the other a non-essential, the latter was justifiable in resisting the attack of unscrupulous enemies. One does not understand Paul who does not understand his emotional nature. He was quick, impetuous, strenuous, impassioned" (Brevan, *St. Paul in the Light of Today*, 1920). It thrusts through his epp. He loves his converts like a mother or a lover (Findlay, *HBD*) rather than a pastor. We forgot the emotional nature of Paul when we居于 the momentary lapses of his personality. He has elasticity and rebound of spirit, and comes up with the joy of victory in Christ out of the second and third half of his life. The words of 1 Cor. 13:2-7 are great, but it is to serve Christ his Lord. He is a man of faith and a man of prayer. For him "love is Christ. He is the love which is the bond of friendship and binds men together. He is the hook of steel—men like Barnabas, Silas, Timothy, Luke, Titus (Scoot, *The Man Paul*, 1906, 111 f). He is not afraid to oppose his friends when it is necessary for the sake of truth, with Peter (Gal 2 11 ff) and with Barnabas (Acts 15:39). While Paul was like the other apostles out of the clay whereof ordinary men are made and fashioned, you may say that he was also a "saint with his education" (Fairbairn, *Studies in Religion and Theology*, 471). If ever a man, full-blooded and open-eyed, with the earth, with the world, with Paul. It is impossible to answer the question whether Paul was married or not. He certainly was married when he wrote the Epistles. It is possible that he was a member of the Sanhedrin when he cast his vote against the disciples (Acts 26:10), as his language naturally means (Ramsay, *St. Paul*, 240).

There is in Paul the gift of leadership in a marked degree. He, though young, is already at the head of the opposition to Stephen (Acts 7:8), and soon drives the disciples out of Jerusalem. (3) *His supernatural gifts.*—He had his share of them. He had all the gifts that others could boast of at Corinth, and which he lightly esteemed except that of prophecy (1 Cor 14:18-29). He had his visions and revelations, but would not tell what he had seen (2 Cor 12:1-9). He did the signs of an apostle (2 Cor 12:12-14). He had the power to work miracles (1 Cor 4:19-21) and to exercise discipline (1 Cor 5:4 ff; 2 Cor 13:1-3). But what he cared for most of all was the fact that Jesus had appeared to him on the road to Damascus and had called him to the work of preaching to the Gentiles (1 Cor 15:8).

No other element in the equipment of Paul is comparable in importance to his conversion. (1) *Preparation.*—It was sudden. 7. *Conversion* and yet God had led Saul to the state of mind when it could more easily happen. True, Saul was engaged in the very act of persecuting the believers in Jerusalem. His mind was flushed with the sense of victory. He was not conscious of any lingering doubts about the truth of his position and the justice of his conduct till Jesus suddenly told him that it was hard for him to kick against the goad (Acts 26:14). It was suddenly brought to bay, the real truth would flash upon his mind. In later years he tells how he had struggled in vain against the curse of the Law (Rom 7:7). It is probable, though not certain, that Paul here has in mind his experience before his conversion, though the latter part of the chapter may refer to a period later. There is difficulty in either view as to the "body of this death" that made him so wretched (Rom 7:24). The Christian keeps up the fight against sin in spite of the fact (7:25). He does not feel that he is "carnal, sold under sin" (7:14). But when before his conversion did Paul have such intensity of conviction? We can only leave the problem unanswered. His reference to it at least harmonizes with what Jesus had said to him that he was to be the "great missionary" and not to the "goad. The words and death of Stephen and the other disciples may have left a deeper mark than he knew. The question might arise whether after all the Nazarenes were right. His plea for his conduct made in later years was that he was conscientious (Acts 26:9) and that he did it ignorantly in unbelief (1 Tim 1:13). He was not wilfully sinning against the full light as he saw it. It will not do to say with Holsten that Saul was half-converted to join the disciples, and only needed a jolt to turn him over. He was "yet breathing threatening and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord" (Acts 9:1), and went to the high priest and asked for letters to Damascus demanding the arrest of the disciples there. He was at a boiling point when he saw Paul. Saul was not in a mood of easy submission to the doctors. That could be true only in case Paul was born 5 or 6 BC, which is quite unlikely. It is pos-
sible again that Paul may have remained in Jesus after leaving the school of Gamaliel and have spent time in Jerusalem. He now appears in Acts 9:1-19. It was a strange transformation, but we have no express statement to this effect in the letter of Paul, when he states emphatically that he was not a party to the death of Christ. (Wynne, Pronouncing Records of Jesus of Nazareth, 1857.) It is almost certain, in view of Acts (Paul and Ananias, Acts 9:1, the portion that Paul himself adds). 1 Cor 15:1 Paul refers to the risen Jesus. The passage in 2 Cor 15:3 is argued both ways: Wherefore we believe that we shall also dwell with him; even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him spiritually. (ib. 1, 5-11) it is his strong faith in the view that he knew Jesus in the flesh. But in the first clause of the sentence above Paul means by "after the flesh," as a result of a personal and spiritual encounter. It is natural to take it in the same way as applied to Christ. He has changed his viewpoint of Christ and so of all men. Weiss pleads (ib. p. 40), at any rate, that we have no word saying that "Paul had seen Jesus in person." It may be left in abeyance as not vitaly important. He certainly had not understood Jesus, if he knew Him.

(2) Experience. Experiences do not permit a discussion of this great event of Paul's conversion at all commensurate with its significance. A literature of this kind has grown up around it. It has led to lengthy discussions in the lives and theologies of Paul (see e.g. Lord Lyttleton's famous Observations on Saul's Conversion, 1774; Fletcher's A Study of the Conversion of St. Paul, 1910; Gardner, The Spiritual Experience of St. Paul, 1915: Muggah, The Spiritual Experience of St. Paul). All sorts of theories have been advanced to explain on naturalistic grounds this great experience of Christ in the life of Paul. It has been urged that Paul had an epileptic fit, that he had a sunstroke, that he fell of his horse to the ground, that he was led by a flash of lightning, that he imagined that he saw Jesus as a result of his highly wrought nervous state, that he deliberately re-converted Judaism because of the growing conviction that the disciples were right. But none of these explanations explains. More prejudice against the supernatural, such as is shown by Weinel in his Paulus, and by Holsten in his able book (Zum Evangelium d. Paulus und Petrus), cannot solve this problem. He must be willing to hear the evidence. There were witnesses of the bright light (Acts 26:13) and of the sound (9:7) which only Paul understood (22:9), as he alone beheld Jesus. It is claimed by some that Paul had a true epileptic fit, and did not see Jesus with his eyes. Denny (Standard Bible Dict.) replies that it is not a pertinent objection. Jesus (in 21:1) "manifested" Himself, and Paul says that he "saw" Jesus (1 Cor 9:1), that Jesus "appeared" (1 Cor 15:8) to him. Hence it was both subjective and objective. But the reality of the event was as clear to Paul as in his own existence. The account is given 3 t in Acts (chs. 9, 25, 26) in substantial agreement, with a few varying details. In ch 9 the historical narrative occurs, in ch 22 Paul's defence before the mob in Jerusalem is given, and in ch 26 we have the apology before Agrippa. There are no contradictions of moment, save that in ch 26 Jesus Himself is represented as giving directly to Paul the call to the Gentiles while in chs. 9 and 22 it is conveyed through Ananias (the fuller and more accurate account). There is no need to notice the apparent contradiction between 9:7 and 22:9, for the difference in case in the Gr gives a difference in sense, hearing the sound, with the genitive, and not in substance, as with the accusative. Findlay (HBD) remarks that the conversion of Paul is a psychological and ethical problem which cannot be accounted for save by Paul's own interpretation of the change wrought in him. He saw Jesus and surrendered to Him.

(3) Effect on Paul. His surrender to Jesus was instantaneous and complete: "What shall I do, Lord?" (Acts 22:10). He could not see for the glory of that light (22:11), but he had already changed the light of the world's knowledge of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. 4:6). The god of this world could blind him no longer. He had seen Jesus, and all else had lost charm for Paul. There is infinite pathos in the picture of the blind Saul led by the hand (Acts 9:8) into Damascus. All the pride of power is gone, all the lust for vengeance.

The fierceness of the name of Saul is well shown in the dread that Ananias has and the protest that he makes to the Lord concerning him (9:10-14). Ananias does not think that the Lord had made a strange choice of a vessel to bear the message of Christ to the Gentiles, kings, and the children of Israel (9:15), but there was hope in the promise of chastisement to him (9:16). So he went, and called him "Brother Saul." Saul was filled with the Holy Spirit, the scales fell from his eyes, he was baptized. And now what next? What did the world hold in store for the proud seer of Judaism who had renounced power, place, pride for the lowly Nazarene? He went back to Damascus, and some in Damascus would have none of him now. Would the disciples receive him? They did. "And he was certain days with the disciples that were at Damascus" (9:9). Ananias vouched for him by his own sight. Jesus Christ (Acts 9:19) appeared to him and went boldly into the synagogues and "proclaimed Jesus, that he is the Son of God!" (9:20).

This was a public commitment and a proclamation of his new creed. There was tremendous path and point in this announcement from the lips of Saul, who was now an amazed (Acts 9:21). This is the core of Paul's message as we see it in his later ministry (Acts 13:17). It rests at bottom on Paul's own experience of grace: "His whole theology is nothing but the explanation of his own conversion" (Stalker, Life of St. Paul, 45). We need not argue (Garvie, Studies of Paul and His Gospel, 51) that Paul understood at once the whole content of the new message, but he had the heart of it right. V. Work. There was evidently a tumult in Paul's soul. He had undergone a revolution, both intellectual and spiritual. Before he proceeded farther it was wise to think through the most important implications of the new truths of the gospel. He gives no account of this personal phase of Paul's career, but he allows room for it between Acts 9 and 22. It is Paul who tells of his retirement to Arabia (Gal 1:17) to prove his independence of the apostles in Jesus. He did not go to them for instruction or for ecclesiastical authority. He did not adopt the merely traditional view of Jesus as the Messiah. He knew, of course, the Christian contention well enough, for he had answered it often enough. But now his old arguments were gone and he must work his way round to the other side, and be able to put his new gospel with clearness and force. He was done with calling Jesus anathema (1 Cor 12:3). Henceforth to him Jesus is Lord. We know nothing of Paul's life in Arabia nor in what part of Arabia he was. He may have gone to Mt. Sinai and thought out grace in the atmosphere of law, but that is not necessary. But it is clear that Paul grew in apprehension of the things of Christ during these years, and gathered strength for his work. But he did not grow away from the first clear vision of Christ. He claimed that God had revealed His Son in him that he might preach to the Gentiles (Gal 1:16). He claimed that from the first and to the very last. The undertone is one of love in Paul's Epp. (see Matheson, Spiritual Development
of St. Paul, and Sabatier, The Apostle Paul) is, however, not a changing view of Christ that nullifies Paul’s "original Christian inheritance" (Kohler, 2nd ed. of "Apostles Paulus," 15). Pfeiffer ("Influence of the Apostle Paul in the Development of Christianity," 3d ed., 1897, 217) rejects Col because of the advanced Christology here found. But the Christology of Col is implicit in Paul’s first sermon at Damascus. "It is impossible to escape the conclusion that the significance and value of the Cross became clear to him almost simultaneously with the certainty of the resurrection and of the Messiahship of Jesus" (Garvie, Studies, etc., 57). The narrow Jew has surrendered to Christ, who demands for the sake of the universal gospel has taken hold of his mind and heart, and it will work out its logical consequences in Paul. The time in Arabia is not wasted. When he reappears in Damascus (Acts 9 22) he has "developed faith" (Findlay, HDB) and energy that bear instant fruit. He is now the slave of Christ. For him henceforth to live is Christ. He is crucified with Christ. He is in Christ. The union of Paul with Christ is the real key to his life. It is far more sublime a thing for him to have fellowship with Christ (Deissmann, St. Paul, 123). Thus it is that the man who probably never saw Christ in the flesh understands him best (Wernle, Beginnings of Christianity, 1, 135). He sustained the mission of his strength, and confounded the Jews that dwelt in Damascus, proving that this is the Christ" (Acts 9 22).

2. Opposition (Acts 9 22). Now he not merely "proclaims" as before (9 20); he "proves." It is now his purpose to work with such nervous skill that the Jews are first confounded, then enraged to the point of murder. Their former hero was now their foe. The disciples had learned to run from Saul. They now let him down in a basket through the wall by night and he is gone (Acts 9 23 f). This then is the beginning of the active ministry of the man who was called to be a chosen vessel to Gentiles, kings, and Jews. There was no need to go back to the wilderness. He had gotten his bearings clearly now. He had his message and it had his whole heart. He had not avoided Jesus because he despised flesh and blood, but because he had no need of light from the apostles since "the Divine revelation so completely absorbed his interest and absorbed his life:" (Acts 9 15). Saul, then, was open. No door was open as yet among the Gentiles. Sooner or later he must go to Jerusalem and confer with the leaders there if he was to cooperate with them in the evangelization of the world. Saul knew that he would be an object of suspicion to the disciples in Jerusalem. That was inevitable in view of the past. It was best to go, but he did not wish to ask any favors of the apostles. Indeed he went in particular "to visit Cephas" (in Acts 15 1) "to become acquainted with him" (Acts 15 37). They had been enemies, of course, as opponents. But Saul comes now with the olive branch to his old enemy. He expressly explains (Gal 1 19) that he saw no other apostle. He did see James, the Lord’s brother, who was not one of the Twelve. It seems that at first Peter and James were both afraid of Saul (Acts 9 26), "not believing that he was a disciple." If a report came 3 years before of the doings at Damascus, they had discounted it. All had been quiet, and now Saul suddenly appears in Jerusalem in a new rôle. It was, therefore, a surprise when the doings of Saul were reported to Barnabas, Saul might not have had that visit of 15 days with Peter. Barnabas was a Hellenist of Cyprus and believed Saul’s story and stood by him. Thus he had his opportunity to preach the gospel in Jerusalem, perhaps in the very synagogues in which he and Stephen, and now he is, taking Stephen’s place and is disputing against the Grecian Jews (Acts 9 29). He had days of blessed fellowship (9 28) with the disciples, till the Grecian Jews sought to kill him as Saul had helped to do to Stephen (Acts 9 29). By the grace of Damascus, but Saul did not wish to run again so soon. He protested to the Lord Jesus, who spoke in a vision to him, and recalls the fate of Stephen, but Jesus bids him go: "For I will send thee forth a renegade Jew. There were apparently no Christians in Tarsus, unless some of the disciples driven from Jerusalem by Saul himself went that far, as they did go to Antioch (Acts 11 19 f). But Saul was not idle, for he probably understood Syria and Cilicia durings this "period of obscurity" (Denney, Standard Bible Dict.) as a thing known to the churches of Judaea (Gal 1 21 f). He was not idle then. The way was not yet opened for formal resistance upon the mission of the Gentiles, but Saul was not the man to do nothing at home because of that. If they would not hear him at Damascus and Jerusalem, they would in the regions of Syria and Cilicia, his home province. We are left in doubt as to what first began Saul’s work to Gentiles or to Gentiles also. He had the specific call to preach to the Gentiles, and there is no reason why he should not have done so in this province, preaching to the Jews first as he did afterward. He did not have the seraples of Simon Peter to overcome. When he appears at Antioch with Barnabas, he seems to take hold like an old hand at the business. It is quite probable, therefore, that this obscure ministry of some 8 or 10 years may have had more results than we know. Paul apparently felt that he had done his work in that region, for outside of Antioch he gives no time to it except that in starting out on the second tour from Antioch "he went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches" (Acts 16 1), and meeting of this early ministry and apparently containing Gentiles also. Better from the Jerusalem conference was addressed to the brethren who are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia (Acts 16 23). Cilicia was now part of the Roman province of Syria. So then we conclude that Saul had a gentle ministry in this region. "Independently, under no human master, he learned his business as a missionary to the heathen" (Findlay, HDB). One can but wonder what Saul would have accomplished if he had not been so kindly received at home by his father and mother. They had looked upon him with pride as the possible successor of Gamaliel, and now he is a follower of the despised Nazarene and a preacher of the Cross. It is possible that his own exhortations to fathers not to provoke their children to wrath (Eph 6 4) may imply that his own father had cast him out at that time. Findlay (HDB) argues that Saul would not have remained in this region so long if his home relations had been altogether hostile. It is a severe test of character to stand alone against one. But Saul turned defeat to glorious gain.

Most scholars hold that the ecstatic experience told by Paul in 2 Cor 12 1–9 took place before he came to Antioch. If we count the years strictly, 14 from 56 AD would bring us to 42 AD. Paul had spent a year in Antioch before going up to Jerusalem.
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(Ac 11 29 f.). Findlay (HDB) thinks that Paul had the visions before he received the call to come to Antioch. Garvie (Life and Teaching of Paul, 41) refers to the call first. "Such a mood of exaltation would account for the vision to which he refers in 2 Cor 12 1-4." At any rate he had the vision with its exaltation and the thorn in the flesh with its humiliation before he came to Antioch in response to the invitation of Barnabas. He had undoubtedly had a measure of success in his work in Cilicia and Syria. He had the seal of the Divine blessing on his work among the Gentiles. But there was a pang of disappointment over the advance towards the work. He had apparently left alone to his own resources. "Only such a feeling of disappointment can explain the tone of his references to his relations to the apostles (Gal 1 11-24)" (Garvie, Life and Teaching of Paul, 41). There is no bitterness in this tone—but puzzled surprise. It seems that the 12 apostles are more or less absent from Jerusalem during this period with James the brother of the Lord Jesus as chief elder. A narrow Pharisaic element in the church was in the fight to stop the church in its attitude toward the Gentiles. This is clear in the treatment of Peter, when he returned to Jerusalem after the experience at Caesarea with Cornelius (Acts 11 1-18). There was an acquisitive clique who noticed an exceptional case of the Lord's doing. Hence they show concern over the spread of the gospel to the Greeks at Antioch, and send Barnabas to investigate and report (Acts 11 19-22). Barnabas was a Hellenist, and evidence does not show him for a moment in the Pharisaic party in the church at Jerusalem (11 2), for he was glad (11 23 f.) of the work in Antioch. Probably minded of the disciple attempted on Simon Peter, he refrained from going back at once to Jerusalem. Moreover, he believed in Saul and his work, and thus he gave him his great opportunity at Antioch. They had there a year's blessed work together (11 25 ff). So great was the outcome that the disciples received a new name to distinguish them from the Gentiles and the Jews. But the term "Christian" did not become general for a long time. There was then a great Church at Antioch, possibly equal in size to the Jewish church in Jerusalem. The prophecy by Agabus of a famine gave Barnabas and Saul a good excuse for a return to Jerusalem with a grateful offering to relieve the poverty in the Jerusalem church. Barnabas had assisted generously in a similar strain in the beginning of the work there (Acts 4 36 f.), unless it was a different Barnabas, which is unlikely. This contribution would help the Jerusalem saints to understand now that the Greeks were really converted. It was apparently successful according to the record in Acts. The apostles seem to have been absent, since only "elders" are mentioned in 11 30.

The incidents in ch 12, as already noted, are probably not contemporaneous with this visit, but either prior or subsequent to it. However, it is urged by some scholars that this visit is the same as that of Gal 2 1-10, since Paul would not have omitted it in his list of visits to Jerusalem. But then Paul is not giving a list of visits, but is only showing his independence of the apostles. If they were absent from Jerusalem at that time, there would be some reason to doubt. Besides, Luke in Acts 15 does recount the struggle in Jerusalem over the problem of gentile liberty, and a question was raised at that time about the same issue (Acts 15 1). It is quite remarkable that he should have passed by, esp. if the matter caused much heat at the time, especially since the apostle Barnabas in ch 11 is much simpler to understand that in Acts 15 and Gal 2 1-10 we have the public and the more important aspects of the controversy. It seems to suppose that Luke has slurred the whole matter over in Acts 11 30. The identification of the incident that in Acts 15 11 and 12 25 making it possible to place Gal before the conference in Jerusalem in Acts 15 and implies the correctness of the South-

Galatian theory of the destination of the ep. and of the work of Paul of Gal. As many advocates and arguments, but which is by no means established (see below for discussion at more length). So far as we can gather from Luke, there was a visit from Luke, but this is not recorded by John Mark (Acts 12 25), "when they had fulfilled their ministerial with satisfaction. The Pharisaic element was apparently persistent, and the possibility of this work among the Gentiles seemed hopeful. Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveller, 98) argues that the revelation mentioned in Paul's speech in Acts 22 16 with this visit in 11 30 (12 25), rather than with the verse Acts 22 16, but I cannot concur in the solution of Ramsay.

Paul had already preached to the Gentiles in Cilicia and Syria; for some 10 years. The work was not new to him. He had had his spec-

5. The First Great Mission

Campaign: individual in Cilicia. The Spirit specifically directs the separation of Barnabas and Saul to this work (Acts 13 2). They were to go together, and they had the sympathy and prayers of a great church. The endorsement was probably "ordination" in the technical sense, but a farewell and sending off by the church. The missionaries went forth on the world-campaign (13 3). No such unanimous endorsement could have been obtained in Jerusalem to this great enterprise. It was momentous in its possibilities for Christianity. Paul met and converted the Greek Gentile at Antioch. The great endowment of the new convert had been in the Roman city. How that mind managed this time we do not know. Some individuals may have helped. Paul had his trade to fall back on, and often had resort to it later. The presence of John Mark "as their attendant" (13 5) was probably due to Barnabas, his cousin (Col 4 10). The visit to Cyprus, the home of Barnabas, was natural. There were already some Christians there (Acts 11 20), and it was near. They preach first in the synagogue of the Jews at Salamis (13 5). We are left to conjecture as to how the results there and through the whole island till Paphos is reached. There they meet a man of great prominence and intelligence, Sergius Paulus, the Roman proconsul, who had been under the spell of sorcery and magic (Acts 13 8). The vision (Acts 13 9) of Peter's encounter with Simon Magus in Samaria. In order to win and hold Sergius Paulus, who had become interested in Christianity, Paul has to punish Bar-Jesus with blindness (13 10 f.) in the exercise of that apostolic power which he afterward claimed with such vigor (1 Cor 5 4 f.; 2 Cor 13 10). He won Sergius Paulus, and this gave him cheer for his work. From now on it is Paul, not Saul, in the record of Luke, perhaps because of this incident, though both names probably belonged to him from the first. Now also Paul steps to the fore ahead of Barnabas, and it is "Paul's company" (13 13) that sets sail from Paphos for Pamphylia. There is no evidence here of resentment on the part of Barnabas at the leadership of Paul. The whole campaign may have been planned from the start by the Holy Spirit as the course now taken may have been due to Paul's leadership. John Mark deserts at Perga and returns to Jerusalem (his home), not to Antioch (13 13). Paul and Barnabas push on to the farther lands of Asia Minor. The Traveller, 98) thinks that Paul had malaria down at Perga and hence desired to get up into higher land. That is possible. The places mentioned in the rest of the tour are Antioch in Pisidia (13 14), and Iconium (13 51), Lystra (14 8), and Derbe (14 20), cities of Lycaonia. Some of these terms re
The matter had to stop. So the Judaisers came up to Antioch and laid down the law to Paul and Barnabas. They did not wait for them to come to Jerusalem. That would not only have split off one of the churches in Galatia (Acts 11). Paul and Barnabas had not sought the controversy. They had both received specific instructions from the Holy Spirit to make this great campaign among the Gentiles. They would not disrupt themselves and the Church in Christ by going back and having the Mosaic Law imposed on them by the ceremony of circumcision. They saw at once the gravity of the issue. The very essence of the gospel of grace was involved. Paul had turned away from this yoke of bondage. They went back to it nor would he impose it on his converts. The church at Antioch stood by Paul and Barnabas. Paul (Gal 2:2) says that he had a revelation to go to Jerusalem with the problem. Luke (Acts 16:8) says that the church sent them. Surely there is no inconsistency here. It is not difficult to combine the personal narrative in Gal 2 with the public meetings recorded in Acts 15. We have first the general report by Paul and Barnabas to the church in Jerusalem. They brought down from Antioch a live specimen, offered as a sacrifice to the Judaisers ("false brethren") and circumcised. But Paul stood his ground for the truth of the gospel and was supported by Peter, John and James and other teachers (Gal 2:1-10). In this private conference some of the timid brethren wished to persuade Paul to have Barnabas and him and the Church at Seleucia and Antioch. They make their report to the church at Antioch. It is a wonderful story. The door of faith is now wide open for the Gentiles who have entered in great numbers (Acts 14:27). No report was sent to Jerusalem. What will the Pharisaic party do now?

The early date of Gal, addressed to these churches of Pisidia and Lycaonia before the Conference in Jerusalem does not allow time for a second visit there (Gal 4:13), and requires that Paul and Barnabas dramatically turned to the Gentiles (Acts 15:45 ff.). But the Jews reached the city magistrate through the influential women, and Paul and Barnabas were ordered to leave (Acts 15:50 ff.). Similar success brings like results in Iconium. At Lystra, before the hostile Jews coming out of Lystra and Derbe, Paul, Barnabas and certain others (Acts 14:1-6) certainly made a report of this success and are taken as Mercury and Jupiter respectively, and worship is offered them. Paul's address in refusal is a fine plea on the grounds of natural theology (Acts 14:15-18) and so this report on the miraculous event came seemed successful. In the band of disciples that "stood round about him," there may have been Timothy, Paul's son in the gospel. From Derbe they retrace their steps to Perga, in order to strengthen Paul in his mission and a thence for Seleucia and Antioch. They make their report to the church at Antioch. It is a wonderful story. The door of faith is now wide open for the Gentiles who have entered in great numbers (Acts 14:27). No report was sent to Jerusalem. What will the Pharisaic party do now?

6. The Conflict at Jerusalem

Upon the heels of Paul and Barnabas, came (Acts 15:3) the letter. The Acts 15:4, 29 AD Besides, this is the less likelihood of reference. It seems to have been taken as a second time to Jerusalem (Acts 15:2) if already the question had been settled in Paul's favor (Acts 11:30). It is strange also that no reference to this previous conference on the same subject is made in Acts 15, since Peter does refer to his experience at Caesarea (Acts 15:9) and since James in Acts 21, 25 specifically ("we wrote") mentions the letter of Acts 15 which full liberty was granted to the Gentiles. Once more, the attack on the position of Paul and Barnabas was made by the conduct of Peter at Caesarea (Acts 11:1 ff.) and had reluctantly acquiesced in the plain work of God (11:18). They had likewise yielded in the matter of the Greeks at Antioch (Acts 11:19 ff.) by the help of the disciples and teachers and they had not agreed to a campaign to Hellenize Christianity.
Some time later Peter appears at Antioch in the fullest fellowship with Paul and Barnabas in their work, and proceeds in free interchange with the Gentiles, as he had timely done in the home of Cornelius, till "certain came from James" (Gal 2 11 f), and probably threatened to have Peter up before the church again (Acts 11 2) on this matter, claiming that James agreed with them on the subject. This I do not believe was true in the light of Acts 15 24, where a similar false claim is discredited, since James had agreed with Paul in Jerusalem (Acts 15 19 ff; Gal 2 9 f). The new ground for controversy was that they attempted to place the question of social relations with the Gentiles in the Jerusalem conference and that Peter had exceeded the agreement there reached. Peter quailed before the accusation, "fearing them that were of the circumcision" (Gal 2 12). To make it worse, "even Barnabas was carried away with their dissimulation" (2 13). Under this specious plea Paul was about to lose the fruit of the victory already won, and charged Peter to his face with Judaizing hypocrisy (2 11-14). It was a serious crisis. Peter had not changed his convictions, but had once more cowered in an hour of peril. Paul won both Barnabas and Peter to his side and took occasion to show how useless the death of Christ was if men could be saved by mere legalism (2 21). But the Judaizers had renewed the attack and could not keep it down. And thus the work of Paul all over the world. Paul had the light of his life upon his hands. The impulse to go out again from Paul. Despite the difference in Gal 2 13, he wished to go again with Barnabas (interwoven 15 36); but Barnabas insisted on taking along Second Mark, which Paul was not willing to Mission do to because of his failure to stick to the work at Perga. So they agreed Bar- to leave after "contention"—18 22; 1 (15 39 f). Barnabas went with Mark and and 2 Thessals, to Cyprus, while Paul took Silas, 49-51 (or "be commended by the brethren") 52 AD to the grace of the Lord." Luke follows the career of Paul, and so Barnabas drops out of view (cf later 1 Cor 9 6). Paul and Silas go "through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches" (Acts 15 41). They pass through the Cilician gates to Derbe, the end of the first missionary journey. Jerusalem was a city where more than twice Mark's place in Paul's life. Timothy's mother was a Jewess and his father a Greek. Paul decided therefore to have him circumcised since, as a half-Jew, he would be esp. obnoxious to the Jews, but Paul, having already been engaged as a witness against that of Titus, a Greek, where principle was involved. Here it was a matter merely of expediency. Paul had taken the precaution to bring along the decrees of the Conference at Jerusalem in case there was need of them. He was sure, but if Paul has to be noted that in 1 Cor 8-10 and in Rom 14 and 15, when discussing the question of eating meats offered to idols, Paul does not refer to these decrees, but argues the matter purely from the standpoint of the principles involved. The Judaizers anyhow had not lived up to the agreement, but Paul is here doing his part by the decision. The result of the work was good for the churches (Acts 16 4).

When we come to Acts 16 6, we touch a crucial passage in the South-Galatian controversy. Ramsay (Christianity in the Roman Empire, chs iii-vi; Hist and Geography of Asia Minor; St. Paul the Traveller, chs v, vi) has laid the field. But in the above "reply to Lacta- its," HDB: Comm. on Gal: The Cities of St. Paul, pp. 247-282. Ramsay is the chief champion of the view that Paul never went to Galatia proper or North Galatia, and that he addressed his Second Epistle written in the year 56. For a careful history of the whole controversy in detail, see Moffatt, Intro to the Lit. of the NT, 90-100, who strongly supports the view of Lightfoot, R. J. Holz-
was stirred over the idolatry before his eyes. He preaches in the synagogues and argues with the Stoics and Epicureans in the Agora who make light of his pretensions to philosophy as a "babbling" (Acts 18 17). But curiosity leads him to invite them to speak on the Areopagus. This notable address, all alive to his surroundings, was rather rudely cut short by their indifference and mockery, and Paul left Athens with small results for his work. He goes over to Corinth, the great commercial city of the province, rich and with bizarre notions of culture. Paul determined (1 Cor 2 1-5) to be true to the cross, even after his experience in Athens. He gave them, not the flashy philosophy of the sophists, but the true wisdom of God in simple words, the philosophy of the cross of Christ (1 Cor 1 17-3 4). In Corinth Paul found fellow-helpers in Aquila and Priscilla, just expelled from Rome by Claudius. They have the same trade of tent-makers and live together (Acts 18 1-4), and Paul preached in the court (Acts 18 5-10). He is cheered by the coming of Timothy and Silas from Thessalonica (18 5) with supplies from Philippi, as they had done while in Thessalonica (Phil 4 15 f.). This very success led to opposition, and Paul has to preach in the court (Acts 18 6-10; 1 Cor 16 17). The way goes on till Galio comes and a renewed effort is made to have it stopped, but Galio declines to interfere and thus practically makes Christianity a religion tolerated, since he treats it as a variety of Judaism. When Paul writes to the Romans (15 24; 16 1-5), and after the departure of Timothy and Silas, Paul writes the letter to Thessalonians, the first of his 13 epp. They are probably not very far apart in time, and deal chiefly with a grievous misunderstanding on their part concerning the exclusiveness placed by him in the Man of Sin and the Second Coming. Paul had felt the power of the empire, and his attention is sharply drawn to the coming conflict between the Rom empire and the kingdom of God. He treats it in terms of apocalyptic eschatology. When he leaves Corinth, it is to go by Ephesus, with Aquila and Priscilla whom he leaves there with the promise to return. He goes down to Caesarea and "went up and saluted the church there at Jerusalem" (Acts 21 26). Paul is elected by the church as its new leader (fourth visit), and "went down to Antioch." If he went to Jerusalem, it was probably incidental, and nothing of importance happened. He is back once again in Antioch after an absence of some 3 or 4 years.

The stay of Paul at Antioch is described as "some time" (Acts 18 23). Denney (Standard Bible Dict.) conjectures that Paul's brief stay at Jerusalem (see above) was due to the fact that he found that the Judaism was not likely to accept his position in the absence of the apostles, and it was so unpleasant that he did not stay. He suggests also that the emissaries of the church at Jerusalem (Acts 18 22, 26) (fourth visit) had sent letters of commendation from the church for their emissaries (2 Cor 3 1) to Corinth and Galatia, which were preaching "another Jesus" of nationalism and narrowness, whom Paul did not recognize (Gal 1 10; 2 Cor 11 4). Both Denney and Findlay follow Neander, Wieseler, and Sabatier in placing here, before Paul starts out again from Antioch, the visit of certain "from James" (Gal 2 12), who overpowered Peter for the moment. But I have put this incident as much as possible in the time when Jesus was over Mark, and as probably contributing to that breach at the beginning of the second tour. It is not necessary to suppose that the Judaism remained ascendant so long.

Paul seems to have set out on the third tour alone unless Timothy came back with him, of which there is no evidence save that he is with Paul again in Ephesus (Acts 19 22). What became of Silas? Paul "went through the region of Galatia, and Phrygia, in order, establishing all the disciples" (Acts 18 23). Paul's order here (Acts 18 6-10) is that of Galatia, then Phrygia, and finally the region of Phrygia and Galatia. According to the North-Galatian view, here followed, he went through the northern part of the province, passing through Galatia proper and Phrygia on his way west to Ephesus. Luke adds, "Paul having passed through the upper country came to Ephesus" (19 1). The ministry of Apollos in Ephesus (18 24-28) had taken place before Paul arrived, though Aquila and Priscilla were still on hand. Apollos passed over to Corinth and incidentally became the occasion of such strife there (1 Cor 1 4) that he left and refused to return at Paul's request (1 Cor 16 12). Paul has a ministry of 3 years, in round numbers, in Ephesus, which is full of excitement and anxiety from the work there and in Corinth. He finds on his arrival some ill-informed disciples of John the Baptist who are ignorant of the chief elements of John's teaching about repentance, Jesus, and the Holy Spirit (Acts 19 2-7), matters of which Apollos had known before he went from Priscilla and Aquila, but there is no evidence that he was re baptized as was true of the 12 disciples of John (Robertson, John the Loyal, 290-303). The boldness of Paul in Ephesus led in 3 months to his departure from the synagogue to the house of Titus (Whose?) and to the schoolhouse of Tyranus, where he remained for 2 years (Acts 19 8-10) with such power that "all they that dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord." It is not strange later to find churches at Colossae and Hierapolis in the Lyceum Valley (cf Acts 19 11). Paul has a second visit to Synagogue, in the presence of Jewish exorcists that led to the burning of books of magic by the wholesale (19 11-20), another proof of the hold that magic and the mysteries had upon the Orient. Ephesus was the seat of the worship of Diana whose wonderful temple was their pride. A great business in the manufacture of shrines of Diana was carried on here by Demetrius, and this Paul had hurt his trade so much that he raised an insurrection under the guise of piety and patriotism and he might have killed Paul with the mob, if he could have got hold of him (19 23-41). It was with great difficulty that Paul was kept from going to the amphitheater, as it was. But here, as at Corinth, the Rom official (the town clerk) defended Paul from the rage of his enemies (through his eloquence, here the tradesmen whose business suffered). He was apparently very ill anyhow, and came near death (2 Cor 1 9). All this seems to have hastened his departure from Ephesus sooner than Pentecost, as he had written to the Corinthians (1 Cor 16 8). His heart was in Corinth because of the discussions there over him and Apollos and Peter, by reason of the agitation of the Judaizers (1 Cor 1 10-17). The household of Chloe had brought word of this situation to Paul. He had written the church a letter now lost (1 Cor 5 9). They had written him a letter (1 Cor 7 1). They sent messengers to Paul (1 Cor 16 17). He had sent Timothy to them (1 Cor 4 17; 16 10), who seems not to have succeeded in quieting the trouble. Paul wrote 1 Cor (spring of 56), and then sent Titus, who was to meet him at Troas and report results (2 Cor 2 12 f). He may also have written another letter and sent it by Titus (2 Cor 2 3 f). The sudden absence of the apostles from the church (20 6) makes it probable that Paul was to arrive ahead of time, but he could not wait for Titus, and so pushed on with a heavy heart into Macedonia, where he met him, and he had good and bad news to tell (2 Cor 2 12 ff; 7 5-13). The effect on Paul was instantaneous. He rebounded to hope and joy (2 Cor 2 14 f) in a glorious defence of the
ministry of Jesus (cf. Robertson, *The Glory of the Ministry; Paul's Exultation in Preaching*), with a message of cheer to the majority of the church that he loved and had tried to lead and to whom he had joined cordially. He had spent considerable time at Ephesus (Acts 19 21) and thought it was time to call a halt. He then spent some time in Macedonia (Acts 20 1-3), and so the last section of his journey was to Philip (Acts 20 6). There is no evidence of Paul writing to the elders at Ephesus to request that he be allowed to stay, as he had done in other places (Acts 20 16).

8. Five Years a Prisoner (Acts 21:17 - 20:31; 22; Phil; Philem; Col; Eph 1:1-8 (with 63 AD)

Paul longed to have a change of scene and to do something to further the cause of the gospel. He had been in prison for some time, and he was eager to return to his work. He also wanted to visit the other churches that he had founded in his previous journeys, and to strengthen them in their faith. Paul wrote to the Galatians, encouraging them to stand firm in the faith, and to continue to work for the advancement of the gospel. He urged them to remember the teaching of Jesus, and to follow his example in their lives.


Paul had hoped to reach Jerusalem (Acts 20 16). He seemed to have done so,Luke gives the story of Paul in Jerusalem, Caesarea, and the voyage to Rome in much detail. He was with him and considered this period of his ministry very important. The welcome from the holy city of Jerusalem was very warm and enthusiastic, and Paul was received with open arms. He was given a warm welcome, and was able to share his message of salvation and liberation with the people. He also had the opportunity to meet with the rulers of the city, and to address them on behalf of the gospel. Paul's teaching was received with enthusiasm, and he was able to make a lasting impact on the people of Jerusalem.

The time Paul spent in Jerusalem was brief, but it was filled with activity and purpose. He met with the leaders of the church, and was able to share his message of salvation and liberation with them. He was also able to make a lasting impression on the people of Jerusalem, and to leave behind a legacy of faith and hope. Paul's time in Jerusalem was a time of growth and development, as he continued to spread the message of the gospel throughout the world, and to build the church of God.
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so that they imagined that he had Greeks with him in the Jewish court, because they had seen him one day with Trophimus in the city (21 27 ff). It is a splendid illustration of the blindness of prejudice and the haste with which the people were set on for the arrest of one who had raised the hue and cry in the temple against Paul as the descender of the holy place and the Law and the people disappear, and are never heard of more (24 18). But it will take Paul five years or more of the prime of his life to get himself out of the tangled web that will be woven about his head. Peril follows peril. He was almost mobbed, as often before, by the crowd that dragged him out of the temple (21 30 f). It would remind Paul of Stephen's murder, and in the Roman captain rescues him, and had him bound with two chains as a dangerous bandit, and had him carried by the soldiers to save his life, the mob yelled "Away with him" (21 36 ff), as they had done to Jesus. After the captain, astonished that "Paul the Egyptian" men speak Gr, grants him permission to stand on the steps of the tower of Antonia to speak to the mob that clamored for his blood, he held their rapt attention by an address in Aram. (22 2) in which he gave a defense of his whole career. All this they heard as if the words were "as the prophet spoke," and which they raged more violently than ever (22 21 ff). At this the captain has Paul tied with thongs, not understanding his Aram. speech, and is about to scourge him when Paul pleads his Roman citizenship, to the amazement of the soldiers on duty who spoke the word "Genos" and simply, "Tyrannicide," because his very words were against his liberty. Almost in despair, the captain, wishing to know the charge of the Jews against Paul, brings him before the Sanhedrin. It is a familiar scene to Paul, and it is now their chance for settling old scores. Paul must face the sharp retort in anger to the high priest Ananias, for which he apologizes as if he was so angry that he had not noticed, but he soon divides the Sanhedrin hopelessly on the subject of the resurrection of Jesus. He has a little case to make on the issue that when Gamaliel scored the Sadducees in Acts 5. This was turning the tables on his enemies, and was justifiable as war. He claimed to be a Pharisee on this point, as he was still, as opposed to the Sadducees. The result was a stand Paul had to be rescued from the contending factions, and the captain knew no more than he did before (23 1–10). That night "the Lord stood by him" and promised that he would go to Rome (23 11). That was a balm, when the two years, having been simply too long for the high priest, means over. By the skill of his nephew he escaped the murderous plot of 40 Jews who had taken a vow not to eat till they had killed Paul (23 12–24). They almost succeeded, but Claudius Lysias sent Paul in haste with a band of soldiers to Caesarea to Felix, the procurator, with a letter in which he claimed to have rescued Paul from the mob, "having learned that he was a Roman" (23 26–30). At any rate he was no longer in the clutches of the Jews. Would Rom provincial justice be any better? Felix follows a perfunctory course with Paul and shows some curiosity about Christianity, till Paul makes him tremble with terror, a complete reversal of situations (cf Pilato's meanness before Jesus). But love of money from Paul or the Jews leads Felix to keep Paul a prisoner for two years, though convinced of his innocence, and to hand him over to Festus, his successor, because the Jews might make things worse for him if he released him (ch 24). The case of the Sanhedrin, who have now made it clear, that it seems to impair the Sanhedrin's authority, though pleaded by the Rom orator Tertullus, has fallen through as Paul calmly ridded their charges. Festus is at first at a loss how to proceed, but he soon follows the steps of Felix by offering to play into the hands of the Jewish leaders by sending Paul back to Jerusalem, whereupon Paul abruptly exercises his right of Rom citizenship by appealing to Caesar (25 1–12). This way, though a long one, offered the only ray of hope. The appearance of Paul before Agrippa and Bernice was approved by Festus to relieve his guests of ennu, but Paul seized the opportunity to make a powerful appeal to Agrippa that put him in a corner logically, though he wriggled out and declined to endorse Christianity, though confirming Paul's innocence, which Festus also had admitted (25 13–26 32). Paul was fortunate in the centurion Julius who took him to Rome, for he was kindly disposed to him at the start, and so it was all the way through the most remarkable voyage on record. Luke has preserved his own record, as he traces the voyage, stage by stage, with change of ship at Myra, delay at Fair Havens, Crete, and shipwreck on the island of Malta. More is learned about ancient seafaring from this chapter than from any other source (see art. Phœnix, and Smith, Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul, 1866). In it all Paul is the hero, both on the ships and in Malta. In the early spring of 60 another ship takes Paul and the other prisoners to Puteoli. Then they go to Rome by land. (23 16–30). Here Luke is intrusted to the care of a Roman soldier, though granted freedom to see his friends and to preach to the soldiers. Paul is anxious to remove any misapprehensions that the Jews in Rome may have about him, and tries to win them to Christ, and with partial success, (24 17–28), but Paul is finally admitted to theennis person of Christ and the glory of the church universal. In due time Paul's appeal was disposed of and he was sentenced. The Romans were provably dilatory. It is doubtful if his enemies ever appeared against him with formal charges. The genuineness of the Pastoral Epp, is here assumed. But for them we should know nothing further, save from a few fragments

10. Further Travels

in the early Christian writings. As it is, some few who accept the Pastoral Epp, seek to place them before 64 AD, so as to allow for Paul's death in that year from the Neronic persecution. In that case, he was not released. There is no space here to argue the question in detail. We can piece together the probable course of events. He had expected when in Corinth last to go on to Spain (Rom 15 28), but now in Rome his heart turns back to the east again. He longs to see the Philippians (1 23 ff) and hopes to see Philemon in Colossae (Philem ver 22). But he may have gone to Spain also, as Clement of Rome seems to imply in his second section, and as stated in the Canon of Muratori. He may have been in Spain when Rome was burned July 19, 64 AD. There is no evidence that Paul went as far as Britain. On his return east he left Titus in Crete (Tit 1 5). He touched at Miletus when he left Trophimus sick (2 Tim 4 20) and when he may have met Timothy,
if he did not go on to Ephesus (1 Tim 1 3). He stayed at Troas and apparently expected to come back here, as he left his cloak and books with Carpus (2 Tim 4 11). The symbol of Macedonia, a sheaf of corn (1 Tim 1 3), whence he writes Timothy in 65-67 a letter full of love and counsel for the future. Paul is apprehensive of the grave perils now confronting Christianity. Besides the Judaizers, the Gnostics, the Jews and the Romans, he may have had dim visions of the conflict with the mystery-religions. It was a syncretistic age, and men had itching ears. But Paul is full of sympathy and tender solicitude for Timothy, who must push on the work and get ready for it. Paul expects to spend the winter in Asia (Acts 20 15ff; 21 1) but the apostle is still in Macedonia when he writes to Titus a letter on lines similar to those in 1 Tim, only the note is sharper against Judaism of a certain type. We catch another glimpse of Apollos in 3 13. Paul hits off the Cretans in 1 10 with a quotation from Epimenides, one of their own poetic prophets.

When Paul writes again to Timothy he has had a winter in prison, and has suffered greatly from the cold and does not wish to spend another winter in Rome (2 Tim 4 13). The lawyer is in prison (2 Tim 4 13.21). We do not know what the charges now are. They may have been connected with the burning of Rome. There were plenty of signs and wonders of God made manifest to Nero. Proof was not now necessary. Christianity is no longer a religio licita under the shelter of Judaism. It is now a crime to be a Christian. It is dangerous to be seen with Paul now, and he feels that desolation keenly (2 Tim 1 15ff; 10). Only Luke, the beloved physician, is with Paul (4 11), and such faithful ones as live in Rome still in hiding (4 21). Paul hopes that Timothy may come and bring Mark also (4 11). Apparently Timothy did come and was put into prison (13 23). Paul is not afraid. He knows that he will die. He has escaped the mouth of the lion (2 Tim 4 17), but he will die (4 18). The Lord Jesus stood by him, perhaps in visible presence (4 17). The tradition is, for now Paul tells us, that Paul, as a Roman citizen, was beheaded on the Ostian Road just outside of Rome. Nero died June, 68 AD, so that Paul was executed before that date, perhaps in the late spring of that year (or 67). Perhaps Luke and Timothy, who were with him at Rome, suggests, to let Paul's words in 2 Tim 4 6-8 serve for his own epistle. He was ready to go to be with Jesus, as he had long wished to be (Phil 1 23).

VI. Gospel.—I had purposed to save adequate space for the discussion of Paul's theology, but that is not now possible. A bare sketch must suffice. Something was said (see above on his epp. and equipment) about the development in Paul's conception of Christ and his message about Him. Paul had a gospel which was different from that of the Galatians, but in their case he could not agree with the words of Deissmann (St. Paul, 6): "St. Paul the theologian looks backward toward rabbinism. As a religious genius St. Paul's outlook is forward into a future of universal history." He did continue to use some rabbinical methods of argument, but his theology was not rabbinical. And he had a theology. He was the great apostle and missionary to the heathen. He was a Christian statesman with far-seeing vision. He was the loving pastor with the shepherd heart. He was the great missionary of the New Testament. He was the wonder - the wonder of the great preacher of Jesus. But he was also "Paul the theologian" (Garvie, Life and Teaching of Paul, ch v). There are two ways of studying his teaching. One is to take it by groups of the epp., the purely historical method, and that has some advantages (cf. Sahatier, The Apostle Paul). But at bottom Paul has the same message in each group, though with varying emphasis due to special exigencies. The same essential notes occur all through. The more common message is: he died and rose again for sinners to Christ reconciling the world to grace, not merely a new creature himself, but he had a new outlook: "Wherefore we henceforth know no man after the flesh: even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him so no more." Wherefore in us the creator: the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new. But all things are of God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not reckoning to them their trespasses, and having committed unto us the word of reconciliation" (2 Cor 5 19-19). Perhaps no single passage in Paul's Ep. tells us more than this one of the change in Paul's theological conceptions wrought by his conversion. His view of Christ as the revealer of God (God in Christ) and the manifestation of love for men (of God, who reconciled us to Himself, reconciling the world to himself) and the means (through Christ) by which God is able to forgive our sins ("not reckoning unto them their trespasses") on the basis of the atoning death of Christ ("wherefore"; for this see vs 14 just before ver 18) with whom the believer has vital union ("in Christ") and whom the believer, at the vantage point of the believer, is here thoroughly characteristic. Paul's passion is Christ (2 Cor 5 14; Phil 1 21). To gain Christ (3 8), to know Christ (3 10), to be found in Christ (3 9), to know Christ as the mystery of God (Col 2 2), to be united with Christ in God (3 3)—this with the new Paul is worth while. Thus Paul interprets God and man, by his doctrine of Christ. To him Jesus is Christ and Christ is Jesus. He has no patience with the infant methods of Christology which denied the true humanity of Jesus. The real mystery of God is Christ, not the so-called mystery-religions. Christ has set us free from the bondage of ceremonial legalism. We are free from the curse of the law (Gal 3 13). Grace is the distinctive word for the gospel (Rom 3-5), but it must lead to sanctification (Rom 6-8), not license (Col 3). Paul's Christology is both theocentric and anthropocentric, but it is theocentric first. His notion of redemption is the redemption of a world lost in sin and finding love's way, the only way consonant with justice, in the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ His Son (Rom 3 21-31). The sinner comes into union with God in Christ by faith in Christ as Redeemer and Lord. Hencedon, he lives to God in Christ by the help of the Holy Spirit (Rom 8; Gal 5). Paul presents God as
Father of all in one sense (Eph 4:6), but in a special sense of the believers in Christ (Rom 8:15f.). Jesus Christ is the Incarnation of the Pre-incarnate Son of God (2 Cor 8:9; Phil 2:5-10), who is both God and Man (1:1). When Paul the apostle created a new kingdom, Paul was the head of the church universal (Col 1:18; Eph 1:22f.). In the work of Christ Paul gives the central place to the cross (1 Cor 17f.); 2:2; Col 2:20; Eph 2:10). His righteousness is universal in humanity (Rom 1:17f. 18-20), but the vicarious redemption is Christ making the redemption possible to all who believe (Rom 3:21f. Gal 3:6-11). The redeemed constitute the kingdom of God or church universal, with Christ as head. Local bodies (churches) are the chief means for pushing the work of the kingdom. Paul knows two ordinances, both of which present in symbolic form the death of Christ for sin and the pledge of the believer to newness of life in Christ. These ordinances are baptism (Rom 6:1-11) and the Lord's Supper (1 Cor 11:17-34). If he knew the mystery-religions, they may have helped him by way of illustration to present his conception of the mystic union with Christ. Paul is animated by the hope of the second coming of Christ, which will bring to pass the consummation of all things. This vision was at once (2 Thess 2:1), but was to be considered as always imminent (1 Thess 5:2f.). Meanwhile, death brings us to Christ, which is a glorious hope to Paul (2 Cor 5:1-10; Phil 1:21f.; 2 Tim 4:18). But while Paul was a theologian in the highest and best sense of the term, the best interpreter of Christ to men, he was also an ethical teacher. He did not divorce ethics from religion. He insisted strongly on the spiritual experience of Christ as the beginning and goal of his teaching, as in ritualistic ceremonies which had destroyed the life of Judaism. But all the more Paul demanded the proof of life as opposed to mere profession. See Rom 6-8 in particular. In most of the epp. the doctrinal section is followed by practical exhortations to holy living. Mystic as Paul was, the greatest of all mystics, he was the sanest of moralists and had no patience with hypocrites or licentious pietists or ideologists who allowed sentimentalism and emotion to take the place of righteousness. This is the place of righteousness. The personal righteousness is the place of righteousness. The righteousness demanded by God and given by God included both sanctification and justification. In the end, the sinner who for Christ's sake was created as righteous must be righteous. Thus the Gospel is Paul's regenerating work of the Spirit of God (2 Cor 3:18). Paul sees God in the face of Christ (2 Cor 4:6), and the vision of Christ brings God to all who see.
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I. THE PREPARATION.—In order to understand the development of St. Paul's theological system, it is necessary to begin with his beliefs as a Pharisee. The full extent of these beliefs, to be sure, is not now ascertainable, for Pharisaism was a rule of conduct rather than a system of dogmas, and great diversity of opinions existed among Pharisees. Yet there was general concurrence in certain broad principles, while some of St. Paul's own statements enable us to specify his beliefs still more closely.

Paul, the Pharisee

1. The Pharisee—In his relation to His world He was transcendent, and governed his life in accordance with the law of his religious spirit. He was not influenced by the Gentile society in which he lived, but the law of his inner spirit determined his course. His inner life was under the guidance of a religious law which was a higher law than the law of the Gentiles, and which governed the thoughts, actions, and dispositions of his soul. In this way he was able to live in accordance with the law of his inner spirit, and to be guided by the light of his inner conscience. He was not influenced by the Gentile society in which he lived, but the law of his inner spirit determined his course. His inner life was under the guidance of a religious law which was a higher law than the law of the Gentiles, and which governed the thoughts, actions, and dispositions of his soul. In this way he was able to live in accordance with the law of his inner spirit, and to be guided by the light of his inner conscience.

2. Saul and Sin—Saul, the name given to Paul in his youth, was a Pharisee and a leader of the Pharisees. He was well acquainted with the teachings of the Pharisees, and was a zealous and devoted follower of their beliefs. However, he was not immune to the temptations of human nature, and he fell into sin and did things which he later regretted. He was, therefore, a sinner, and his salvation was necessary in order that he might be saved from the penalty of sin.

3. Primitive Christianity—The first Christian church was founded by the Apostle Paul, and its members were called Christians. They believed in one God, the Father, Maker of heaven and earth. They believed in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who was crucified and died for the sins of the world. They believed in the Holy Spirit, who was sent by the Father to dwell in the hearts of believers. They believed in the resurrection of Jesus from the dead, and in the ascension of Jesus to heaven. They believed in the coming of the kingdom of God, and in the second coming of Jesus to judge the living and the dead. They believed in the forgiveness of sins, and in the assurance of eternal life through faith in Jesus Christ. They believed in the observance of the Lord's Supper, and in the practice of baptism by immersion. They believed in the authority of the Bible, and in the inspiration of its words. They believed in the existence of angels, and in the possibility of their intervention in human affairs. They believed in the doctrine of the trinity, and in the unity of the church. They believed in the existence of hell, and in the possibility of its destruction by the power of God. They believed in the power of the Devil, and in the possibility of his being overcome through faith in Jesus Christ. They believed in the necessity of repentance, and in the possibility of salvation through faith in Jesus Christ. They believed in the necessity of faith, and in the possibility of its being manifested through good works. They believed in the necessity of love, and in the possibility of its being shown through the practice of good works. They believed in the necessity of prayer, and in the possibility of its being answered through faith in Jesus Christ. They believed in the necessity of perseverance, and in the possibility of its being demonstrated through the practice of good works.
Pauline Theology
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Saul must have gained a reasonable knowledge of Christ's teachings in this period of antagonism. He certainly could not have begun to write the Pauline epistles without learning what it was, and in the inevitable discussions with the other members of the primitive church and was the truth for which Christ had died (Mc 16:6). But it involved much. It made Christ the Son of God (Rom 8:32; Gal 4:4, etc.), "firstborn of [i.e. 'earlier than'] all creation" (Col 1:15), "existing in the form of God" (Phil 2:6) and "rich" (2 Cor 8:9). In the Messiah are "all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden" (Col 2:3), to be manifested at the end of time when the Messiah shall appear as the Judge of all (2 Cor 5:10, etc.), causing the resurrection of the dead (1 Cor 15:15, etc.). All this was given by St. Paul's former beliefs and had been claimed by Christ for Himself. That this Messiah had become man was a fact of the immediate past (the reality of the manhood was no problem at this period). As Messiah His sinlessness was understood, the fact that He proved, His sinlessness also. His teaching was wholly binding (1 Cor 7:10-11; that the writer of these words could have spared any effort to learn the teaching fully is out of the question). The conversion experience was professed by sufficient evidence, although for missionary purposes St. Paul used other evidence as well (1 Cor 15:1-11).

Faith in this Messiah brought the unmistakable experience of the Holy Spirit (Rom 8:2; Gal 3:2, etc.; cf Acts 9:17), demonstrating Christ's Lordship (1 Cor 12:3; cf Acts 2:33). So "the head of every man is Christ" (1 Cor 11:3; cf Col 1:18; Eph 1:22; 4:15), with complete control of the future (1 Cor 15:25), and all righteous men are His servants ("slaves," Rom 1:1, etc.). To Him men may address their prayers (2 Cor 12:8; 1 Cor 1:2, etc.; cf Acts 14:23).

Further reflection added to the concepts. As the Lordship of Christ was absolute, the power of all heavenly things had been brought also (Rom 1:5, 8; Phil 2:9-11; Col 2:15; Eph 1:21-23, etc.). The Being who had such significance for the present and the future could not have been without significance for the past. "In all things" He must have been "therefore" (Col 1:18). It is He who ministered to the Israelites at the Exodus (1 Cor 10: 4,9). In fact He was not only "before all things" (Col 1:17), but "all things have been created through him" (ver 16). Wisdom and Logos concepts may have helped St. Paul in reaching these conclusions, which in explicit statement are an advance on Christ's own words. But the conclusions were inevitable.

Fitting these data of religious fact into the metaphysical doctrine of God was a problem that occupied the church for the four following centuries. After endless experimenting the only conclusion was shown to be that already reached by St. Paul in Rom 9:5 (cf Tit 2:13, ERV, ARVm), that Christ is God. To be sure, St. Paul's terminology, carried over from his pre-Christian days, elsewhere elsewhere, elsewhere "God" for the Father (and cf 1 Cor 15:28). But the fact of this theology admits only of the conclusion that was duly drawn.

A second fact given directly by the conversion was the presence of the Spirit, where the actual experience transcended anything that had been dreamed of. Primarily the operation of the Spirit was recognized in vividly supernatural effects (Rom 15:19; 2 Cor 12:5-11, etc.; cf 2 Cor 12:12; Acts 2:4), but St. Paul must at first have known the presence of the Spirit through the assurance of salvation given him, a concept that he never weary of expressing (Rom 8:10-23; Gal 4:6, etc.). The work of the Spirit in producing the external fruit of Christian life needs no comment (see HOLY SPIRIT; SANCITIFICATION), but it is characteristic of St. Paul that it is on this part of the Spirit's activity, rather than on the miraculous effects, that he lays the emphasis.

"The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, etc. (Gal 5:22); the greatest miracles without love are more than useless (1 Cor 13:1-3); in such sayings St. Paul touched the depths of the purest teaching of Christ. To be sure, in the Synoptic Gospels the word "Spirit" is not often on Christ's lips, but there is the same conception of a life proceeding from a pure center (Mt 6:22; 7:17, etc.) in entire dependence on God.

Further reflection and observation taught St. Paul something of the greatest importance for Christian theology. In prayer the Spirit appeared distinguished from the Father as well as from the Son (Rom 8:26; cf 1 Cor 2:10f), giving three terms that together express the plenitude of the Deity (2 Cor 13:14; Eph 1:3,6,13, etc), with the fourth term ever similarly associated. See TRINITY.

The indwelling of the Divine produced by the Spirit is spoken of indifferently as the indwelling of the Spirit, or of the Spirit of Christ, or of Christ Himself (all three terms occur in the Union Rom 8:9-11; cf 1 Cor 12:2; Gal Mystica 4:6; Eph 3:17, etc.). The variations are in part due to the inadequacy of the old terminology (so 2 Cor 3:17), in part to the nature of the subject. Distinctions made between the operations of the persons of the Trinity on the soul can never be much more than verbal, and the terms are freely interchangeable. At all events, through the Spirit Christ is in the believer (Rom 8:10; Gal 2:20; 4:19; Eph 3:17), or, what is the same thing, the believer is in Christ (Rom 6:8; 16:7, etc.). "We have become united with him" (Rom 6:5, συμφωνοί, "grown together with") in a union once and for all effected (Gal 3:27) and yet always to be made more intimate (Rom 13:14). The union so accomplished makes the man "a new creature" (2 Cor 5:17).

St. Paul now saw within himself a dual personality. His former nature, the old man, still persisted, with its impulses, liability 4. Salvation to corruption, and certainty. The realm of ruin and death, the realm of union, and life. The "real" still existed (Gal 5:17; Rom 12:13; 14; Eph 4:22; Phil 3:12, etc.). On the other hand there was fighting in him against this former nature nothing less than the whole power of Christ, and its final victory could not be uncertain for a moment (Rom 6:12; 8:210; Gal 5:16, etc.). Indeed, it is possible to speak of the believer as entirely spiritual (Rom 6:11; 8:9, etc.), as already in the kingdom (Col 1:13), as already fitting in heavenly places (Eph 2:20). Of course St. Paul had too keen an appreciation of reality to regard believers as utterly sinless (Phil 3:12, etc.), and his pages abound in reproofs and exhortations. But the present existence of remnants of sin had no final terrors, for the ultimate victory over sin was certain, and if it was not complete until the last day when the power of God would redress even the present physical frame (Rom 8:11; Phil 3:21, etc.).

As the first man to belong to the higher order, and as the point from which the race could take a fresh start, Christ could truly be termed "the Lord" (Gal 3:14; 45-49; cf Rom 5:12-21). If Cor 15:45 has any relation to the Pauline doctrine of the two Adams, it is a polemic against it. Such a polemic would not long likely.
A most extraordinary fact, to the former Pharisee, was that this experience had been gained without conscious effort and even against conscious effort (Paul 3 7f). After years of fruitless striving a single act of self-surrender had brought him an assurance that he had despaired of ever attaining. And this act of self-surrender is what St. Paul means by “faith,” “faith without works. This faith is not naturally contained in the word, but rather than a mere intellectual acknowledgment of a fact (Rom 2 19), and is an act of the whole man, too complex for simple analysis. It finds, however, its perfect statement in Christ’s reference to “receiving the kingdom of God as a little child” (Mk 10 15). By an act of simple yielding St. Paul found himself no longer in dread of his sins; he was at peace with God, and confident as to his future; in a word, justified. In one sense, to be sure, “works” were still involved, for without the past struggles the result would never have been attained. A desire, however imperfect, to do right is a necessary preparation for justification, and the word has no meaning to a man satisfied to be sunk in complete selfishness (Rom 6 2, 8, etc). This desire to do right, which St. Paul says “presents” and the context given “faith” are sufficient safeguards against antinomianism. But the grace given is in no way commensurate with past efforts, nor does it grow out of them. It is a simple gift of God (Rom 6 23).

I. Further Developments.—The adoption by St. Paul of the facts given by his conversion (and the immediate conclusions that followed from them) involved, naturally, a readjustment and a reformulation of the other parts of his belief. The process must have occupied some time. It was ever complete during his life, and must have been affected materially by his controversies with his former coreligionists and with very many Christians.

Fundamental was the problem of the Law. The Law was perfectly clear that he—and only he—who performed it would live. But 1. Abolition of Law was found through faith in Christ, of the Law while the Law was not fulfilled. There could be no question of compromise between these two positions; they were simply incompatible (Rom 10 5f; Gal 2 16; 3 11f; Phil 3 7). One conclusion only was possible: “Christ is the end of the law unto righteousness to every one that believeth” (Rom 10 4). As far as concerns the believer, the Law had gone. Two things followed. One was the immense simplification of what we call “Christian ethics,” which were now to be determined by the broadest general principles of right and wrong and no longer by an elaborate legalistic construing of God’s commands (Rom 13 8–10; Gal 5 22f; etc; cf Mk 12 29–31). To be sure, the commandments might be quoted as convenient expressions of moral duty (Eph 6 2; 1 Cor 9 9, etc; cf Mk 10 19), but they are binding because they are right, not because they are commandments (Gal 2 16). So in St. Paul’s moral directions, he tries to bring out always the principle involved, and Rom 14 and 1 Cor 8 are masterpieces of the treatment of concrete problems by this method.

The second result of the abolition of the Law was overwhelming. Gentiles had as much right to Christ as had the Jews, barring perhaps the priority of honor (Rom 3 2, etc) possessed by the latter. It is altogether conceivable, as Acts 22 21 implies, that St. Paul’s reception of the call was a long delayed and reached only after severe struggles. The fact was utterly revolutionary, and although it was prophesied in the Old Testament (Rom 9 25f), yet the Messiah among you Gentiles remained the hidden mystery that God had revealed only in the last days (Col 1 26f; Eph 3 3–6, etc). The struggles of the apostle in defence of this principle are the most familiar part of his career.

This consciousness of deliverance from the Law came to St. Paul in another way. The Law was meant for men in this world, but the 3. Redemption-union with Christ had raised him out of the world and so taken him away from its control. In the Epistles, this fact finds expression in an elaborately reasoned form. As Christ’s nature is now a vital part of our nature, His death and resurrection are facts of our past as well. “Ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God” (Col 3 3). But “the law had dominion over a man only for so long time as he lived” (Rom 7 1). “Therefore, my brethren, ye also were made dead to the law through the body of Christ” (ver 4). Cf Col 2 11–13, where the same argument is used to show that ritual observance is no longer necessary. In Rom 6 1–14 this argument is made to issue in a practical exhortation. Through the death of Christ, which is our death (ver 4), we, like Him, are placed in a higher world (ver 5) where sin has lost its power (ver 7), a world in which we are no longer under Law (ver 14). Hence the last, greatest moral effort becomes our duty (ver 13; cf 2 Cor 5 14f).

This release from the Law, however, does not solve the whole problem. Evil, present and past, is a fact, Law or no Law (on Rom 4 15f; cf 2 Cor 3 13). Sensuality, and a forbearance of God that simply “passes over” sins is disastrous for man as well as contrary to the righteous nature of God (Rom 3 25f). However inadequate the OT sacrifices were felt to have been in relation to St. Paul’s avoidance of the Levitical terms except in Eph 6 2), yet they offered the only help possible for the treatment of this most complex of problems. The guilt of our sins is “covered” by the death of Christ (1 Cor 15 3, where this truth is among those which were delivered to converts “first of all”; Rom 3 25; 4 25; 5 6, etc). This part of his theology St. Paul leaves in an incomplete form. He was accustomed, like any other man of his day, whether Jew or Gentile, to think naturally and sacriphically. He, and neither he nor his converts were conscious of any difficulty involved. Nor has theology since his time been able to contribute much toward advancing the solution of the problem. The fatal results of unchecked sin, its inevitable lead to the woe of the guilty, and the value of vicarious suffering, are simple facts of our experience that defy our attempts to reduce them to intellectual formulas. In St. Paul’s case it is to be noted that he views the inceptive as coming from God (Rom 3 25; 5 8; 8 32, etc), because of His love toward man, so that a “gift-propitiation” of an angry deity is a theory the precise opposite of the Pauline. Moreover, Christ’s death is not a mere fact of the past, but through the “mystical union” is incorporated into the life of every believer.

Further developments of this doctrine about Christ’s death find it in the complete destruction of whatever remained of the Law (Col 1 14), esp. as the barrier between Jew and Gentile (Eph 2 15f). The extinction of the effects of the death to the unseen world (Col 2 15; cf Gal 4 9; Eph 4 8) was of course natural.

The death of Christ as producing a subjective moral power in the believer is appealed to frequently by St. Paul (e.g. Gal 2 15f; Gal 5 19f; Eph 5 25; Phil 3 5, etc), while the idea is perhaps present to some degree even in Rom 3 26. From a different point of view, the Cross as teaching the vanity of worldly things is a favorite subject with St. Paul (1 Cor 1
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22-25; 2 Cor 13 4; Gal 5 11; 6 14, etc. These aspects require no explanation.

There are, accordingly, in St. Paul's view of the death of Christ, the treasury of "mysteries," the "juridical," and the "ethical." But this distinction is largely only genetic and logical, and the lines tend to blend in execution. Consequently, Paul, as in so frequently an inquieslig problem to determine which of Christ's acts is most prominent in any given passage (e.g. 2 Cor 15 4).

Regarding the Law a further question remained, which had great importance in St. Paul's controversies. If the Law was useless for salvation, why was it given at all? And if it were useful, what was its purpose? To gain righteousness one must desire it and this desire the Law taught (Rom 7 12-16; 2 18), even though it had no power to help toward fulfillment. So the Law gave knowledge of sin (Rom 3 20f; 5 20f; 7 8 25; cf. 1 Cor 15 56). Thus the Law became our παράδοσις "to bring us unto Christ" (Gal 3 24; see SCHOOLMASTER), and came in "besides" (Rom 3 27). Hence the conclusion, which must have tated to go beyond this. Familiar in his own experience with the psychological truth that a prohibition may actually stimulate the desire to transgress it, he showed that the Law actually had the purpose of bringing sin to him, and in this way he knew that grace might deal with it effectively (Rom 5 20f; 7 8 25; cf 1 Cor 15 56). Thus the Law became our παράδοσις "to bring us unto Christ" (Gal 3 24; see SCHOOLMASTER), and came in "besides" (Rom 3 27). Hence the conclusion, which must have required much time to work out, St. Paul's reversal of his former Pharisaic position was complete.

IV. Special Topics.—As Christ is the central element in the life of the believer, all believers have element in common and we can unite with each other (Rom 12 5). This is the basis of the Pauline doctrine of the church. The use of the word "church" to denote the whole body of believers is not attained until the later Epistle (Col 1 18; Phil 2 16; Eph 1 22 23) —before that time the word is in the plural, when describing more than a local congregation (2 Thess 1 4; 1 Cor 7 17; Rom 16 16, etc.)—but the idea is present from the first. Indeed, the only terms in Judaism that were available were "Israel." Paul uses the latter term (Gal 6 16) and quite constantly emphasizes the exalted status of the Gentile converts as compared with the Jewish figures for the nation (e.g. cf Eph 3 5 with Hos 2 19 f.) and time was needed in order to give ekklēsia (properly "assembled people") its content.

The church is composed of all who have professed faith in Christ and have accepted him as Saviour. The members are considered as a church by the church (Rom 15 16; 1 Cor 11 8, etc.), even in the case of the incestuous person; e.g. the Christian converts in Rome at least (Rom 16 18; cf Eph 5 11-15) makes it clear that the excommunication of grave sinners had been found necessary, and one may doubt if St. Paul had much hope for the "false brethren," of 2 Cor 11 29; Gal 2 4 (cf 1 Cor 17, etc.). But on the whole St. Paul's optimism has little doubt that every member of the church is in right relations with God and the church (in his own mind, and that of the church, form a corporate, social organism of the greatest possible solidarity (1 Cor 12 26, etc.) and have the maximum of responsibility toward one another (Rom 15 16; 1 Cor 11 8; 2 Cor 3 13-15; Gal 6 2; Eph 4 25; Col 1 24, etc.). The church is a community from the very world around them (2 Cor 4 14-18; 1 Cor 12, etc.), although in constant intercourse with the world (1 Cor 16 10-27, etc.). It was even desirable, in the conditions of the times, that the church should have her own courts like Jews in gentile cities (1 Cor 6 1-15). The right of the church to act in behalf of members is taken for granted (1 Cor 8 11; 2 Cor 2 5-11). According to Acts 14 23 St. Paul made his own appointments of church officers, but the Epistle as a whole suggests that this practice did not extend beyond Asia Minor. For further details see CREATION GOVERNMENTS. A general resemblance to the attributes of Paul's own authority is presupposed throughout.

The object of Christ's sanctifying power (Eph 2 21-22) and its method is to unite with Him as to be spoken of as His "body" (1 Cor 12 27, etc.), as the parts may be on the body (cf. 1 Cor 12 27, etc.). The unity of Christ, the extension of His personality into the world ( Eph 1 20 21), as his members, it not only their duty toward one another, but also the responsibility of carrying Christ's message into the world (Phil 3 15f. and presupposed everywhere) and the glory in the church and in Christ Jesus unto all generations for ever and ever" (Eph 3 21).

As the doctrine of Christ is something more than a subjective impression made on the mind by the fact of that death, the union of the church with the death accomplished in baptism in Rom 6 1-7 and Col 2 11 is not explained in any particular, to make a more dramatic ceremony. That St. Paul was greatly influenced by the mystery-religion concepts has not been made out. But his readers certainly were so influenced and tended to conceive very nonChristian a doctrine of the Church (Rom 10 6; 15 12 f). And historic exegesis is bound to construe St. Paul's language in the way in which he knew his readers would. A Jewish or a Christian gentle reader of St. Paul's day would have seen a purely "symbolic" meaning in either of the baptismal passages. Philo would have done so, but not the class of men with whom St. Paul had to deal. Similarly, with regard to the Lord's Supper, in 1 Cor 10 16 St. Paul teaches that through participation in a sacral meal it is possible to bring into objective relations with demons of whom one is wholly ignorant. In this light it is hard to avoid the conclusion that through participation in the Lord's Supper the believer is objectively brought into communion with the Lord (1 Cor 10 16), a communion that will react for evil on the believer if he approach it in an unworthy manner (11 29-32); i.e., the union with Christ that is the center of St. Paul's theology is not to be obtained by fasting. And in the Lord's Supper this union is further strengthened, though that faith on the part of the Christian which is an indispensable prerequisite for the efficacy of the sacraments need not be said.

See, further, CONFESSION; CONCILIATION; CONSCIENCE; PROMISE; PROPITIATION, etc.

LITERATURE.—See under PAUL.

PAULUS, päl'ús, SERGIUS, sär'gē-us (Σέργιος Παῦλος, Sergios Paulos): The Rom "proconsul" (RV) or "deputy" (AV) of Cyprus when Paul, along with Barnabas, visited that island on his first missionary journey (Acts 13 4-7). The official title of Sergius is curiously given to this man, who was originally an imperial provincial, but in 22 BC it was transferred by Augustus to the Senate, and was therefore placed under the administration of proconsuls, as is attested by extant Cyprian coins of the period. When the two missionaries arrived at Paphos, Sergius, who was a "prudent man" (AV) or "man of understanding" (RV), i.e. a man of practical understanding, "sought to hear the word of God" (Acts 13 7). Bar-Jesus, or Elymas, a sorcerer, was sent against the apostles by Sergius, fearing the influence of the apostles, sought, however, "to turn aside the proconsul from the faith," but was struck with blindness (vs 8-11); and the deputy, "when he saw what was done, believed, being astonished at the teaching of the Lord" (ver 12). The narrative indicates that not only the proconsul, but the people of Cyprus, with which Sergius listened to the teaching of Paul (cf ver 7) conduced to his conversion (Bengel). Attempts have been made to trace some connection between the name Sergius Paulus and the fact that Saul is first called Paul in ver 9, but the joint occurrence of the two names is probably to be set down as only a coincidence.

C. M. KERR

PAVEMENT, pāv'ment: In the OT, with the exception of 2 K 16 17, the Heb word is רכפת, rıḵāf; (2 Ch 7 3; Est 1 6; Ezk 40 17, etc.) and Sir 20 18 and Bel ver 19 the word is און, 'aron. In Jn 19 13, the name "The Pavement" (ל>'+הא, "paved with stone") is given to the place outside the Praetorium on which Pilate sat to give judicial sentence upon Jesus. The Aramaic equivalent is declared to be גָּבָרָתָה (g.b'rah). The identification of the place is uncertain.

PAVILION, pāv'il-yōn: a covered place, booth, tent, in which a person may be hid or secret (Ec 5 15; Ps 27 7; Ps 121 6; Ps 51 20), otherwise withdrawn from view.
PAW, pê (פֵּח, kapkh, lit. "palms,") of "hand"): The former (kapkh) is applied to the soft paws of animals in contradistinction to the hoofs (Lev 11:27); the latter is thrice used in 1 S 17:27; "Jeh that delivered me out of the paw (yêdôh) of the lion (Lev 15:37). He will deliver me out of the hand (yêdôh) of this Philistine." The vb. to "paw" (פֵּח, haphar) is found in the description of the horse: "He paweth (m. "they paw") in the valley, and rejoiceth in his strength: he goeth out to meet the armed men (m. "the weapons")" (Job 39:21). The word is usually tr. to "delve into," "to pro into," "to explore." 

H. L. E. LÜERING

PE, pê (פֵּה, LXX; פֵּא, AV): The 17th letter of the Heb alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopaedia as p. It was formerly used (primarily, generally, usually) to be used for the number 80. For name, etc., see Alphabet.

PEACE, pêâ (פֶּאָז, šâlôm; εἰρήνη, cirēnē): Is a condition of freedom from disturbance, whether outwardly, as of a nation from war, or (2 S 22:12; Ps 18:11) to kings drinking in privacy (1 K 18:27; 2 Ch 34:18) gives "pavilion" for AV "tabernacle," in Job 36:29; Isa 4:6; while in Nu 26:8 it substitutes this word, with m. "aloe," for AV "tent" (kubbâh, and Jer 43:10, for "royal pavilion" (shophûrâh), reads in m. "glittering pavilion." 

The term is used with reference to God (2 S 22:12; Ps 18:11): to kings drinking in privacy (1 K 18:27), gives "pavilion" for AV "tabernacle," in Job 36:29; Isa 4:6; while in Nu 26:8 it substitutes this word, with m. "aloe," for AV "tent" (kubbâh, and Jer 43:10, for "royal pavilion" (shophûrâh), reads in m. "glittering pavilion."

In the LXX; cf Lk 19:42, RV "If thou hast known.... the things which belong unto peace", we have the word "pavilion" for AV "tabernacle." 

2. In the NT, through the coming of the Christ (Lk NT 1:74:79; 12:51) and also its fulfilment in the higher spiritual sense. (1) The gospel in Christ is a message of peace from God to men (Lk 2:14; Acts 10:36, "peacemaking..."). It is "peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ," in Rom 5:1; AV 10:15; peace between Jew and Gentile (Eph 2:14:15); an essential element in the spiritual kingdom of God (Rom 14:17). (2) It is to be cherished and followed by Christians. Jesus rebuked His disciples, "Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace one with another" (Mk 9:60); Paul exHORTS, "Live in peace: and the God of love and peace shall be with you" (2 Cor 13:11; of Rom 12:18; 1 Cor 7:15). (3) God is therefore "the God of peace," the Author and Giver of all good ("peace" including every blessing) very frequently (e.g. Rom 15:33; 16:20; 2 Thess 3:16, etc., "the Lord of peace"). "Peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" is a common apostolic wish or salutation (1 Cor 1:7; Eph 1:2, 38). (4) The word "peace" as a greeting (Mk 10:13; Lk 10:5): "a son of peace" (10:6) is one worthy of it, in sympathy with it; the Lord's own greeting to His disciples was "Peace be unto you" (Lk 24:36; Jn 20:19:26). (5) And there is a perfect peace in the Lord's intercession for us (Eph 6:18). Especially His blessing of "Peace" (Jn 14:27); we have also frequently "Go in peace" (Mk 5:34; Lk 7:50). In Lk 19:38 we have "peace in heaven" (in the acclamation of Jesus on His Messianic entry of Jerusalem). (6) The peace of Christ, brought about by spiritual peace from and with God, peace in the heart, peace as the disposition or spirit. He said that He did not come "to send peace on the earth, but a sword," referring to the searching nature of His call and the divisions and clearances it would create. But, of course, the spirit of the gospel and of the Christian is one of peace, and it is a Christian duty to seek to bring war and strife everywhere to an end. This is represented as the ultimate result of the gospel and of the Spirit of Christ; universal and permanent peace can come only as that Spirit rules in men's hearts.

"Peace" in the sense of silence, to hold one's peace, etc., is in the OT generally the tr. of קָצָם, "to be still, to be quiet, to be silent" (Gen 18:11; Shem 5:14), or the surge of one's heart (Num 23:22). (7) Inward peace was the portion of the righteous who trusted in God (Job 22:21; "Acquaint now thyself with him, and be at peace [šalâm];" Ps 4:8; 85:8, "He will speak peace unto his people, and to his saints"); 119:165; Prov 3:17; Isa 26:3, "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace [Hab "peace, peace"], whose mind is stayed on thee; because he trusteth in thee"; Mal 2:5; also outward peace (Job 5:23; Prov 16:7, etc.). (4) Peace was to be sought and followed by the righteous (2 S 22:12; Ps 25:14, "Seek peace, and pursue it"); 8:16,19, "Love truth and peace"). (5) Peace should be a prominent feature of the Messianic times (Isa 2:4; 9:6, "Prince of Peace"); 11:6; Ezek 34:25; Mic 4:2-4; Zec 9:10) In the NT, where eirēnē has much the same meaning and usage as šâlôm (for which it is employed

PECHEMAKER, pēs'mâk-ër: Occurs only in the pl. (Mt 5:9, "Blessed are the peacemakers [eirēnopoûlôi]; for they shall be called sons of God") who is "the God of peace"). We have also what seems to be a reflection of this saying in Jas 3:18, "The fruit of righteousness is sown in peace for [Heb "by"] them who make peace (eirēnô).... (lote peinai eirēnē)." In classical Gr a "peacemaker" was an ambas-
sador sent to treat of peace. The word in Mt 5:9 would, perhaps, be better rendered “peace-workers,” implying not merely making peace between those who are at variance, but maintaining peace as that which is the will of the God of peace for men.

W. L. Walker

PEACOCK, pe'kōk (אֲדוֹן, tukkel tym [pl.]; Lat Pavo cristatus): A bird of the genus Pavo. Japan is the native home of the plainer peafowl; Siam, Ceylon and India produce the commonest and most gorgeous. The peacock has a bill of moderate size with an arched tip, its cheeks are bare, the eyes not large, but very luminous, a crest of 24 feathers 2 in. long, with naked shafts and broad tips of blue, glancing to green. The neck is not long but powerfully arched, the breast full, prominent and of bright blue green, blue predominant. The wings are short and ineffectual, the feathers on them made up of a surprising array of colors. The tail consists of 18 short, stiff, grayish-brown feathers. Next is the lining of the train, of the same color. The glory of this glorious bird lies in its train. It begins on the back between the wings in tiny feathers not over 6 in. in length, and extends backward. The quills have the tip of purple, shades of blue, green, and the eye at the tip of each feather from one-half to 2 in. across, of a deep peculiar blue, surrounded at the lower part by half-moon-shaped crescents of green. Whether the train lies naturally, or is spread in full glory, the display shows exquisitely a marvelous glancing shades of blue, green, purple, blue and bronze. When this train is spread, it opens like a fan behind the head with its sparkling crest, and above the wondrous blue of the breast. The bird has the power to contract the massive train at the will of the quills and play a peculiar sort of music with them. It loves high places and cries before a storm in notes that are starting to one not familiar with them. The bird can be domesticated and will become friendly enough to take food from the hand. The peahen is smaller than the cock, her neck green, her wings gray, tan and brown—but she has not the gorgeous train. She nests on earth and breeds with difficulty when imported, the young being delicate and tender. The grown birds are hardy when acclimated, and live to old age. By some freak of nature, pure white peacocks are at times produced. Aristophanes mentioned peafowl in his Birds, II. 102, 209. Alexander claimed that he brought them into Greece by sea from the East, but failed to prove, but not by contention. Pliny wrote that Hortensius was the first to serve the birds for food, and that Auidius Lurco first fattened and sold them in the markets. It was the custom to skin the bird, roast and receive it and send it to the table, the gaudy feathers showing.

The first appearance of the bird in the Bible occurs in a summation-up of the wealth and majesty of Solomon (1 K 10:22; “...and the navy of Tarshish...”). every three years came the navy of Tarshish, bringing gold, and silver, ivory, and apes, and peacocks”). (Here LXX translates πελεκηλοί [i.e., πελεκήλοι], pelekeloi [i.e., “stones” carved with an ax.”]) The same statement is made in 2 Ch 9:21: “...for the king had ships that went to Tarshish with the servants of Huram: once every three years came the ships of Tarshish, bringing gold, and silver, ivory, and apes, and peacocks” (LXX occurs). There is no question among scholars and scientists but that these statements are true, as the ships of Solomon are known to have visited the coasts of India and Ceylon, and Tarshish was on the Malabar coast of India, where the native name of the peacock was tukkel, from which tukkelym undoubtingly derives. See Gold, p. 472). The historian Tennant says that the Heb names for “ivory” and “apes” were also the same as the Tamil. The reference to the small, ineffectual wing of the peacock which scarcely will lift the weight of the body and train, that used to be found in Job, is now applied to the ostrich, and it is no doubt correct: “The wings of the ostrich wave proudly: But are they the pinions and plumage of love?” (Job 39:13).

While the peacock wing seems out of proportion to the size of the bird, it will sustain flight and bear the body to the treetops. The wing of the ostrich is useless for flight. GENE STRATTON-PORTER

PEARL, purl. See STONES, PRECIOUS.

PECULIAR, pe-kü'lar: The Lat peculiwm means “private property,” so that “peculiar” properly implied “pertaining to the individual.” In modern Eng. the word has usually degenerated into a half-colloquial form for “extraordinary,” but in Bib. Eng. it is a thoroughly dignified term for “esp. one’s own”; of the “peculiar treasure” of the king in Ecd 28 (AV). Hence “peculiar people” (AV Dt 23, 2 etc), means a people esp. possessed by God and particularly prized by Him. The word in the OT is usually renderedPELADHEL, ped-a-ke'el (טֶלֶדֶל, p'e-dhale’el, “whom God redeems”): A prince of Naphtali; one of the tribal chiefs who apportioned the New Canaan (Nu 34:28; cf ver 17).

PELADHUZ, pe-dá'zur (טֶלֶדָע, p'e-dhá'keur): Mentioned in Nu 1:10; 2:20; 7:54–59; 10:23 as the father of Gamilah, head of the tribe of Manasseh, at the time of the exodus. See ESR T, VIII, 555f.

PELDAIAH, pe-dá'ya, pe-d'ya (טֶלֶדַיָּה, p'e-dhá-yá’áh, “Jehovah redeems”): (1) Father of Joel, who was ruler of Western Manasseh in David’s reign (1 Ch 27:20). Form תֶלֶדַיָּה (see above).

(2) Pedahiah of Runah (2 K 23:36), father of Zebudah, Jehoiakim’s mother.

(3) A son of Jeconiah (1 Ch 3:18); in ver 19 the father of Zerubbabel. Pedahiah’s brother, Shealtiel, is also called father of Zerubbabel (Ezr 3:2; but in 1 Ch 3:17 AV spelled “Salathiel”). There may have been two cousins, or even different individuals who were referred to under Shealtiel and Salathiel respectively.

(4) Another who helped to repair the city wall (Neh 3:25), of the family of Parosh (cf. ver 47). Perhaps this is the man who stood by Ezra at the reading of the Law (Neh 8:4; 1 Esd 9:44, called “Phai-deus”).

(5) “Levite,” appointed one of the treasurers.
over the “treasuries” of the Lord’s house (Neh 13:13).

(6) A Benjamite, one of the rulers residing in Jerus under the “return” arrangements (Neh 11:7).

PEDESTAL, ped’s-əs-tal (Tēn, kên): In two places (1 K 7:29-31) RV gives this word for AV “base” (in Solomon’s “Sea”).

PEDIAS, ped’i-as, pē’di-as (Πηδαῖς, Petaides, A, Πηδαίας, Petaides; AV by mistake Pelias): One of those who had taken “strange wives” (1 Esd 9:34) = “Bedezah” of Ezr 10:35.

PEDIGREE, ped’i-grē (μνημεῖον, kithyallid, “to show one’s birth”): The Eng. word “pedigree” occurs only once in the Bible, according to the concordance. In Nu 1:18, it is said: “They declared their pedigrees”; that is, they enrolled or registered themselves according to their family connections. The same idea is expressed frequently, employing a different term in the Heb, by the compound phrase of Ch, Ezr and Neh, “to reckon by genealogy,” “to give genealogy,” etc (cf 1 Ch 7:59; Ezr 2:62 f; Neh 7:64). These last passages indicate the importance of the registered pedigree or genealogy, i.e., the list of the priests in the post-exilic community, for the absence of the list of their pedigrees, or their genealogical records, was sufficient to cause the exclusion from the priesthood of certain enrolled priests.

PEEL, pil. PILL, pil: “Fill” (Gen 30:37:8; Tob 11:13 [RV “scaled”]) and “peel” (Isa 18:27 [AV and RVm]; Ezk 29:18 [AV and ERV]) are properly two different words, meaning “to remove the hair” (piles) and “to remove the skin” (peles), but in Elizabethan Eng. the two were confused. In Isa 18:27, the former meaning is implied, as the Heb word here (פור, מזרע) is rendered “pluck off the hair” in Ezr 9:3; Neh 13:25; Isa 50:6. The word, however, may also mean “make smooth” (so RVm) or “bronzed.” This last, referring to the dark skins of the Ethiopians, is best here, but in any case AV and RVm are impossible. In the other cases, however, “remove the skin” (cf “scaled,” Tob 11:13 RV) is meant. So in Gen 30:37:38, Jacob “peels” (so RV) off portions of the bark of his rods, as so to give alternating colors (cf ver 39). And in Ezk 29:18, the point is Nebuchadrezzar’s total failure in his siege of Tyre, although the soldiers had carried burdens until the skin was peeled from their shoulders (cf ARV “worm”).

PEEP, pép (לעָפָה, ἐμπαίζω; AV Isa 8:19; 10:14 [RV “chirp”]): In 10:14, the word describes the sound made by a nestling bird; in 8:19, the changed (ventriloquistic?) voice of necromancers uttering sounds that purported to come from the feeble dead. The modern use of “peep” as “lock” is found in Sir 21:23, as the tr of παρακάτω, paraqēptō: “A foolish man peepeth in from the door of another man’s house.”

PEKAH, pe’kā (פֶּקָה, pekāh, “opening” [of the eyes] [2 K 15:25-31]; פֶּקָה, Pekece): Son of Remaliah, and 18th king of Israel.

a. Accession Pekah murdered his predecessor, Pekahiah, and seized the reins of power (ver 25). His usurration of the throne is said to have taken place in the 52nd year of Uzziah, and his reign to have lasted for 20 years (ver 27). His accession, therefore, may be placed in 748 BC (other chronologies place it later, and make the reign last only a few years).

Pekah came to the throne with the resolution of assisting in forming a league to resist the westward advance of Assyria. The memory of defeat by Assyria at the battle of Karkar in 753, more than 100 years before, had never died out.

b. Attitude Tiglath-pileser III was now ruler of Assyria Assyria, and in 734 he had proved himself a resistless conqueror. His lust for battle was not yet satisfied, and the turn of Philistia and Syria was about to come. In 733, a coalition, of which Pekah was a prominent member, was being formed to check his further advance. It comprised the princes of Comagene, Gebal, Hamath, Arvad, Ammon, Moab, Edom, Gaza, Samaria, Syria, and some minor potentates, the list being taken from a roll of the subject-princes of Assyria who attended and assisted. After the fall of Damascus, Ahaz likewise attended as a voluntary tributary to do homage to Tiglath-pileser (2 K 16:10).

While the plans of the allies were in course of formation, an obstacle was met with which proved insurmountable by the arts of diplomacy. This was the refusal of Ahaz, Recaligant then on the throne of David, to join the confederacy. Arguments and threats having failed to move him, resort was had to force, and the troops of Samaria were sent against the place (2 K 18:1). Great alarm was felt at the news of their approach, as seen in the 7th and 8th chapters of Isa. The allies had in view to dispossess Ahaz of his crown, and give it to one of their own number, a son of Tabeel. Isaiah himself was the mainstay of the opposition to their projects. The policy he advocated, by Divine direction, was that of complete neutrality. This he urged with passionate earnestness, but with only partial success. Isaiah (probably) had kept back Ahaz from joining the coalition, but could not prevent him from sending an embassy, laden with gifts to Tiglath-pileser, to secure his intervention. On the news arriving that the Assyrian was on the march, a hasty retreat was made from Jerusalem, and the blow soon thereafter fell, where Isaiah had predicted, on Rezin and Pekah, and their kingdoms.

The severely concise manner in which the writer of K deals with the later sovereigns of the Northern Kingdom is, in itself, a testimony of PEAK.


The messages sent from Jerusalem to Nineveh appear to have arrived when the army of Tiglath-pileser was already prepared to march. The movements of the Assyrians being recorded, they fell upon Damascus, before the junction of the allies as and Eastern accomplished. Rezin was defeated in a decisive battle, and took refuge Overrun in his capital, which was closely invested. Another part of the invading army descended on the upper districts of Syria and Samaria. Serious resistance to the veteran troops of the East could hardly be made, and city after city fell. A list of districts and cities that were overrun is given in 2 K 15:29. It comprises Galead beyond Jordan—already subdued by Damascus—never (1 Ch 5:20); the tribal division of Naphtali, lying to the W. of the lakes of Galilee and Merom, and all Galilee, as far S. as the plain of Esdraelon and the Valley of Jezreel. Cities particularly mentioned are Ijon (now ‘A‘agan), Abel-beth-maacah (now ‘Ati,)
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Janoah (now Yānūn), Kadesh (now Kadous) and Hazor (now Hadirār).
These places and territories were not merely attacked and plundered. Their inhabitants were removed, with indescribable loss and suffering, to the four corners of the earth. Of the places and regions given as Halah, Habur, Hara, and both sides of the river Gozan, an affluent of the Euphrates. The transplantation of these tribes to a home beyond the great river was a new experiment in political geography, devised with the object of welding the whole of Western Asia into a single empire. It was work of immense difficulty and must have taxed the resources of even so great an organizer as Tiglath-pileser. The soldiers who had conquered in the field were, of course, employed to escort the many thousands of prisoners to their new locations. About two-thirds of the Sam kingdom, comprising the districts of Samaria, the two Galilees, and the trans-Jordanic region, was thus denuded of its inhabitants.
Left with but a third of his kingdom—humbled but still defiant—Pekah was necessarily unpopular with his subjects. In this extremity the wave of invasion from the North, having spent itself—the usual solution occurred, and a plot was formed by which the assassination of Pekah should be secured, and the assassin should take his place as a satrap of Assyria. A tool was found in the person of Hoesha, whom Tiglath-pileser claims to have appointed to the throne. The Bib. narrative does not do more than record the fact that "Hoshea the son of Elah made a conspiracy against Pekah the son of Remaliah, and smote him, and slew him, and reigned in his stead" (2 K 15 18). The date given to this act is the 20th year of Jotham. Pekah's reign lasted but 16 years, this number is evidently an error.

For the first time, the historian makes no reference to the religious cult of a king of Israel. The subject was beneath notice. The second section of Isaiah's prophecies in (7 1—10 4) belongs to the reign of Isaiah Ahaz and thus to the time of Pekah, both of whom are named in the prophecy. Pekah is named in 7 1, and is often, in this and the next chapter, referred to as "the son of Remaliah." His loss of the territorial divisions of Zebulun and Naphtali is referred to in 9 1, and is followed by a prediction of future glory for the earthly home of the Son of Man. The wording of Isa 9 14 shows that it was written before the fall of Samaria, and that of Isa 10 9—11 that Damascus and Samaria had both fallen and Jerus was expected to follow. This section of Isaiah may thus be included in the literature of the time of Pekah.

W. SHAW CALDESCOTT

PEKAHIAH, pē-kā'-hā, pē-kā'-yā, pēkā'-yāh, "Jehah opened" [the eyes] [2 K 15 23—26]; Phäkeias, Phækeias, A, Phækeias; [Plathias]: Son of Menahem and 17th king of Israel. He is said to have succeeded his father in the "50th year of Azariah" (or Uzziah), a synchronism not free from difficulty if his accession is placed in 750—749 (see MENAHEM; UZIAH). Most date lower, after 738, when an Assyrian inscription makes Menahem pay tribute to Tiglath-pileser (cf 2 K 15 19—21).

Pekahiah came to the throne enveloped in the danger which always accompanies the successor of a exceptionally strong ruler, in a new country where there was no settled law of succession. Within two years of his accession he was feely murdered—the 7th king of Israel who had met his death by violence (the others were Naahal, Elah, Tibni, Jehoram, Zechariah and Shallum). The chief conspirator was Pekah, son of Remaliah, one of his captains, with whom, as agent in the crime, were associated 50 Gileadites. These penetrated into the palace (RV "castle") of the king's house, and put Pekahiah to death, his bodyguards, Arab and Ararih, dying with him. The record, in its close adherence to fact, gives no reason for the king's removal, but it may reasonably be surmised that it was connected with a league which was at this time forming for opposing resistance to the power of Assyria. This league, Pekahiah, preferring his father's policy of tributary vassalage, may have refused to join. If so, the decision cost him his life. The act of treachery and violence is in accordance with all that Hosea tells us of the internal condition of Israel at this time: "They...devour their judges; all their kings are fallen!" (Hos 7 7).

The narrative of Pekahiah's short reign contains but a brief notice of his personal character. Like his predecessors, Pekahiah did not depart from the system of worship introduced by Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, "who made Israel to sin." Despite the denunciation of the prophets of the Northern Kingdom (Am 5 21—27; Hos 8 1—6), the king, and a land of the calvies remained to him, till the whole was swept away, a few years later, by the fall of the kingdom.

After Pekahiah's murder, the throne was seized by the regicide Pekah. W. SHAW CALDESCOTT

PEKOD, pē'kōd (יְפֹ֫כָד, pēkōdāh): A name applied in Jer 50 21 and Ezk 23 23 to the Chaldæans. RV in the former passage gives the meaning as "visitation."

PELAIH, pē-lā'ya, pē-lā'ya (לַעֲיַה, p̄la'yāh): (1) A son of Elioenai, of the royal house of Judah (1 Ch 3 24).
(2) A Levite who assisted Ezra by expounding the Law (Neh 8 7), and was one of those who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (10 10). He is called "Phalais" in 1 Esd 9 48 (RV).

PELALIAH, pel-a-lā'ya (לַעֲלַיָ֥ה, p̄la'yāh), "Jeh judges": A priest, father of Jerobam, one of the "workers" in the Lord's house (Neh 11 12).

PELALIAH, pel-a-lā'ya (לָעֲלָיָה, p̄la'yāh, "Jeh delivers") as "Phalalas" as "Phaleas": (1) One who "sealed" the covenant (Neh 10 22).
(2) A descendant of Solomon, grandson of Jerubabel (1 Ch 3 21).
(3) A Simeonite, one of the captains who cleared out the Amalekites and dwelt on the captured land (1 Ch 4 42 43).
(4) A prince of the people whom Ezekiel (in Babylon) pictures as "deceiving mischief" and giving "wicked counsel" in Jerus. He is represented as falling dead while Ezekiel prophesies (Ezk 11 13). His name has the 7, v, ending.

PELEG, pē'leg (פֶלֶג, peleg, "watercourse," "division"): A son of Eber, and brother of Joktan. The derivation of the name is given: "for in his days was the earth divided" (nepheh'γāh) (Gen 10 25; of Lk 3 35, AV "Pealec"). This probably refers to the scattering of the world's population and the confounding of its language recorded in Gen 11 1—9. In Am. pēlah mean "division"; in Heb peleg means "watercourse." The name would naturally be due to the occupation by this people of some well-watered (furnished), district (e.g. in Babylonia), for these patronyms represent races, and the derivation in Gen 10 25 is a later editor's remark.

S. F. HUNTER
PELET, pe'let (םֶלֶט; pelet, "delivery";): (1) Son of Ithai (1 Ch 2 47). (2) Son of Asmaveth, one of those who resorted to David at Ziklag while he was hiding from Saul (1 Ch 12 3).

PELETH, pe'leth (פֶלֶת; peleth, "swiftness"): (1) Father of On, one of the rebels against Moses and Aaron (Nu 16 1); probably same as PALLU (q.v.). (2) A descendant of Jerahmeel (1 Ch 2 33).

PELETHITES, pe'leth-its (פֶלֶתִיתֵס; peleth-its): A company of David's bodyguard, like the CHESTITHITES (q.v.) (2 S 8 18; 15 18); probably a corrupt form of "Philistines."

PeliaS, pe'lias: AV = RV "Peleas."

PELICAN, pel-ikan (פקֹן; pekon; פֶלֵי-קָן, pe'lian; פֶלֵי-קָט, pel'kat, a place-name): Two of David's military companies are thus described: (1) "Holez the Pelican" (1 Ch 11 27) (see PALTITE); and (2) "Ahijah the Pelonite" (1 Ch 11 36).

Pen, (פֶן; פֶונֶה, heret; כָּלָמוֹס, kalamos): The first writing was done on clay, wax, lead or stone tablets by scratching into the material with some hard pointed instrument. For this purpose bodkins of bronze, iron, bone or ivory were used (Job 19 24; Isa 8 1; Jer 17 1). In Jer 17 1 a diamond is described as being used for the same purpose. In Jer 36 Baruch, the son of Neriah, declares that he recorded the words of the prophet with ink in the book. In ver 23 it says that the king cut the roll with the penknife (lit. the scribe's knife). This whole scene can best be explained if we consider that Baruch and the king's scribes were in the habit of using reed pens. These pens are made from the hollow jointed stalks of a coarse grass growing in marshy places. The dried reed is cut diagonally with the penknife and the point thus formed is carefully shaved thin to make it flexible and the nib split as in the modern pen. The last operation is the clipping off of the very point so that it becomes a stub pen. The Arab scribe does this by resting the nib on his thumb nail while cutting, so that the nib will be clean and the pen will not scratch. The whole procedure requires considerable skill. The pupil in Hcb or Arab, writing learns to make a pen as his first lesson. A scribe carries a sharp knife around with him for keeping his pen knife in good condition, hence the name penknife. The word used in 3 Jn ver 13 is kalamos, "reed," indicating that the pen described above was used in John's time (cf kalam, the common Arab name for pen). See Ink; Ink-Horn; Writing.

Figureative. Written with a pen of iron, i.e. indelibly (Jer 17 1; Ps 45 1; cf Jer 36 18). As the trained writer records a speech, so the Psalmist's tongue impresses or engraves on his hearers' minds what he has conceived.

James A. Patch
comes a history of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the collateral lines of descendants being rapidly dismissed. The story of Joseph is told in detail, and Gen closes with his death. The rest of the Pent covers the opus of the Israelites in Egypt, the exodus and wanderings, the conquest of the Trans-Jordanic lands and the fortunes of the people to the death of Moses. The four concluding books contain masses of legislation mingled with the narrative (for special contents, see arts., on the several books).

II. Authorship, Composition, Date.—The view that Moses was the author of the Pent, with the exception of the concluding vs of Dt, was once held universally. It is still held by the great mass of Jews, Critical and Christians, but in most universities of Northern Europe and North America other theories prevail. An application of what is called 'higher' or 'documentary criticism' (to distinguish it from lower or textual criticism) has led to the formation of a number of hypotheses. Some of these are very widely held, but unanimity has not been attained, and recent investigations have challenged even the conclusions that are most generally accepted. In England the vast majority of the critics would regard Driver's LOT and Carpenter and Harford-Batterby's Hexateuch as fairly representative of their position, but on the Continent of Europe the numerous school that holds such positions is developing widely, and influencing world opinion, while even in Great Britain and America some of the ablest critics are beginning to show signs of being shaken in their allegiance to cardinal points of the higher-critical case. However, at the time of writing, the case of the Pent is in a very unsatisfactory state; the fresh formulation of their views, and accordingly the general positions of the works named may be taken as representing with certain qualifications the general critical theory. Some of the chief stadia in the development of this may be mentioned.

After attention had been drawn by earlier writers to various signs of post-Mosaic date and extraordinary perplexities in the Pent, the first real step toward what its advocates have, till within the last few years, called "the modern position" was taken by J. Astruc (1753). He propounded what Carpenter terms "the clue to the documents," i.e. the difference of the Divine appellations in Gen as a test of authorship. On this view the word "Kurios" (characteristic of the principal seer, Moses) and the Tetragrammaton, i.e. the Divine name "YHWH" represented by the "Lord" (Gen I-Deut) and "Eloah" and "Yehovah" (Pent) seemingly belong to one author, while another. Despite occasional warnings, this clue was followed in the main for 150 years after the pioneering point. In whole current of critical development, but the most recent investigations have successfully proved that it is unreliable (see below, 3, [3]). Astruc was followed by Eichhorn (1790), who made a more thorough examination of Gen, indicating numerous differences of style, representation, etc.

Goddes (1792) and Vater (1802-5) extended the method applied to Gen to the other books of the Pent. In 1822, Hengel distinguished two Eloists in Gen, but this view did not find followers for some time. The next step of fundamental importance was the assignment of the bulk of Dt to the 7th cent. BC. This was due to De Wette (1806). Hupfeld (1853) again distinguished a "principe dietro le scene" which has been adopted by the critics. Thus there are four main documents at least: D (the bulk of Dt), the Elohist (P) and E (the Pent) and one document (J) that underlies the Tetragrammaton in Gen. From 1822 (Block) a series of writers maintained that the Book of Josh was compounded from the same documents as the Pent (see Hexateuch).

Two other developments call for notice: (1) there has been great tendency to divide these documents further, regarding them as the work of schools rather than of individuals; within different streams (P, E, etc., J, etc.; or in the notation of other writers J, Je, etc); (2) a particular scheme of dating has found wide acceptance. The principal development was assumed that the principal Elohist (P) was the earliest document. A succession of writers of whom R. Hasiass, Graf, Kuenen and Wellhausen are the most prominent have, however, maintained that this is not the first hypothesis put forward, and should be referred to by the name of Josiah's reign. Later it was combined with JE into JED by a redactor (Kt6), P or PC, the last of all (originally the P, principal Elohist, minus its later part with an earlier code of uncertain date which consists in the main of most of Lev, Ex 40, the Laws of Holiness (H or Psb). P itself is largely post-exilic. Ultimately it was joined with JED by a priestly redactor (Jr) into what is called Priestly. As already stated, the theory is subject to many minor variations. Moreover, it is admitted that not all its portions are generally well supported. With JE into J and E is regarded as less certain than the separation of P, and again, there is analysis, differences of opinion as to the exact dating of the documents, and so forth. Yet the view just sketched has been held by a very numerous and influential school during recent years, nor is it altogether fair to lay stress on the differences of opinion, as to the documents involved in the Pent, that the data were inadequate to enable all the minor details to be determined with certainty (see Criticism of the Bible).

This theory will hereafter be discussed at length for two reasons: (1) while it is now commonly less gainsay ground, it is still more widely held than any other; and (2) so much of the modern work has been written from this standpoint that no intelligent use can be made of the most of the ordinary books of reference without some acquaintance with it.

Before 1908 the conservative opposition to the dominant theory had exhibited two separate tendencies. One school of conservatives rejected the scheme in toto; the other accepted the analysis with certain modifications, but sought to throw back the dating of the documents. In both these respects it had points of contact with dissentient critics (e.g. Delitzsch, Knibb, Oecolampadius). More recently, Van Hoonacker, who sought to save for conservatism any sparcs they could from the general wreck-age. The former school of thought was most prominently represented by the late H. H. John, and J. H. Raven's OT Intro may be regarded as a typical modern presentation of their view; the latter esp. by Roberton and Orr. The scheme put forward by the last named has found many adherents. He refuses to regard J and E as two separate documents, holding that the J should rather think (as in the case of the Hex) as two recensions of one document marked by the use of different Divine appellations. The critical P he treats as the work of a supplementer, and that it it is independent of the Pent as we have it. He has assumed that the whole Pent as early. He holds that the work was done by "original composers, working with a common aim, and toward a common end, in contrast with the idea of late irresponsible redactors, combining, altering, manipulating, enlarging, at pleasure" (POY, 375).

While these were the views held among OT critics, a separate opposition had been growing up among archaeologists. This was of course utilized to the utmost by the conservatives of both kinds. In some ways archaeology undoubtedly has confirmed the traditional view as against the critical (see Archaeology and Criticism); but a candid survey leads to the belief that it has not yet dealt a mortal blow, and here again it must be remembered that the critics may justly plead that they must not be judged on mistakes that they made in their earlier investigations or on refutations of the more uncertain portions of their theory, but rather on the main completed result. It was indeed fitting that it should be certain topics to which archaeology can never supply any conclusive answer. If it be the case that the Pent contains hopelessly contradictory laws, no archaeological discovery can make them anything else; if the numbers of the Israelites are original and impossible,
archaeology cannot make them possible. It is fair and right to lay stress on the instances in which archaeology has confirmed the Bible as against the critics; it is neither fair nor right to speak as if archaeology had done what it never purported to do and did not do.

The year 1908 saw the beginning of a new critical development which makes it very difficult to speak positively of modern critical views. Kuenen has been mentioned as one of the ablest and most eminent of those who brought the Graf-Wellhausen theory into prominence. In that year B. D. Eerdmans, his pupil and successor at Leyden, began the publication of a series of volumes in which he renounces his allegiance to the line of critics that had extended from Astruc to the publications of our own day, and entered on a series of investigations that were intended to set forth a new critical view. As his labors are not yet complete, it is impossible to present any account of his scheme; but the volumes already published justify certain remarks. Eerdmans has perhaps not converted any member of the Wellhausen school, but he has made many realize that their own scheme is not the only one possible. Thus while a few years ago we were constantly assured that the "main results" of OT criticism were unalterable and conservative, and recent writers adopt a different tone: e.g. Sellin (1910) says, "We stand in a time of fermentation and transition, and in what follows we present our own opinion merely as the hypothesis which appears to us to be the most fruitful." (Eertunck, p. 1.) By general consent Eerd- mans' work contains a number of isolated shrewd remarks to which criticism will have to attend in the future; but it also contains many observations that are demonstrably unsound (cf. Eerdmans, 1910, 549-561). His own reconstruction is in many respects so faulty and blurred that it does not seem likely that it will ever secure a large following in its present form. On the other hand he appears to have succeeded in inducing a large number of students in various parts of the world to think along new lines and in this way may exercise a very potent influence on the future course of OT study. His arguments show increasingly numerous signs of his having been influenced by the current literature, and it seems certain that criticism will ultimately be driven to recognize the essential soundness of the conservative position. In 1912 Dahse (TMH, 1) began the publication of a series of volumes attacking the conservative view, and it seems certain that criticism will ultimately be driven to recognize the essential soundness of the conservative position. In 1912 Dahse (TMH, 1) began the publication of a series of volumes attacking the conservative view, and it seems certain that criticism will ultimately be driven to recognize the essential soundness of the conservative position. In his view many phenomena are due to the influence of the pericopes of the synagogal service or the form of the text and not to the causes generally assigned.

The examination of the Graf-Wellhausen theory must now be undertaken and attention must first be directed to the evidence which is 2. Evidence adduced in its support. Why should for the Current Critical documents designated as J and E and P Scheme and D? Why is it believed that these documents are of very late date, in one case subsequent to the exile?

(1) Astruc's clue.—It has been said above that Astruc proposed the Divine appellations in Gen 22:17 as a clue to the dissection of that book. This is based on Ex 3 8, 9, and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of Shaddai, and made no mention of Almighty, but by my name YHWH I was not known to them.' In numerous other places unutterably settled texts are written, e.g. 4 26, where we read of men beginning to call on it in the days of Noah. The discrepancy here is very obvious, for the Astruc and E. D. S. schemes can be said to be effectually removed by postulating different sources. This clue, of course, falls after Ex 3 8, but other difficulties are found, and moreover the sources already distinguished in Gen ace, it is claimed, marked by separate styles and other characteristics as discovered by Professor J. A. Astur, R. B. D. E., are to be identified when they occur in the narrative of the later books (see Criticism of the Bible).

(2) Signs of post-Mosaic departure. Inspection of the Pent shows that it contains a number of passages which, if it is alleged, could not have reached Moses in his present form. Probably the most familiar instance is the account of the death of Moses (Dt 34). Other examples are to be found in seeming allusions to post-Mosaic events, e.g. in Gen 22 we hear of the Mount of the Lord, the land of Moriah, and the altar brought to the Temple Hill, which, however, would not have been so designated before Solomon. So too the list of kings who reigned in the land before the wander- ing over the children of Israel (36 31) presumes the existence of the monarchy. The Camels which Moses referred to "then in the land" (Gen 12 6; 13 7) did not disapper till the time of Solomon, and, accordingly, this expression means "then still" it cannot antedate his reign. Dt 3 11 (Og's bestrade) comes unnaturally from one who had vanished Og but a few weeks previous (Nu 21 14 (AV)). Contains a reference to "the book of the Wars of the Lord" which would hardly have been quoted in this way by a contemporary. Ex 16 35 refers to the cessation of the manna after the death of Moses. These passages, and many like them, are cited to disprove Mosaic authorship; but the main weight of the critical argument does not rest on them.

(3) Narrative discrepancies.—While the Divine appellations form the starting-point, they do not even in Gen constitute the sole test of different authorship. There are other critical devices, narrative discrepancies, antinomies, differences of style, duplicate narratives, etc. adduced to support the critical theory. We must now glance at some of these.

In Gen 21 14 J Ishmael is a boy who can be carried on his mother's shoulder, but from a comparison of 16 316; 17, it appears that he must have been 14 when Isaac was born, and, since weaning sometimes occurs at the age of 3 in the East, may have been even as young as 3. Again, "We all remember the scene (Gen 27) in which Isaac in extreme old age blesses his sons; we picture him as lying on his deathbed. Do we, however, all realize that according to the chronology of the Book of Gen he must have been then lying on his deathbed for eighty years (cf 25 26; 26 34; 35 28)? Yet we can only diminish this period by extending proportionately the interval between Esau marrying his Hittite wives (26 31) and his father Isaac's expectation to send Jacob away, lest he should follow his brother's example (27 46); which, from the nature of the case, will not admit of any but slight extension. Keil, however, does so extend it, reducing the period of Isaac's last illness from 30 years to 30 months. And as Esau had taken his Hittite wives, should express her fear that Jacob, then aged 77, will do the same" ( DRIVER, Contemporary Review, LVII, 29). An important instance occurs in Nu. According to 33 38, Aaron died on the 1st day of the 5th month. From Dt 1 3 it appears that 6 months later Moses delivered his speech in the plains of Moab. Into those 6 months are compressed one month's mourning for Aaron in the Asia campaign, the wandering round by the Red Sea, the entry into Canaan, and the missions to Edom and Og, the journeys to Balaam and the whole episode of his prophecies, the painful occurrences of Nu 25, the second census, the appointment of Joshua, the expedition against Mèshin, besides other events. It is clearly impossible to fit all these into the time.

Other discrepancies are of the most formidable character. Aaron dies now at Mt. Hor (Nu 20 28; 33 38), now at Moab (Dt 10 6). According to Dt 1 1 11 the Philistines of Israel left Kadesh-barnea in the 3d year, and that year 15 after being returned to it, while in Nu they apparently remain there till the journey to Mt. Hor, where Aaron dies in the 40th year. The Tent of Meeting per-
has provides some of the most perplexing of the discrepancies, for while according to the well-known scheme of Ex 25 ff and many other passages, it would appear very accommodating in the midst of the camp, Ex 33 7-11 provides us with another Tent of Meeting that stood outside the camp at a distance and could be carried by Moses alone. The vs. used are frequentative, denoting a regular presence, and it is impossible to suppose that after receiving the commands for the Tent of Meeting Moses could have instituted a quite different tent of the same name. Joseph again is sold, now by Ishmaelites (Gen 37 22-28; 39 1), anon by Midianites (28a-30). Sometimes he is imprisoned in one place, sometimes apparently in another. The story of Korah, Dathan and Abiram in Nu 16 is equally full of difficulty. The enormous numbers of the Israelites given in Nu 1-4, etc., are in conflict with passages that regard them as very few.

(4) Doubts.—Another portion of the critical argument is provided by doubts or duplicate narratives of the same event, e.g. Gen 16 and 21. These are particularly numerous in Gen, but are not confined to that book. "Twice do you appear in comments made differently in Gen 31 4-6.31 ff; Ex 16 13.) Twice does Moses draw water from the rock, when the strife of Israel begets the name Meribah ("strife") (Ex 17 1-7; Nu 20 1-18)." (Carpenter, Hexateuch, 1, 30).

These must be borne in mind. So far as the argument from the laws and their supposed historical setting. By far the most important portions of this are examined in Sanctuary and Priests (q.v.). These subjects form the two main pillars of the Graf-Wellhausen theory, and if the laws, in question must be read as supplementing the present article. An illustration may be taken from the slavery laws. It is claimed that Ex 21 1-6; Dt 16 12 if permit a Hebrew to contract for life slavery after 6 years' service, but that Lev 25 39-42 takes no notice of this law and enacts the totally different provision that Hebrews may remain in slavery only till the Year of Jubilee. While these different enactments might proceed from the same hand if properly coordinated, it is contended that this is not the case and that the legislator in Lev ignores the legislator in Ex and is in turn ignored by the legislator in Dt, who only knows the law of Ex.

(6) The argument from style.—The argument from style is next and is especially a difficulty, since it depends so largely on an immense mass of details. It is said that each of the sources has certain characteristic phrases which either occur nowhere else or only with very much less frequency. For instance in Gen 1, where 'Elkalim is used throughout, we find the word "create," but this is not employed in 2 4b ff, where the Tetragrammatarion occurs. Hence it is argued that this word is peculiarly characteristic of P as contrasted with the other documents, and may be used to prove his presence in e.g. 5 11.

(7) Proofs of the development hypothesis.—While the main supports of the Graf-Wellhausen theory must be sought in the arts, to which reference has been made, it is necessary to mention briefly some other phenomena to which some weight is attached. Jer displays many close resemblances to Dt, and the framework of K is written in a style that has marked similarities to the same book. Ezek again has notable points of contact with P and esp. with R; either he was acquainted with the portion of R or else he must have exercised considerable influence on those who composed them. Lastly the Chronicler is obviously acquainted with the completed Pent. Accordingly, it is claimed that the literature provides a sort of external standard that confirms the historical stages which the different Pentateuchal sources are said to mark. Dt influences Jer and the subsequent literature. It is argued that it would equally have influenced the earlier books of the tripartite sources. Again the completed Pent should have influenced K as it did Ch, if it had been in existence when the earlier history was composed.

(1) The veto of textual criticism.—The first great objection that may be made to the higher criticism is that it starts from the Massoretic text (MT) without investigation. This is not the only text that has come down to us, and in some instances it can be shown that alternative readings that have been preserved are superior to those of the MT. A convincing example occurs in Ex 18. According to the Heb., Jethro comes to Moses and says "I, thy father-in-law, am come," and subsequently Moses goes out to meet his father-in-law. The critics here postulate different sources, but some of the best authorities have preserved a reading which (allowing for ancient differences of orthography) supposes an alteration of a single letter. According to this reading the text is "Behold thy father-in-law, is come." The result of this Moses went out and met Jethro. The vast improvement in the sense is self-evident. But in weighing the change other considerations are also involved. Since this is the reading of some of the most ancient authorities, only two views are possible. Either the MT has undergone a corruption of a single letter, or else a redactor made a most improbable cento of two documents which gave a narrative of the historical event. It seems evident that this was followed by textual corruption of so happy a character as to remove the difficulty by the change of a single letter; and this corruption was so widespread that it was accepted as the genuine text by some of our best authorities. There is little doubt which of these two cases is the more credible, and with the recognition of the textual solution the particular 'bit of the analysis that depends on this corruption falls to the ground. This instance illustrates one branch of textual criticism; there are others. Sometimes the narrative shows with certainty that in the transmission of the text the positions have taken place; e.g. the identification of Kadesh shows that it was S, of Hormah. Another frequently a difficulty, since it depends so largely on an immense mass of details. It is said that each of the sources has certain characteristic phrases which either occur nowhere else or only with very much less frequency. For instance in Gen 1, where Elkalim is used throughout, we find the word "create," but this is not employed in 2 4b ff, where the Tetragrammatarion occurs. Hence it is argued that this word is peculiarly characteristic of P as contrasted with the other documents, and may be used to prove his presence in e.g. 5 11. Proofs of the development hypothesis.—While the main supports of the Graf-Wellhausen theory must be sought in the arts, to which reference has been made, it is necessary to mention briefly some other phenomena to which some weight is attached. Jer displays many close resemblances to Dt, and the framework of K is written in a style that has marked similarities to the same book. Ezek again has notable points of contact with P and esp. with R; either he was acquainted with the portion of R or else he must have exercised considerable influence on those who composed them. Lastly the Chronicler is obviously acquainted with the completed Pent. Accordingly, it is claimed that the literature provides a sort of external standard that confirms the historical stages which the different Pentateuchal sources are said to mark. Dt influences Jer and the subsequent literature. It is argued that it would equally have influenced the earlier books of the tripartite sources. Again the completed Pent should have influenced K as it did Ch, if it had been in existence when the earlier history was composed.

(1) The veto of textual criticism.—The first great objection that may be made to the higher criticism is that it starts from the Massoretic text (MT) without investigation. This is not the only text that has come down to us, and in some instances it can be shown that alternative readings that have been preserved are superior to those of the MT. A convincing example occurs in Ex 18. According to the Heb., Jethro comes to Moses and says "I, thy father-in-law, am come," and subsequently Moses goes out to meet his father-in-law. The critics here postulate different sources, but some of the best authorities have preserved a reading which (allowing for ancient differences of orthography) supposes an alteration of a single letter. According to this reading the text is "Behold thy father-in-law, is come." The result of this Moses went out and met Jethro. The vast improvement in the sense is self-evident. But in weighing the change other considerations are also involved. Since this is the reading of some of the most ancient authorities, only two views are possible. Either the MT has undergone a corruption of a single letter, or else a redactor made a most improbable cento of two documents which gave a narrative of the historical event. It seems evident that this was followed by textual corruption of so happy a character as to remove the difficulty by the change of a single letter; and this corruption was so widespread that it was accepted as the genuine text by some of our best authorities. There is little doubt which of these two cases is the more credible, and with the recognition of the textual solution the particular bit of the analysis that depends on this corruption falls to the ground. This instance illustrates one branch of textual criticism; there are others. Sometimes the narrative shows with certainty that in the transmission of the text the positions have taken place; e.g. the identification of Kadesh shows that it was S, of Hormah. Another frequently a difficulty, since it depends so largely on an immense mass of details. It is said that each of the sources has certain characteristic phrases which either occur nowhere else or only with very much less frequency. For instance in Gen 1, where Elkalim is used throughout, we find the word "create," but this is not employed in 2 4b ff, where the Tetragrammatarion occurs. Hence it is argued that this word is peculiarly characteristic of P as contrasted with the other documents, and may be used to prove his presence in e.g. 5 11.
ing the true origin of the difficulties on which the critics rely.

(2) *Astruc’s clue tested.*—Astruc’s clue must next be examined. The critical case breaks down with extraordinary frequency. No clean division can be fixed upon here or anywhere else. In 1 Sam 16:13, Gen makes P or E use the Tetragrammaton or J *Elohim*. In some of these cases the critics can suggest no reason; in others they are compelled to assume that the MT is corrupt for no better reason than that it is in conflict with their theory. Again to the theory, the textual evidence of the theory frequently forces the analyst to sunder verses or phrases that cannot be understood apart from their present contexts, e.g. in Gen 28:21 Carpenter assigns the words “and Jeh will be my God” to J while giving the beginning and end of the verse to E; in Gen 32:8 3 goes to a redactor, though E actually refers to the statement of ver 3 in ver 5; in ch 32, ver 30 is torn from a J-context and given to E, thus leaving ver 31 (J) unintelligible. When textual criticism is applied, startling facts that entirely shatter the entire critical argument are suddenly revealed. The variants to the Divine appellations in Gen are very numerous, and in some instances the new readings are clearly superior to the MT, even when they substitute *Elohim* for the Tetragrammaton. Thus, in one variant of the same *Elohim* requires the word *Elohim*, as the name would otherwise have been Ishmaiah, and one Heb MS, a recension of the LXX and the Old Lat do in fact preserve the reading *Elohim*. The full facts and arguments cannot be given here, but Professor Strong has made an exhaustive examination of the various texts from Gen 1 1 to Ex 3 12. Out of a total of 347 occurrences of one or both words in the MT of that passage, there are variants in 196 instances. A very important and detailed discussion, too long to be summarized here, will now be found in *TMH*. I. Wellhausen himself has admitted that the textual evidence constitutes a sore point of the documentary theory (*Expos* T, XX, 563). Again in Ex 6 3, many of the best authorities read “I was not made known” instead of “I was not known”—a difference of a single letter in Heb. But if this be right, there is comparative evidence to suggest that to the early mind a revelation of his name by a deity meant a great deal more than a mere knowledge of the name, and involved rather a pledge of his power. Lastly the analysis may be tested in yet another way by inquiring whether it fits in with the other data, and when it is discovered (see below 4, [1]) that it involves ascribing, e.g. a passage that cannot be later than the time of Abraham to the period of the kingdom, it becomes certain that the clue and the method are alike misleading (see further *EPC*, ch 1; *Expos* T, XX, 578 f., 473–75, 563; *TMH*, I, 45, 40–149; 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201; *Astruc*, The Name of God, NKZ, XXIV [1913], 119–48; *Expos*, 1913).

(3) *Narrative discrepancies and signs of post-Mosaic date.*—Septuagintal MSS are providing very illuminating material for dealing with the chronological difficulties. It is well known that the LXX became corrupt and passed through various recensions (see *Septvagint*). The original text has not yet been reconstructed, but as the result of the great variety of recensions it happens that our various MSS present a wealth of alternative readings. Some of these discrepancies are significant, e.g. a southerly march from Kadesh no longer conducts the Israelites to Arad in the north, the name Hormah is no longer used (Nu 14:45) before it is explained (21:3), there is no longer an account directly contradicting Dt and making the 40 years of wilderness wanderings 37 years at Kadesh immediately after receiving the Divine command “Go forth to the land tomorrow” (Nu 14:25). A full discussion is impossible here and will be found in *EPC*, 114–38. The order of the narrative that emerges as probably original is as follows: Nu 12 20 1:14–21:21 1:1–3; 13:14; 16:18; 20:2–13:22c; 21 46–9, then some

17, 100 years old when Isaac was born. In 17 25 we find that Ishmael is already 13 a year before Isaac’s birth. Now we are familiar with marginal notes that set forth a system of chronology in many printed English Bibles. In Gen 2 12, 13, and again, ver 16, while in 17 25 there is a variant making Ishmael only 3 years old. If these readings are correct it is easy to see how the difficulty arose. The narrative originally contained mere round numbers, like 100 years old, and these were afterwards corrected so as to be taken literally. A commentator constructed a scheme of chronology which was embodied in marginal notes. Then these crept into the text and such numbers as were in conflict with them were thought to be corrupt and underwent alteration. Thus the 3-year-old Ishmael became 13.

The same MSS that present us with the variants in Gen 16 have also preserved a suggestive reading in 35 28, one of the passages that are responsible for the inference that according to the text of Gen Isaac lay or was killed at deathbed for 3 years (Expos, 3, [2]). According to this Isaac was not 180, but 150 years old when he died. It is easy to see that this is a round number, not to be taken literally, but this is not the only source of the difficulty. In 27 41, Esau, according to EV, states “The days of mourning for my father are at hand; then will I slay my brother Jacob.” This is a perfectly possible rendering of the Heb, but the LXX is the text differently, and its rendering, while grammatically correct, has the double advantage of avoiding Isaac’s long lingering on a deathbed and of presenting Esau’s hatred and ferocity far more vividly. It renders, “May the days of mourning for my father approach that I may slay my brother Jacob.” Subsequent translators preferred the milder version, but doubtless the LXX has truly apprehended the real sense of the narrative. If we read the ch with this modification, we see Isaac as an old man, not knowing when he may die, performing the equivalent of making such a will. It would be hard for any good credibility to suppose that he may have lived 20 or 30 years longer. Such episodes occur constantly in everyday experience. As to the calculations based on 25 20 and 26 34, the numbers used are 60 and 40, which is as well known as the method employed by the ancient Hebrews, not as mathematical expressions, but simply to denote unknown or unspecified periods. See *Nummen*.

The other chronological difficulty cited above (viz., that there is not room between the date of Aaron’s death and the address by Moses in the plains of Moab for all the events assigned to this period by Nu) is met partly by a reading preserved by the Pesh and partly by a series of transpositions. In Nu 33 35 Pesh reads “first” for “until” as the month of Aaron’s death, thus recognizing a longer period for the subsequent events. The transpositions, however, which are largely due to the evidence of Dt, solve the most formidable and varied difficulties; e.g. a southerly march from Kadesh no longer conducts the Israelites to Arad in the north, the name Hormah is no longer used (Nu 14:45) before it is explained (21:3), there is no longer an account directly contradicting Dt and making the 40 years of wilderness wanderings 37 years at Kadesh immediately after receiving the Divine command “Go forth to the land tomorrow” (Nu 14:25). A full discussion is impossible here and will be found in *EPC*, 114–38. The order of the narrative that emerges as probably original is as follows: Nu 12 20 1:14–21:21 1:1–3; 13:14; 16:18; 20:2–13:22c; 21 46–9, then some
missing vs, bringing the Israelites to the head of the Gulf of Akabah and narrating the turn northward from Ethl and Ezion-geber, then 20 223–29; 21 4e, and some lost words telling of the arrival at the precipice behind which the Hebrews were said to have crossed over to the J. 40 is a gloss that is missing in Lægerde's LXX, and vs 366–37a should probably come earlier in the chapter than they do at present.

Another example of transposition is afforded by Ex 33 7–11, the passage relating to the Tent of Meeting which is at present out of place (see above 2, [3]). It is supposed that this is E's idea of the Tabernacle, but that, unlike P, he places it outside the camp and makes Joshua its priest. This latter view is discussed and refuted in Psslers, 3, where it is shown that Ex 33 7 should be rendered "And Moses used to take a [or, the] tent and pitch it for himself," etc. As to the theory that this is E's account of the Tabernacle, Ex 18 has been overlooked. This chapter belongs to the same E but refers to the end of the period spent at Horeb, i.e. it is later than 33 7–11. In vs 13–16 we find Moses sitting with all the people standing about him because they came to inquire of God; i.e. the business which according to ch 33 was transacted in solitude outside the camp was performed in the midst of the people at a later period. This agrees with P, e.g. Nu 27. If now we look at the other available clues, it appears that 33 11 seems to introduce Joshua for the first time. The passage should therefore precede 17 8–15; 24 13; 39 17, where he is already known. Again, if Ex 18 refers to the closing scenes at Horeb (as it clearly does), Ex 24 14 providing for the temporary transaction of judicial business reads very strangely. It ought to be preceded by his last statement of the ordinance of the Tabernacle. "And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee" (Ex 25 22). After its erection the earlier tent was disused, and the court sat at the door of the Tabernacle in the center of the people, etc.

Some other points must be indicated more briefly. In Nu 16 important Septuagintal variants remove the main difficulties by substituting "company of Korah" for "dwelling of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram" in two vs (see EPC, 143–46). Similarly in the Joseph story the perplexities have arisen through corruptions of verses which may still be corrected by the versional evidence (PS, 29–48). There is evidence to show that the numbers of the Israelites are probably due to textual corruption (EPC, 155–69). Further, there are numerous passages where careful examination has led critics themselves to hold that particular verses are later notes. In this way they dispose of Dt 10 6 f (Aaron's death, etc.), the references to the Israelites being "kingdom" in Nu 36 31 and the Canaanites as being "then" in the land (12 5; 17 3), the bedstead of Og (Dt 3 11) and other passages. In Gen 22, "the land of Moriah" is unknown to the VSS which present the most diverse readings, of which "the land of Moriah" is probably the most probable, while in ver 14 the LXX, reading the same Heb consonants as MT, translates "In the Mount the Lord was seen." This probably refers to a view that God manifested Himself esp. in the mountains (cf 1 K 20 23–28) and has no reference whatever to the Temple Hill. The Massoretic pointing is presumably due to a desire to avoid what seemed to be an anthropomorphism (see further PS, 19–21). Again, in Nu 21 14, the LXX inserts, "the book of the Wars of Jehovah" (see Field, Hebrew-Grammar, ad loc). It is difficult to tell what the original reading was, esp. as the succeeding words are corrupt in the Heb, but it appears that no genitive followed "wars" and it is doubtful if there was any reference to a "book of wars."

(4) The argument from the doublets examined.—The foregoing sections show that the documentary theory often depends on phenomena that were absent from the original Pent. We are now to examine arguments that rest on other foundations. The doublets have been cited, but when we examine the instances more carefully, some curious facts emerge. Gen 16 and 21 are, to all appearance, narratives of different events; so are Ex 17 1–7 and Nu 20 1–13 (the drawing of water from rocks). In the latter case the critics after rejecting this divide the passages into 5 different stories, two going to J, two to E and one to P. If the latter also had a Rephidin-narrative (of Nu 13 14 P), there were 6 tales. In any case both J and E tell two stories each. It is impossible to determine the order in which the events occurred, and that the author of the Pent could not have told two such narratives, if not merely the redactor of the Pent but also J and E could do so. The facts as to the manna stories are similar. As to the flights of quails, it is known that these do in fact occur every year, and the Pent places them at almost exactly a year's interval (see EPC, 104 f, 109 f).

(5) The critical argument from the laws.—The legal arguments are due to a variety of misinterpretations, the subject-matter, the legal background and the state of the text. Reference must be made to the separate articles (esp. Sanctuary; Passers). As the slave laws were cited, it may be explained that in ancient Israel as in other communities slavery could arise or slaves be acquired in many ways: e.g. birth, purchase (Gen 14 14; 17 12, etc), gift (20 14), capture in war (14 21; 34 29), kidnapping (Joseph). The law of Ex and Dt applies only to Heb slaves acquired by purchase, not to slaves acquired in any other way, e.g. all of those who lost their eyes in the eye of the law of the law were not true slaves. Lev 25 has nothing to do with Heb slaves. It is concerned merely with free Israelites who become insolvent in one or another of the following ways (see infra): (1) (see vs 35–37). Nobody who was already a slave could wax poor and sell himself. The law then provides that these insolvent freemen were not to be treated as slaves. In fact, they were a class of free bondmen, i.e. they were full citizens who were compelled to perform certain duties. A similar class of free bondmen existed in ancient Rome and were called servi. The Egyptians who sold themselves to Pharaoh and became serfs afford another though less apt parallel. In all ancient societies insolvency led to some limitations of freedom, but while in some full slavery ensued, in others a sharp distinction was drawn between the slave and the insolvent freeman (see further SBL, 5–11).
supposed to attest the presence of P, versificational evidence seems to show that the expressions in question have been introduced by glossators, and when they are removed the narrative remains unaffected in its original, terser and more vigorous and greatly improved as a vehicle of expression. To take a simple instance in Gen 23:1, "And the life of Sarah was a hundred and seven and twenty years: . . . the years of the life of Sarah," the italicized words were missing in the LXX. When they are removed the meaning is unaltered, but the form of expression is far superior. They are obviously a mere marginal note. Again the critical method is perpetually breaking down. It constantly occurs that redactors have to be called in to intervene from a passage attributed to some source expressions that are supposed to be characteristic of another source, and this is habitually done on no other ground than that the theory requires it. One instance must be given. It is claimed that the word "create" is a P-word. It occurs several times in Gen 1:1—2 and 3 in Gen 5:12, but in 6:7 it is found in a J-passage, and some critics therefore assign it to a redactor. Yet J undoubtedly uses the word in Nu 15:30 and D in Dt 4:32. On the other hand, during the pre-Mosaic period the expression "having been in Gen 1:1—2, the word "make" being employed in 1:7, 25:26:31; 2:2, while in 2:3 both words are combined. Yet all these passages are given hesitantly.

(7) Perplexities of the theory.—The perplexities of the critical hypothesis are very striking, but a detailed discussion is impossible here. Much material, however, be found in POTT and BSS. A few general statements may be made. The critical analysis repeatedly divides a straightforward narrative into two sets of fragments, neither of which will make sense without the other. A man will go to sleep in one document and wake in another; or a subject will belong to one source and the predicate to another. No intelligible account can be given of the proceedings of the redactors who at one moment slavishly preserve their sources and at another cut them about without any necessity, who now rewrite their material and now leave it untouched. Again, the most consistent theory is that material thus preserved will be chapters will be assigned by one writer to the post-exilic period and by another to the earliest sources (e.g. Gen 14, pre-Mosaic in the main according to Sellin [1910], post-exilic according to other critics). Again, it is a fact that the repetition of words and repetition of passages has greatly increased the perplexity. Clue after clue, both stylistic and material, is put forward, to be abandoned silently at some later stage. Circular arguments are extremely common. It is first alleged that some phenomenon is characteristic of a particular source; then passages are referred to that source for no other reason than the presence of that phenomenon; lastly these passages are cited to prove that the phenomenon in question distinguishes the source. Again the theory is compelled to feed on itself; for J, E, P, etc., we have schools of J's, E's, etc., subsisting side by side for centuries, using the same material, employing the same ideas, yet remaining separate in minute stylistic points. This becomes impossible when viewed in the light of the evidences of pre-Mosaic date in parts of Gen below 4, [1] to [3].

(8) Signs of unity.—It is often possible to produce very convincing internal evidence of the unity of what is said. A strong instance of this is to be found when one considers the characters portrayed. The character of Abraham or Laban, Jacob or Moses is essentially unitary. There is but one Abraham, and this would not be so if we really had a cent of different documents representing the results of the labor of various schools during different centuries. Again, there are some times literary marks of unity, e.g. in Nu 15, the effect of rising anger is given to the dialogue by the repetition of words (see Pott, [5:7], followed by the repetition of "is it a small thing that" (vs 9.13). This must be the work of a single literary artist (see further SBL, 37 f).

(9) Supposed props of the development hypothesis.—When we turn to the supposed props of the development hypothesis we see that there is nothing conclusive in the critical argument. Jer and the subsequent lit. certainly exhibit the influence of Dt, but a Book of the Law was admittedly found in Josiah's reign and had lain unread for at any rate some considerable time. Some of its requirements had been in actual operation, e.g. in Naboth's case, while others had become a dead letter. The circumstances of its discovery, the belief in its undoubted Mosaic authenticity and the subsequent course of history led to its greatly influencing contemporary and later writers, but that really proves nothing. Ezek again was steeped in priestly ideas, but it is shown in Paviors, 50, how this may be explained. Lastly, Ch certainly knows the whole Pent, but at an entirely misjudged date.

On the other hand the Pent itself always represents portions of the legislation as being intended to reach the people only through the priestly teaching, and this fully accounts for P's lack of influence on the older literature. But the differences of style within the Pent itself, something is said in III, below. Hence this branch of the critical argument really proves nothing, for the phenomena are susceptible of more than one explanation.

(1) The narrative of Genesis. Largely different lines of argument are quite readily provided by the abundant internal evidences of date. In Gen 4. Evidence 19, we read the phrase "as thou of Date" goest toward Sodom and Gomorrah, and Admah and Zeboim" in a definition of boundary. Such language could only have originated when the places named actually existed. One does not define boundaries by reference to towns that are purely mythical or have been overthrown many centuries previously. The consistent tradition is that these towns were destroyed in the lifetime of Abraham, and the passage therefore cannot be later than his age. But the critics assign it to a late stratum of J, i.e. to a period at least 1,000 years too late. This suggests that the repeated repetition of words! there be asked whether much reliance can be placed on a method which after a century and a half of the closest investigation does not permit its exponents to arrive at results that are correct to within 1,000 years. Secondly, it shows clearly that in the composition of the Pent very old materials were incorporated in their original language. Of the historical importance of this fact more will be said in IV; in this connection we must observe that it throws fresh light on expressions that point to the presence in Gen of sources composed in Pal, e.g. "the sea" for "the West" indicates the probability of a Palestinian source, but once it is proved that we have materials as old as the time of Abraham such expressions do not argue post-Mosaic, but rather pre-Mosaic authorship. Thirdly, the passage demolishes the theory of schools of J's, etc. It cannot seriously be maintained that there was a school of J's writing a particular style marked by the most delicate and subjective criteria subsisting continuously from the time of Abraham onward, side by side with other writers with whom its members never exchanged terms of even such common occurrence as "handmaid."
In 2:14 we read of the Hiddekel (Tigris) as flowing E. of Aṣšur, though there is an alternative reading "the Hiddekel of the west" to correct, the passage must antedate the 13th cent. BC, for Aṣšur, the ancient capital, which was on the west bank of the Tigris, was abandoned at about that date for Kalkh on the E.

(2) Archaeology and Genesis.—Closely connected with the foregoing are cases where Gen has preserved information that is true of a very early time only. Thus in 10:22 Elam figures as a son of Shem. The historical Elam was, however, an Aryan people. Recently inscriptions have been discovered which show that in the age of ver 10, Elam was inhabited by Semites. "The fact," writes Driver, ad loc., "is not one which the writer of this verse is likely to have known." This contention falls to the ground when we find that only three verses off we have material that goes back at least as far as the time of Abraham. After all, the presumption is that the writer stated the fact because he knew it, not in spite of his not knowing it; and that knowledge must be due to the same cause as the note- worthy fact in the age of ver 10, Elam was inhabited by Semites. This is merely one example of the confirmations of little touches in Gen that are constantly being provided by archaeology. For the detailed facts see the separate articles, e.g. AMARASPEL; JERUSALEM, and so forth.

From the point of view of the critical question we note (a) that such accuracy is a natural mark of authentic early documents, and (b) that in view of the arguments already adduced and of the legal evidence to be considered, the most reasonable explanation is to be found in a theory of contemporary authorship.

(3) The legal evidence of Genesis.—The legal evidence is perhaps more convincing, for here no theory of late authorship can be devised to evade the natural inference. Correct information as to early names, geography, etc, might be the result of researches by an exilic writer in a Bab library; but early customs that are confirmed by the universal experience of primitive societies, and that point to a stage of development which had long been passed in the Babylonian even of Abraham's day, can be due to but one cause—genuine early sources. The narratives of Gen are certainly not the work of comparative sociologists. Two instances may be cited. The law of the purification of the dead of those that are known to be earlier than the stage attested by Ex 21:12 ff. In the story of Cain we have one stage; in Gen 9:6, which does not yet recognize any distinction between murder and other forms of homicide, we have the other.

Our other example shall be the unlimited power of life and death possessed by the head of the family (38:24; 42:37, etc), which has not yet been limited in any way by the jurisdiction of the courts as in Ex 21. In both cases comparative historical jurisprudence confirms the Bible account against the critical, which would make e.g. Gen 9:6 post-exilic, while assigning Ex 21 to a much earlier period. (On the whole subject see further OP, 135 ff.)

(4) The professedly Mosaic character of the legislation.—Coming now to the four concluding books of the Pent, we must first observe that the legislation everywhere professes to be Mosaic. Perhaps this is not always fully realized. In critical editions of the text the rules relating to Levitical sacrifices assigned to redactors, but the representation of Mosaic date is far too closely interwoven with the matter to be removed by such devices. If e.g. we take such a section as Dt 12, we shall find it full of such phrases as "for ye are not as yet come unto the rest and to the inheritance," "when ye go over Jordan," "the place which the Lord shall choose" (AV), etc. It is important to bear this in mind throughout the succeeding discussion.

(5) The historical situation required by P.—What do we find if we ignore the Mosaic dress and seek to fit P into any other set of conditions, particularly those of the post-exilic period? The general historical situation gives a clear answer. The Israelites are represented as being so closely concentrated that they will always be able to keep the three pilgrimages. One exception only is contemplated, viz. that ritual uncleanness or a journey may prevent an Israelite from keeping the Passover. Note that this was certainly to keep it one month later (Nu 9:10). How could this law have been enacted when the great majority of the people were in Babylonia, Egypt, etc, so that attendance at the temple was impossible for them on any occasion whatever? With this exception the entire PC always supposes that the whole people are at all times dwelling within easy reach of the religious center. How strongly this view is embedded in the code may be seen esp. from Lev 16, which makes that care is not domestic animals to be slaughtered for food must be brought to the door of the Tent of Meeting. Are we to suppose that somebody deliberately intended such legislation to apply when the Jews were scattered all over the civilized world for even all the earth? If so, it means a total prohibition of all animal food for all save the inhabitants of the capital.

In post-exilic days there was no more pressing danger for the religious leaders to combat than intermarriage, but this code is supposed to have been written for the express purpose of bringing about their action, goes out of its way to give a fictitious account of a war and incidentally to legalize some such unions (Nu 31:18). And this chapter also contains a law of booby. What could be more unsuitable? How and where were the Jews to make conquests and capture booty in the days of Ezra?

"Or again, pass to the last chapter of Nu and consider the historical setting. What is the complaint urged by the repetition that waits upon Moses? It is this: If he is married to any of the sons of the other tribe of the children of Israel, then shall their inheritance be taken away from the inheritance of our fathers, and it shall be added unto the inheritance of the tribe whitherunto they shall belong." What a pressing grievance for a legislator to consider and redress when tribes and tribal lots had long since ceased to exist for ever!" (OP, 121 f.)

Perhaps the most informative of all the discrepancies between P and the post-exilic age is one that explains the freedom of the prophets from its literary influence. According to the constant testimony of the Pent, including P, portions of the law were to reach the people only through priestly teaching (Lev 10:11; Dt 24:8; 33:10, etc.). Ezra on the other hand read portions of P to the whole people.

(6) The hierarchical organization in P.—Much of what falls under this head is treated in Pug. In the 9, 10 analogies, and need not be repeated here. The following may be added: "Urim and Thummim were not used after the Exile. In lieu of the simple conditions—a small number of priests and a body of Levites—we find a developed hierarchy, priests, Levites, subpriests, priestly families, etc. In the inner sanctuary of the temple, Leviticus 21:23-25, which declares that the High Priest alone may enter the Holy of Holies together with his sons and the Levites, to burn incense and to offer the sacrifice of atonement for the sins of the people of Israel, and to minister to the Lord in the holy place in the sight of the Lord. The Epistle of the Christian Church would be justified if it were based on this law of the ceremonial order, "because it is written in the law of Moses that the high priest should offer gifts and sacrifices for sins."
carying pecuniary emoluments is far beyond the primitive simplicity of "OP (P, 122)"

(7) The legal evidence of P.—As this subject is technically of no importance for our present purpose, we may pass

Legal rules may be such as to enable the historical inquirer to define definitely that they belong to an early stage of society. Thus if we find ele-

tary rules relating to the inheritance of a farmer who dies without leaving sons, we know that they cannot be long subsequent to the introduction of individual property in land, unless of course the law has been deliberately altered. It is an every-
day occurrence for men to die without leaving sons, and the question what is to happen to their land in such case must from the nature of the case be raised and settled before very long. When we therefore find such rules in Nu 27, etc., we know that they are either very old or else represent a deliberate change in the law. The latter is really out of the question, and we are driven back to their antiquity (see further OP, 124 ff.). Again in Nu 35 we find an elaborate struggle to express a general principle which shall distinguish between two kinds of homic.

cide. The earlier law had regarded all homicide as of which no one could assign the cause. The human mind only reaches general principles through concrete cases, and other ancient legislations (e.g., the Ic-

celandic) bear witness to the primitive character of the rules of Nu. Thus an expert like Dareste can say that those who assert that much of the Mosaic law is extremely archaic (see further SSL and OP, passim).

(8) The evidence of D. —The following may be quoted: "Laws are never issued to regulate a state of things which has passed away ages before, and can never be revived by us, that are not, in our mind, then, of a hypothesis which assigns the code of Dt to the reign of Josiah, or shortly before it, when its injunctions to exterminate the Canaanites (20 16-18) and the Amalekites (25 17-19), who had long since disappeared, would be as utterly out of date as a law in New Jersey at the present time offering a bounty for killing wolves and bears, or a royal proclamation in Great Britain ordering the expulsion of the Danes! A law contemplating foreign conquests (20 10-15) would have been absurd when the urgent question was whether Judah could maintain its own existence against the encroachments of Babylon and Egypt. A law discrimi-

nating against Ammon and Moab (23 3-4), in which no exception is made for the present kingdom (7 5), bears witness to the Mosaic period, but not in the time of the later kings. Jeremiah discriminates precisely the other way, promising a future restoration to Moab (48 47) and Ammon (49 6), which he denies to Edom (49 17.15), who is also to Joel (3 19), Ob, and Isa (63 1-6), the representative foe of the people of God. . . . . . The allusions to Egypt imply familiarity with and recent residence in that land. . . . And how can a code belong to the time of Josiah, which, while it permits sacrifices to be offered of a king in the future (Dt 17 11 ff), nowhere implies an actual regal government, but vests the supreme central authority in a judge and the priesthood (17 8-12; 19 17); which lays special stress on the require-

ments that the king must be a native and not a for-

eigner (17 15), when the undisputed line of suc-

cession had for ages been fixed in the family of David, and that he must not 'cause the people to return to Egypt' (ver 18), as they seemed ready to do on every grievance in the days of Moses (Nu 14 4), but that he was to do justice to the poor (17 9), which were fairly established in Canaan?" (Green, Moses and the Prophets, 63 f).

This too may be supple-

mented by legal evidence (e.g. 22 26 testifies to the undeveloped intellectual condition of the people). OP (32 23) speaks of nu 27 as now widely regarded as Mosaic in critical circles.

Wellhausen (Protegenomen, 392, n.) now regards their main elements as pre-Mosaic Canaanitish law.

(9) Later allusions.—These are of two kinds. Sometimes they are only of the nature of reference. In other cases we find evidence that they were in operation. (a) By postulating redactors evidence can be ban-

ished from the Bib. text. Accordingly, reference will only be made to some passages where this procedure is not followed. Ezek 22 20 clearly knows of a law that dealt with the subjects of P, used its very language (of Lev 10 10 ff), and like P was to be taught to the people by the priests. Hosea also knows of some priestly teaching, which, however, is moral and may therefore be Lev 19; but not 11-13 he speaks of 10,000 written precepts, and here the context points to ritual. The number and the subject-matter of these precepts alike make it cer-

tain that he knew a bulky written law which was not merely identical with Ex 21-33, and this passage cannot be met by Wellhausen who resorts to the device of translating it with the omission of the im-

portant word "write." (b) Again, in dealing with institutions the references can often be evaded. It is possible to say, 'Yes, this passage knows such and such a law, but we really come into existence with D or P, but was an older law incor-

porated in these documents.' That argument would apply, e.g., to the necessity for two witnesses in the case of Naboth. That is a law of D, but who assigns it must assert that it is here merely incorporating older material. Again the allusions sometimes show something that differs in some way from the Pent., and it is often impossible to prove that this was a wear.

(10) Other evidence.—We can mention certain other branches of evidence. There is still the evi-

dence of early date (see e.g., Lias, BS, 1910, 20-46, 299-334). Further, the minute accuracy of the narrative of Ex-Nu to local conditions, etc (noticed below, IV, 5, 6), affords valuable testimony. It may be said that the earlier narrations, which were well in 

mature—mirrors early conditions, whether we regard intellectual, economic or purely legal development (see further below, IV, and OP, passim).

(1) Moral and psychological issues.—The great fundamental improbabilities of the critical view
have hitherto been kept out of sight in order that the arguments for and against the detailed case might not be prejudiced by other considerations. We must now glance at some of the broader issues. The first great frauds were perpetrated—in each case by men of the loftiest ethical principles. Dt was deliberately written in the form of Mosaic speeches by some person or persons who well knew what was not Mosaic. P is a make-up—nothing more. All its references to the wilderness, the camp, the Tent of Meeting, the approaching occupation of Canaan, etc., are so many tacks introduced for the purpose of deceiving. There can be no talk of literary convention, for no such convention existed in Israel. The prophets all spoke in their own names, not in the dress of Moses. David introduced a new law of booty in his own name; the Chronicler repeatedly refers to temple ordinances to David and Solomon; Samuel introduced a law of the kingdom in his own name. Yet we are asked to believe that these gigantic forgeries were perpetrated without reason or pretext. Is it credible? Consider the principles involved, e.g. the Deuteronomistic denunciations of false prophets, the prohibition of adding aught to the law, the passionate injunctions to teach children. Can it be believed that men of such principles would have been guilty of such conduct? Nemo repente fæ turpius datur, says the old maxim; can we suppose that the denunciations of those who prophesy falsely in the name of the Lord proceed from the pen of one who was himself forging in that name? Or can it be that the great majority of Biblical scholars know as little of truth when they assert it that they cannot detect the ring of unquestionable sincerity in the references of the Deuteronomist to the historical situation? Or can we really believe that documents that originated in such a fashion could have exercised the enormous force for righteousness in the world that these documents have exercised? Ex nihilo nihil. Are literary forgeries a suitable parentage for Gen 1 or Lev or Dt? Are the great monotheistic ethical religions of the world that have more than purely rooted in nothing better than folly and fraud?

(3) The divergence between the laws and post-exilic practice.—Thirdly, the entire perversion of the true meaning of the laws in post-exilic times makes the critical theory incredible. Examples have been given (see above, 4, [5], [6], and Priest, passim). It must now suffice to take just one instance to make the answer clear. Well, we know from the author of P deliberately provided that if Levites approached the altar both they and the priests should die (Nu 18 3), because he really desired that they should approach the altar and perform their service in a manner that Ezra and the people on reading these provisions at once understood that the legislator meant the exact opposite of what he had said, and proceeded to act accordingly (1 Ch 23 31). This is only one little example. It is throughout P. Everybody understands that the Tabernacle is really the second Temple and wilderness conditions post-exilic, and everybody acts accordingly. Can it be contended that this view is credible?

(4) The testimony of tradition.—Lastly the uniform testimony of tradition for Mosaic authenticity—the tradition of Jews, Samaritans and Christians alike. The national consciousness of a people, the convergent belief of Christendom for 18 centuries are not lightly to be put aside. And what is more against them is that they correspond with each fresh exponent, and that they take their start from textual corruption, develop through a confusion between an altar and a house, and end in mistreating narratives and laws by 8 or 10 centuries! (see above 3 and 4; Sanctuary: Priests, 18). If anything at all emerges from the foregoing discussion, it is the impossibility of performing any such analytical feat as the critics attempt. No critical microscope can detect with the necessary degree of certainty the joins of various sources, even if such sources really exist, and when we find that laws and narratives are constantly misdated by 8 or 10 centuries, we can only admit that no progress at all is possible along the lines that have been followed. On the other hand, certain reasonable results do appear to have been secured, and there are indications of the direction in which we must look for the further investigation.

First, then, the Pentateuch contains various notes by later hands. Sometimes the VSS enable us to detect and remove those notes, but many are pre-versional. Accordingly, it is in the impossible to remove all the conjectures on which different minds may differ.

Secondly, the Prophet's prose is, what we call, an organic whole, but we cannot determine the scope of these or the number and character of the sources employed, or of the extent of the author's work.

Thirdly, the whole body of the legislation is subject only to textual criticism Mosaic. But the laws of Dt carry with them their framework, the speeches which cannot be severed from them (see Shb. II). The speeches of Dt in turn carry with them large portions of the narrative of Ex-Nu which they presuppose. They do not necessarily carry with them such passages as Ex 35-39 or Nu 1-4, 7, 26, but Nu 1-4 contains internal evidence of Mosaic date.

At this point we examine the various phenomena that throw light on our problem. It may be said that there are three chief phenomena— textual corruption—that which is due to the ordinary processes of copying, perishable, annotating, etc., and that which is due to conscious and unconscious fraud. There is an attempt to produce, as far as possible, a correct standard text. Differences that will be found in the work of the Massoretic on the Heb text, that of Origen and others on the LXX, and that of the commission and of Aristotles and the Alexandrian critics on Homer. There is evidence that such revision is attempted. An important instance is to be found in the chronology of certain portions of Gen of which three different VSS survive. Massoretic, Sam, and Septuagint. Another instance of even greater consequence for the
matters in hand is to be found in Ex 35-39. It is well known that the LXX preserves an entirely different edition from that of MT supported in the main by the Septuagint. Some other editions have been noticed incidentally in the preceding discussion; one other that may be proved by further research to possess considerable interest may be mentioned. It appears that in the law of the kingdom (Dt 17) and some other passages the Massoretes and the Septuagint specify a hereditary king. The LXX knew nothing of such a person (see further Ps 137-68). The superiority of the LXX text in this instance appears to be attested by 1 S, which is unacquainted with any law of the kingdom.

According to the view of the translators, the Sam and the Sept. While there are a number of minor readings (in cases of variation through accidental corruption) it is manifestly true that in general the way the Sam belongs to the same family as the MT. While the LXX in the crucial matters represents a different textual tradition from the other two (see Exeg. September 1911, 200-219). How is this to be explained? According to the worthless story preserved in the letter of Aristarchus the LXX was tr. from Msh brought from Jews at a date long subsequent to the Sam schism. The fact that the LXX preserves a recension so different from both Sam and MT (and indeed from our Mosaic sources in Gen., and of the 5th cent. B.C. and its lineal descendants) suggests that this part of the story must be rejected. If so, the LXX preserves portions through the text of the Pent. prevalent in Egypt and descents from a Heb that separated from the text before the Sam schism. At some point we must recall the fact that in Jer the LXX differs from MT more widely than in any other Bib. book; the nature of which is such that the difference goes back to the times of Jeremiah, his work having been preserved in a text. It may be that if the Jews of Egypt had an edition of Jer, they also had an edition of that law to which Jer refers, and it is possible that the differences between LXX and MT (with its allies) are due to the two streams of tradition separating from the time of the exile—Egypt and the Bab. The narrative of the finding of the Book of the Law in the days of Josiah (2 K 22), which probably refers to events that took place at that time, is based on the single MS found. The phenomena as a whole are strongly suggestive of the idea that they were at one time dependent on a single damaged MS, and that conscious efforts were made to restore the original or at least to make as genuine an copy as possible (see esp. EFC. 114-38; Es. 1913, 270-90). In view of the great corruption in the LXX in 35-39, it may be taken as certain that in some instances the editing went to considerable lengths.

Thus the history of the Pent. so far as it can be traced, is briefly as follows: The backbone of the book consists of pre-Mosaic sources in Gen., and the Mosaic narratives, speeches and legislation in Ex-Dt. To this, notes, archaeological, historical, explanatory, etc., were added by successive readers. The text at one time depended on a single MS which was lost or more or less tampered with to repair this damage by rearrangement of the material. It may be that some of the narrative chapters, such as Nu 1-4, 7, 26, were added from a separate source and amplified or rewritten in the course of redaction, but in this book nothing certain can be said. Within a period that is attested by the materials that survive, Ex 35-39 underwent one or more such redactions. Slighter redactions attested by Sam and LXX have affected the chronology of the Pent, the number of the legislative units and some references to post-Mosaic historical events. Further than this it is impossible to go on our present materials.

III. Some Literary Points. No general estimate of the Pent. can be attempted without a knowledge of its literary beauties. Anybody who is not would do well to compare the chapter on Joseph in the Koran (12) with the Bib. narrative. A few words must be said of some of the less obvious matters that would naturally fall into a literary consideration, the aim being rather to draw the reader's attention to points that he might overlook.

Of the style of the legislation no sufficient estimate can be formed, for the first requisite of legal style is the absence of individuality. Though some contemporaries, and today no judgment can be offered on that head. There is, however, one feature that is of great interest even now, viz. the prevalence in the main of three different styles, each marked by its special adaptation to the end in view. These styles are

1. Style of Legislation (1) mnemoniac, (2) oratorical, and (3) procedural. The first is familiar in other early legislations. It is lapidary, terse, the extreme, pregnant, and from time to time marked by a rhythm that must have assisted the retention in the memory. Occasionally we meet with parallelism. This is the style of Ex 21 ff and occasional later passages, such as the judgment in the case of Reuben's son (Num 15:10-31). No doubt these laws were memorized by the elders.

2. The Narrative. The narrative of Nu 33 is intentionally composed in a style which undoubtedly possesses peculiar qualities which cannot be appropriate to the text. The census lists, etc., appear to be written in a formal official manner, and something similar is true of the list of the spies in Nu 13. There is no ground for surprise in this. In the ancient world it would be natural to discover in the composition to a far greater extent than it does today. A literary form that is peculiar to the Pent. deserves special notice, viz. the covenant document as a form of literature. Many peoples have had laws that were attributed to some deity, but it is only here that laws are presented in the form of sworn agreements entered into with certain formalities between the Lou and God. It has been observed that it is certain that portions of the Pent. are in the form of a sort of deed with properly articulated parts. This deed would have been ratified by oath if made between men, as was the covenant between Abraham and Abimelech, but in a case like this inapplicable, and the place of the jur is in each case taken by a discourse setting forth the rewards and penalties attached by God to observance and breach of the covenant respectively. The covenant conception and the idea that the laws acquire force because they are terms in an agreement between God and people, and not merely because they were commanded by God, is one of extraordinary importance in the history of thought and in theology, but we must not through absorption in these aspects of the question fail to notice that the conception found expression in a literary form that is unknown elsewhere and that it provides the key to the comprehension of large sections of the Pent, including almost the whole of Dt (see in detail SBL, ch ii).

Insufficient attention has been paid to order and rhythm generally. Two great principles must be borne in mind: (1) in really good ancient prose there are no appeals to the ear in many subtle ways, and (2) in all such prose, emphasis, substance, and meaning are given to the sentences to the greatest extent by the order of the words. The figures of the old Gr rhetoricians play a considerable part. Thus that figure "the candle," "the circle," is sometimes used with great skill. In this the clause or sentence begins and ends with the same word, which denotes alike the sound and the thought. Probably the
most effective instance—heightened by the meaning, the shortness and the heavy boom of the word—is to be found in Gen 14 from ver. 24. The parallel "clue" with הָקָל, kol, "voice"—the emphasis conveyed by the sound being at least as marked as that conveyed by the sense. This is no isolated instance of the figure; cf. e.g. in Gen 20, 24 and 27 in Luke 3: "would that we had died."] Chiasmus is a favorite figure, and asonnance, plays on words, etc., are not uncommon. Similarly this was an ancient art of the narrator, as may be seen from instances like Gen 1:2. "the voice of the Lord was softly;" "while and void;" 4:12: "the voice of a fugitive and a wanderer:" 9:6: "the voice of the waters was heard;" 4:18: "the voice of the Lord was heard;" Nu 13:30: "the voice of a song;" 14:11: "the voice of a singing man;" 19:20: "the voice of a waqeqet, and smote them and beat them down.

The prose of the Pentateuch, except in its more formal and official parts, is closely allied to poetry (cf. e.g. the Assyrian "Sin coucheth at the door" [Gen 4:17]: "how bare you on eagles' wings" [Ex 19:4]). In the oratorical prose of Dt we find an imagery and a poetical imagination that are not common among great orators. This rhythm is marked and the arrangement of the words is extraordinarily easy, esp. in such a chapter as ch. 28. It is difficult to convey any idea of how much the book loses in EV from the changes of order. Occasionally we have the point of the original in Dt 4:36: "out of heaven he made thee to hear his voice;" but consider how strikingly this contracts with the flat "He made thee to hear his voice out of heaven;" some notion may perhaps be formed of the importance of the order. However, this frequent loss of sense, however, the Eng. is false to the emphasis and spirit of the Heb. Sometimes, but not always, this is due to the exigencies of Eng. idiom. This is the cardinal fault of AV, which otherwise excels so greatly.

IV. The Pentateuch as History.—Beyond all doubt, the first duty of any who would use the Pentateuch as a historical source is to consider the light that textual criticism throws upon it. So many of the impossibilities of History bilities are relied upon by those who seek to prove that the book is historically worthless may be removed by the simplest operations of scientific textual criticism, that a neglect of this primary precaution must lead to disastrous conclusions. After all, it is common experience that a man who sets out to produce a historical narrative either by original composition or compilation—ideally, it is possible to make, e.g. a southwest march lead to a point northward of the starting-place, or a woman carry an able-bodied lad of 16 or 17 on her shoulder, or a patriarch linger some 80 years on a deathbed. When such episodes are found in the Hebrew text of history, the reader justifiably requires that we should first ask whether the text is in order, and if the evidence points to any easy, natural and well-supported solutions of the difficulties, we are not justified in rejecting them without inquiry and denying to the Pentateuch all historical value. It is a priori far more probable that narratives which have come down to us from a date some 3,000 years back may have suffered slightly in transmission than that the Pentateuch was in the first instance the story of a historical life; it is far more reasonable, e.g. to suppose that in a couple of verses of Ex a corruption of two letters (attested by Aquila) has taken place in the MT than that the Pentateuch contains two absolutely inconsistent accounts of the origin of the priesthood (see Gen 4:18). But the first principle of any scientific use of the Pentateuch for historical purposes must be to take account of textual criticism.

Having discovered as nearly as may be what the author wrote, the next step must be to consider what he means. By R. L. Here, unfortunately, the modern inquirer is apt to neglect many simpler problems. It would be a truism, but for the fact that it is so often disregarded, to say that the whole is not necessarily to be carefully read in order to ascertain the author's meaning; e.g. how often we hear that Gen 14 represents Abram as having inflicted a defeat on the enemy with only 318 men (ver. 14), whereas the context clearly shows that he had with him his allies Aner, Eschol and Mamre (i.e. as we shall see, the inhabitants of certain localities) had accompanied him! Sometimes the clue to the sense of the narrative is to be sought in the history of the book in which the methods of expression adopted cause trouble in some modern commentaries. We are often met with a passage trips and stumbles us in a way that apparently presents difficulties to the mind. Thus in Ex 9:6 it is possible to interpret "all" in the sense of a sweeping generalization in the verb as in vv. 19, 22, etc., which recognize that some cattle still existed. Or again the term may be regarded as limited by ver. 3 to all the cattle in the field (see Acts 15:26).

At this point two further idiosyncrasies of the Sem genus must be noted—the habits of personification and the genealogical tendency; e.g. in Nu 20:12-21, Edom and Israel are personified and used in relationships. Genealogies "Edom came out against him," etc. Nobody here mistakes the meaning. Similarly with genealogical methods of expression. The Semites spoke of many relationships in a way that is forcibly revealed in the expressions of the Heb for "30 years old" is "son of 30 years."] Again we read "He was the father of such as dwell in tents" (Gen 4:20). These habits of (personification and genealogical expression of relationships) are greatly extended, e.g. "And Canaan begat Zidon his first-born" (10:15). Often this leads to no trouble, yet strangely enough men who will grasp these methods when dealing with ch. 10 will claim that ch. 14 cannot be historical because localities are there personified and used in relationships. Yet if we are to estimate the historical value of the narrative, we must surely be willing to apply the same methods to one chapter as to another if the sense appears to demand this. See, further, Genealogies.

A further consideration that is not always heeded is the exigency of literary form; e.g. in Gen 24 there occurs a dialogue. Strangely enough, an ancient writer has been able to personify the narrative rather than the character of Gen on this ground. It cannot be supposed, for instance, that we have here a literal report of what was said. This entirely ignores the practice of all literary artists. Such passages are to be regarded as not a literal but a metaphorical expression of what occurred; they convey a truer and more vivid idea of what nature and importance. The literal report of the mere words, divorced from the gestures, glances and modulations of the voice that play such an important part in conversation.

Another matter is the influence of the sacred numbers on the text; e.g. in Nu 33 the figure of the number 70 is a complete truism (see Numbers).

5. The Sacred Numbers

Numbers

Gen 10 probably contains 70 names in the original text. This is a technical consideration which must be borne in mind, and so, too, must the Heb habit of using certain round numbers to express an unspecified time. When, for instance, we read that somebody was 40 or 60 years old, we are not to take these words literally. "Forty years old" often seems to correspond to "after a man had reached man's estate" (see Numbers).

Still more important is it to endeavor to appreciate the habits of thought of those for whom the Pentateuch was intended, and to seek the nature of the thought which it expresses. The many explanations of names few are philologically correct. It is certain that Noah is not connected with the Heb for "to comfort" or Moses with "draw out"—even if Egypt princesses
spoke Heb. The etymological key will not fit. Yet we must ask ourselves whether the narrator ever thought that it did. In times when names were supposed to have some mystic relation to their bearers they might be conceived as standing also in some mystic relation to events either present or future; it is possible that the formal method of the narratives was not to suggest this in literary form. How far the ancient Hebrews were from regarding names in the same light as we do may be seen from such passages as Ex 23:20; Is 30:27; see further E.P.C. 47 ff.; see also Names, Proper.

The Pent is beyond all doubt an intensely national work. Its outlook is so essentially Israelitish that no reader could fail to notice the fact.

7. National Coloring proves. Doubtless this has in many instances led to its presenting a view of history with which the contemporary peoples would not have agreed. It is not to be supposed that the exodus was an event of much significance in the Egypt of Moses, however important it may appear to the Egyptians of today; and this suggests two points. On the one hand we must admit that to most contemporaries the Pentateuchal narratives must have seemed out of all perspective; on the other the course of subsequent history has shown that the Mosaic sense of perspective was in reality the true one, however absurd it may have seemed to the nations of his own day. Consequently in using the Pent for historical purposes we must always apply two standards—the contemporary and the historical. In the days of Moses the narrative might often have looked to the outsider like the attempt of the frog in the fable to attain to the size of an ox; for us, with the light of history upon it, the two are very different. The national coloring, the medium through which the events are seen, has proved to be true, and the seemingly insignificant doings of unimportant people have turned out to be events of prime historical importance.

There is another aspect of the national coloring of the Pent to be borne in mind. If ever there was a book which revealed the immost soul of a people, that book is the Pent. This will be considered in W. It is not merely present in the narrative as such but is associated with its historical significance. In estimating actions, motives, laws, policy—all that goes to make history—character is necessarily a factor of the utmost consequence. Now here we have a book that at every turn and in every way bears the mark of national character. Alike in contents and in form the legislation is adapted with the utmost nicety to the nature of the people for which it was promulgated.

When due allowance has been made for all the various matters enumerated above, what can be said as to the trustworthiness of the Pent? The answer is entirely favorable.

8. How Far Can We Trust the Pentateuch?—It is not possible to read the references to events in such a chapter as Ex 4 without feeling that the author who speaks most fully believed the truth of his statements. The most unquestionable sincerity is impressed upon the chapter. The speaker is referring to what he believed with all the faith of which he is capable.

we have to ask whether they were truthful and able. As to the ability no doubt is possible; genius is stamped on every page of the Pent. Similarly as to truthfulness. The conscience of the narrator is essentially ethical. This appears of course most strongly in the legislation of Lev 19; and the attribution of truthfulness to God (Ex 34 6), but it may readily be detected throughout; e.g. in Gen 20 12 the narrative clearly shows that truthfulness was esteemed as a virtue by the ancient Hebrews. Throughout, the faults of the dramatic personae are never minimized even when the narrator's sympathy is with them. Nor is there any attempt to belittle the opponents of Israel's heroes. Consider on the one hand the magnanimity of Esa's character and on the other the very glaring light that is thrown on the weaknesses of Jacob, Judah, Aaron. If we are taught to know the Moses who prays, "And if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written" (Ex 32 32), we are also shown his frequent complaints, and we make acquaintance with the hot-tempered man of letters and the lawyer who disobeyed his God.

(3) The historical genius of the people.—Strangely enough, those who desire to discuss the trustworthiness of the Pentatexual narrative go on to inquire into the habits of other nations and, selecting according to their bias peoples that have a good or a bad reputation in the matter of historical tradition, proceed to argue for or against the Pentateuchal narrative on this basis. Such procedure is alike unjust and unscientific. It is unsound because the object of the inquirer is to obtain knowledge as to the habits of this people, and in view of the great divergences that may be observed among different races, the comparative method is clearly inapplicable; it is unjust because this people is entitled to be judged on its own merits or defects, not on the merits or defects of others. Now it is a bare statement of fact that the Jews possess the historical sense to a preeminent degree. Nobody who surveys their long history and examines their customs and practices to this day can fairly doubt that this. This is no recent development; it is most convincingly attested by the Pent itself, which here, as elsewhere, presents at every turn the spirit of the race. What is the highest guaranty of truth, a guaranty which unquestioning appeal may be made in the firm assurance that it will carry conviction to all who hear? "Remember the days of old, Consider the years of many generations, Think of the generations of Esa; Think, elders, and they will tell thee" (Dt 32 7). "For ask now of the days that are past, which were before thee, since the day that God created man upon the earth," etc (Dt 4 32). Conversely, the due handing down of tradition is a religious duty: "And it shall come to pass, when your children shall say unto you, What mean ye by this service? that ye shall say," etc (Ex 12 26). "Only take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things which thine eyes saw, and lest they depart from thy heart all the days of thy life; but make them known unto thy children, and thy children's children" (Dt 4 9). It is needless to multiply quotations. Enough has been said to show clearly the attitude of this people toward history.

(1) The good faith of Deuteronomy.—Closely connected with the preceding is the argument from the very obvious good faith of the speeches in Dt. It is not possible to read the references to events in such a chapter as ch 4 without feeling that the speaker who speaks most fully believed the truth of his statements, and that the most unquestionable sincerity is impressed upon the chapter. The speaker is referring to what he believes with all the faith of which he is
capable. Even for those who doubt the Mosaic authenticity of these speeches there can be no doubt as to the writer's unqualified acceptance of the historical consciousness of the people. But once the Mosaic authenticity is established the argument becomes overwhelming. How could Moses have spoken to people of an event so impressive and unparalleled as having happened within their own recollection if it had not really occurred? (5) Nature of the events recorded.—Another very important consideration arises from the nature of the events recorded. No nation, it has often been pointed out, will invent a story of its enslavement to another. The extreme sobriety of the patriarchal narratives, the absence of miracle, the lack of any tendency to display the ancestors of the people as conquerors or great personages, are marks of credibility. Many of the episodes in the Mosaic age are extraordinarily probable. Take the stories of the rebelliousness of the people, of their complaints of the water, the food, and so on: what could be more in accordance with likelihood? On the other hand there is another group of narratives to which the converse argument applies. A Sinai cannot be made part of a nation's consciousness by a clever story-teller or a literary forger. The unparalleled nature of the events narrated was recognized quite as clearly by the ancient Hebrews as by Thucydides (Hist. 4:92 ff.). It is incredible that such a story could have been made up and successfully palmed off on the whole nation. A further point that may be mentioned in this connection is the witness of subsequent history to the truth of the narrative. Such a witness is the history itself of the Jews, such tremendous consequences as their religion has had on the fortunes of mankind, require for their explanation causal events of sufficient magnitude.

3) External corroborations.—All investigation of evidence depends on a single principle: "The coincidences of the truth are infinite." In other words, a false story will sooner or later become involved in conflict with ascertained facts. The Bible narrative has been subjected to the most rigorous cross-examination from every point of view for more than a century. Time after time consistent assertions have been made that its falsehood has been definitely proved, and in each case the Pent has answered the test triumphantly. The detailed studies will for the most part be found enumerated or referred to under the separate articles. Here it must suffice just to refer to a few matters. It was said that the whole local coloring of the Egyptian scenes was entirely false, e.g., that the vine did not grow in Egypt. Egyptology has in every instance vindicated the minute accuracy of the Pent, down to even the non-mention of earthenware (in which the discolored Nile waters can be kept clean) in Ex 7:19 and the very food of the lower classes in Nu 14:5. It was said that writing was unknown in the days of Moses, but Egyptology and Assyriology have utterly demolished this. The historical character of many of the names has been strengthened by recent discoveries (e.g. Jerusalem; Amarna). The position of the narrator point of view modern observation of the habits of the quails has shown that the narrative of Nu is minutely accurate and must be the work of an eyewitness. From the ends of the earth there comes confirmation of the details of the story as depicted in the Pent. Finally it is worth noting that even the details of some of the covenants in Gen are confirmed by historical parallels (Churchman, 1908, 171). It is often said that history in the true sense was invented by the Greeks and that the Heb genius was the opposite; but the Divine guidance that it negated secondary causes altogether. There is a large measure of truth in this view; but so far as the Pent is concerned it can be greatly overstated.

9. The Pentateuch

One great criticism that fails to be answered entirely in favor of the Hebrew as against some Greeks, viz. as Reasoned History are given. Thucydides would have stated the reasons that induced Pharaoh to persecute the Israelites, or Abraham and Lot to separate, or Korah, Dathan and Abiram and their followers to rebel; but every reader would have known precisely what he was doing and many who can read the material passages of the Pent with delight would have been totally unable to grapple with his presentation of the narrative. The audience here is more unsophisticated and the material is presented in more artistic form. In truth, any historian who sat down to compose a philosophical history of the period covered by the Pent would in many instances be surprised at the lavish material it offered to him. A second criticism is more obvious. The writer clearly had no knowledge of the other side of the case. For example, the secondary causes for the defeat near Hormah are plain enough so far as they are internal to the Israelites, lack of moral order, lack of discipline, division of opinion, discouragement produced by the Divine disapproval testified by the absence from the army of Moses and the Ark, and the warnings of the former—but the secondary causes on the side of the Amalekites and Canaanites are entirely omitted. Thus it generally happens that we do not get the same kind of view of the events as might be possible if we could have both sides. Naturally this is largely the case with the work of every historian who tells the story from one side only and is not peculiar to the Pent. Thirdly, the object of the Pent is not merely to inform, but to persuade. It is primarily state-mentship, not literature, and its form is influenced by this fact. Seeking to sway conduct, not to provide a more philosophical exposition of history, it belongs to a different (and higher) category from the latter, and where it has occasion to use the same material puts it in a different way, e.g. by assigning as motives for obeying the commandments reasons the historian would have advanced as causes for their enactment. To some extent, therefore, an attempt to criticize the Pent from the standpoint of philosophical history is an attempt to express it in terms of something not incommensurable with it.

V. Character of the Pentateuch.—The following sentences from Maine's Early Law and Custom form a suggestive introduction to any consideration of the character of the Pent:

"The theory upon which these schools of learned men worked, from the ancient, perhaps very ancient, Apastamba and Gautama to the late Manu and the still later Narada, is perhaps still held by some persons of earnest religious convictions, but in time now buried it beneath every walk of thought. The fundamental assumption is that a sacred or inspired lit. being once bequeathed to exist, all knowledge is contained in it. The Hindu way of putting it is simply that the Scripture is true, but that everything which is true is contained therein, and to be observed that such a theory, firmly held during the infancy of systematic thought, tends to work itself into facts. As the human mind advances, accumulating observation and accumulating reflection, nascent philosophy and nascent science are separated from sacred literature, while they are at the same time limited by the ruling ideas of its priestly authors. But as the mass of its literature passes through the hands of successive expositors, it gradually specializes itself, and subjects, which at first was most mixed together, the several conceptions, become separated from one another and isolated. In the history of law the most important of these was the separating of that which was right in the law as decreed by the lawgiver from that which was right in the law as decreed by the lawgiver from that which was right in the law as decreed by the lawgiver from that which the lawgiver was bound to do from what he ought to know. A great part of the religious literature, including the Creation of the Universe, the structure of Heaven, Hell, and the World
or Worlds, and the nature of the Gods, falls under the last head, what a man ought to know. Law-books first appeared about the beginning of the first century, what a man should do. Thus the most ancient books of this class are moral, and are written for all men. To this class the Hindu who would lead a perfect life. They contain much more ritual than law; a great deal more about the impiety cause things that impress crime, a great deal more about penances than about punishments" (pp. 16–18).

It is impossible not to see the resemblance between the Pentateuch and the Old Testament. Particularly interesting is the commentary they provide on the attitude of Moses toward knowledge: "The secret things belong unto Jeh, our God; but the things that are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words thereof." (Deut. 29:29).

But if the Pentateuch has significant resemblances to other old law books, there are differences that are even more significant.

"By an act that is unparalleled in history a God took to Himself a people by means of a sworn agreement. Some words that are fundamental for our understanding of the Pentateuch must be quoted from the other books:

"Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be unto me a deight among all people: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a holy nation.

The views here expressed dominated the legislation, holiness—the correlative holiness to which the law seeks to give ethical expression, because the Holy One of Israel; 

It is the holiness that is laid upon the Israelites in these words is a duty that has practical consequences in every phase of social life. I have already quoted a sentence from Sir Henry Maine in which he speaks of the uniformity with which religion and law are implanted in archaic legislation. There is a stage in human development when men can see no God but their own. It is to this stage that the Pentateuch belongs. But no other legislation so takes up one department of man's life after another and impresses all the relations of God and man into one body. Perhaps nothing will so clearly bring out my meaning a chapter of the Old Testament.

5. The National Aspect

History. If it be asked wherein the secret of this strength lies, the answer is in the combination of the national and the religious. The course of history must have been entirely different if the Pentateuch had not been the book of the people long before the Jews became the subjects of the book of the world.

LITERATURE.—The current critical view is set forth in vast numbers of books. The following may be mentioned: LOT: Cornill's "Intro to the Canonical Books of the OT"; Carpenter and Harford-Battersby's "Hexateuch" (a 2d ed. of the Intro without the text has been published as The Composition of the Hexateuch); the "Exposition of the ICC, Westminster Comms., and Century Bible. Slightly less thoroughgoing views are put forward in the "G. S. of the Konig (1893), Baudissin (1901), Sellin (1910); and Geddes, "Outlines of Intro to the Heb Bible" (1900); Ketel, "Scientific Study of the OT" (1910); Erasm. St. has entirely divergent critical views; "OT, JTR, 1, and W. Moller, Are the Critics Right? And Widersch. der Quinten und der Quellenforschung, Early Religion of Israel; Van Hoonacker, "Die Erelle der sule, and Sacredness with a Tradition and an "Early Religion of Israel; Van Hoonacker, "Die Erelle der sule, and Sacredness with a Tradition and an .."}


dings, and it is impossible to sever it from the history of the "people of the book"—as Mohammed called them. It appears then that it possesses in some unique and profound way to the creation of an intensely universal character and a few words must be said as to this.

The great literary qualities of the work have undoubtedly been an important factor. All readers have felt the fascination of the stories. The Jewish character has also counted for much; so again have the moral and ethical doctrines, and the miraculous and unprecedented nature of the events narrated. And yet there is much that might have been thought to militate against the book's obtaining any wide influence. Apart from some phrases about all the families of the earth being blessed (or blessing themselves) in the seed of Abraham, there is very little in its direct teaching to suggest that it was ever intended to be of universal application. Possibly these phrases only mean that other nations will use Israel as a typical example of greatness and happiness and pray that they may attain an equal degree of glory and prosperity. Moreover, the Pentateuch is a document that cannot exist, and a corpus of jural law that has not been adopted by other peoples. Of its most characteristic requirement—holiness—large elements are rejected by all save its own people. Wherein then lies its universal element? How can an intensely national of books to exercise a world-wide and ever-growing influence? The reason lies in the very first sentence: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." This doctrine of the unity of all things is the answer to our question. Teach that there is a God and One Only All-powerful God, and the book that tells of Him acquires a message to all His creatures.

Of the national character of the work something has already been said. It is remarkable that for its own people it has in very truth contained life and length of days, for it has been in and through that book that the Jews have maintained themselves throughout their unique history. If it be asked wherein the secret of this strength lies, the answer is in the combination of the national and the religious. The course of history must have been entirely different if the Pentateuch had not been the book of the people long before the Jews became the subjects of the book of the world.
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IV. ON PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM

V. TARGUMS AND CHRONICLE LITERATURE

The existence of a Sam community in Nablus is generally known, and the fact that they have a recension of the Pent which differs in some respects from the Massoretic has been long recognized as important.

I. Knowledge of the Samaritan Pentateuch.—Of the Gr Fathers Origen knew of it and notes two insertions which do not appear in

1. In Older Times Nu 13:1 and 21:12, drawn from Dt 1.2 and 2.18. Eusebius of Caesarea in his Chronicon compares the ages of the patriarchs before Abraham in the

LXX with those in the Sam Pent and the MT. Epiphanius is aware that the Samaritans acknowledged the Pent alone as canonical. Cyril of Jerusalem notes agreement of LXX and Sam in Gen 4:8. These are the principal evidences of knowledge of this recension among the Gr Fathers. Jerome notes some omissions in the MT and supplies them from Sam. The Talm shows that the Jews retained a knowledge of the Sam Pent longer, and speaks contemptuously of the points in which it differs from the MT. Since the differences observed by the Fathers and the Talmudists are to be seen in the Sam Pent before us, they afford evidence of its authenticity.

After nearly a millennium of oblivion the Sam Pent was restored to the knowledge of Christendom by Pietro de la Valle who in 1616 published

2. Revised a copy from the Sam comm. Knowledge of the Pent which then existed in Damascus. This copy was presented in 1623 to the Paris Oratory and shortly after published in Paris Polyglot under the editorship of Morinus, a priest of the Oratory who had been a Protestant. He emphasized the difference between the MT and Sam Pent for argumentative reasons, in order to prove the necessity for the intervention of the church to set up which was correct. A fierce controversy resulted, in which various divines, Protestant and Catholic, took part. Since then copies of this recension have multiplied in Europe and America. All of them may be regarded as copies ultimately of the Nablus roll. These copies are in the form, not of rolls, but of codices or bound volumes. They are usually written in two columns to the page, one being the Tg or interpretation and this is sometimes in Aramaic and sometimes in Arabic. Some codices show three columns with both Tgs. There are probably nearly 100 of these codices in various libraries in Europe and America. These are all written in the Sam script and differ only by scribal blunders.

II. Codices and Script.—The visitor to the Samaritans is usually shown an ancient roll, but only rarely is the most ancient exhibited.

1. The Nablus Roll is it in circumstances in which it may be examined. Dr. Mills, who spent three months in the Sam community, was able to make a careful though interrupted study of it. His description (Nablus and the Modern Samaritans, 312) is that "the roll is of parchment, written in columns, 13 in. deep, and 7 in. wide. The writing is in a fair hand, rather small; each column contains from 70 to 72 lines, and the whole roll contains 110 columns. The name of the scribe is written in a kind of acrostic, running through these columns, and is found in the Book of Dt. The roll has the appearance of very great antiquity, but is wonderfully well preserved, considering its venerable age. It is worn out and torn in many places and patched with re-written parchment; in many other places, where not even the writing is worn, it seemed to me that about two-thirds of the original is still readable. The skins of which the roll is composed are of equal size and measure each 25 in. long by 15 in. wide." Dr. Rosen’s account on the authority of Kraus (Zeitschr. der deutschen Gesellschaft, XVIII, 582) agrees with this, adding that the “breadth of the writing is a line and the space between is similar.” Both observers have noted that the parchment has been written only on the ‘hair’ side. It is preserved in a silk covering inclosed in a silver case embossed with arkaeshh nombrons.

The reader on opening one of the codices of the Sam Pent recognizes at once the difference of the writing from the characters in an ordinary Heb Bible. The Jews admit that the character in which the Sam Pent is written is older than their square character. It is said in the Talm (Sanhedrin 21b): The law at first was given to Israel in ‘shvri’ letters and in the holy tongue and again has Ezra in the square ('ashbhr) character and the Aram. tongue. Israel chose for themselves the ‘ashbhr” character and the holy tongue; they left to the ‘heihyygof’ (“uncultured”) the ‘ashbhr character and the Aram. tongue—"the Cuthenians are the ‘heihyygof,’" says Rabbi Hasen. When Jewish hatred of

Samaritan High Priest with Scroll.
the Samaritans, and the contempt of the Pharisees for them are remembered, this admission amounts to a demonstration. The Sam script resembles that on the Maccabean coins, but is not identical with it. It may be regarded as between the square character and the angular, the latter as is seen in the MS and the Siloam inscription. Another intermediate form, that found on the Assouan papyri, owes the differences it presents to having been written with a reed on papyrus. As the chronology of these scripts is of importance we subjoin those principally in question.

3. Peculiarities in Writing

In inscriptions the lapidary had no hesitation, irrespective of syllables, in completing in the next line any letter to which he had been led by a characteristic of the previous letters. In the papyri the words are not divided, but the scribe was not particular in the distribution of words. The second line is wider spacing. The first letter or couple of letters of each line are placed directly under the first letter or letters of the preceding line—so with the last letters—two or three of the line, while the other words are spread out to fill up the space. The only exception to this is a paragraph ending. Words are separated from each other by dots; sentences by a sign like our colon. The Torah is divided into 906 kism or paragraphs. The termination of these is shown by the colon having a dot added to it, thus :. Sometimes this is reinforced by a line and an angle—<. These kism are often enumerated on the margin; sometimes, in later MSS in Arab, numerals. A—sometimes separates one of these kism from the next.

When the scribe wished to inform the reader of his personality and the place where he had written the MS, he made use of a peculiar device. In copying he left a space near the middle of a column. The space thus left is a column now and then bridged by a single letter. These letters read down the column forming words and sentences which convey the information. In the case of the Nabûlûs scribe this takes place in DT and occupies three columns. In this it is said, "A Abshuú, son of Pinhas [Pinhehas], son of Elezar, son of Aharon [Aaron] the priest, have written this holy book in the wall of the tabernacle of the congregation in Mt. Gerizim in the 18th year of the rule of the children of Israel in the land of Canaan." Most of the codices in the libraries of Europe and America have like information given in a similar manner. This tarikh is usually Hebrew, but sometimes it is in Sam Aramaic. Falsification of the date merely is practically impossible; the forgery must be the work of the first scribe.

5. The Mode of Pronunciation

Not only has the difference of script to be considered, but also the different values assigned to the letters. The names given to the letters differ considerably from the Heb, as may be seen above. There are no vowel points or signs of reduplication. Only B and P of the square or KPLH are aspirated. The most singular peculiarity is that none of the gutturals are pronounced at all—a peculiarity which explains some of the names given to the letters. This characteristic appears all the more striking when it is remembered how prominent gutturals are in Arab, the everyday language of the Samaritans. The first 5 verses of Genesis are subjoined according to the Sam pronunciation, as taken down by Petermann (Versuch einer hebr. Fornehmlehre, 161), from the reading of Ahrarun the high priest: E. ráshh bâh Blaum wí oshékhém wí aáréh. Wóár, agaya tê-u bâh wóshekh al fânî, ... um uru Blaum mën, afd al as, aamem waíh la wí yéshíh, waíh al waíh al waíh aír, ada Blaum wí aír ki wóshekh al waíh bêr lef yíh wí wóshekh kara lâh. Uyâ' éer uay kâh yôm aír.

Table Showing Script of Semitic Languages.

| Semitic Name | Hebrew Name | Nabûlûs 800 BC | Siloam 750 BC | Maccabean 400 BC | Assouan 400 BC | Samaritans
|--------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------
| Aphabet      | Beth        | כב‎ | כב‎ | כב‎ | כב‎ | כב‎
| Gomel        | Daniel      | דניאל‎ | דנaniel‎ | דניאול‎ | דניאול‎ | דניאול‎
| Dalath       | He          | י‎ | י‎ | י‎ | י‎ | י‎
| Vav          | Zain        | ז‎ | ז‎ | ז‎ | ז‎ | ז‎
| He           | Yodh        | יו‎ | ‎ | ‎ | ‎ | ‎
| Vav          | Zain        | ז‎ | ז‎ | ז‎ | ז‎ | ז‎
| He           | Yodh        | יו‎ | ‎ | ‎ | ‎ | ‎
| Kof          | Lamed       | ט‎ | ‎ | ‎ | ‎ | ‎
| Lamed        | Moin        | מ‎ | מ‎ | מ‎ | מ‎ | מ‎
| Nun          | Nun         | נ‎ | נ‎ | נ‎ | נ‎ | נ‎
| Nun          | Nun         | נ‎ | נ‎ | נ‎ | נ‎ | נ‎
| Simech       | In           | א‎ | א‎ | א‎ | א‎ | א‎
| In           | Fi          | פ‎ | פ‎ | פ‎ | פ‎ | פ‎
| Gede         | Gede        | ס‎ | ס‎ | ס‎ | ס‎ | ס‎
| Gede         | Kof         | ק‎ | ק‎ | ק‎ | ק‎ | ק‎
| Kof          | Rish        | ר‎ | ר‎ | ר‎ | ר‎ | ר‎
| Rish         | Shin        | ש‎ | ש‎ | ש‎ | ש‎ | ש‎
| Shin         | Taf         | ת‎ | ת‎ | ת‎ | ת‎ | ת‎

There is no doubt that if the inscription given above is really in the MS it is a forgery written on the skin at the first. Of its falsity there is also no doubt. The Am Tab of the NA- sent from Canaan, and nearly contemporary with the Israelite conquest of the land were impressed with cuneiform characters and the language was Bab. Neglecting the tarikh, we may examine the matter independently and come to certain conclusions. If it is the original from which the other MSs have been copied we are forced to assume a date earlier at least than the 10th cent. AD, which is the date of the earliest Heb MS. The script dates from the Hammonaean. The reason of this mode of writing being perpetuated in copying the Law must be found in some special sanctity in the document from which the copies were made originally. Dr. Mills seems almost inclined to believe the authenticity of the tarikh. His reasons, however, have been rendered less persuasive by Mr. C. O. Cowley, on the other hand, would date it somewhere about the 12th cent. AD, or from that to the 14th. With all the respect due to such a scholar we venture to think his view untenable. His hypothesis is that an old MS was found and the tarikh now seen
in it was afterward added. That, however, is impossible unless a new skin—the newness of which would be obvious—had been written over and inserted. Even the comparatively slight change implied in turning Ishmael into Israel in the tarikh in the MT-Nahdimscroll necessitates a great adjustment of lines, as the letters of the tarikh are handled horizontally as well as perpendicularly. If that change were made, the date would then be approximately 650 AD, much older than Cowley's 12th cent. There is, however, nothing in this to explain the substitution of this MT—necessarily, because the roll was saved from fire, that it leaped out of the fire in the presence of Nebuchadnezzar. If it were found unconsumed when the temple on Mt. Gerizim was burned by John Hyrcanus I, this would account for the veneration in which it is held. It would account for its being stored in theScripture. The angular script prevailed until near the time of Alexander the Great. In it or in a script akin to it the copy of the Law must have been written which Manasseh, the son-in-law of Sanballat, brought to Samaria. The presentation of such a copy would be ascribed to miracle and the script consecrated.

III. Relation of the Samaritan Recension to the MT and LXX—While the reader of the Sam text cannot fail to perceive its practical identity with the MT, closer study to MT: reveals numerous, if minor, differences. These differences are classified by Gesenius. Besides being illogically classified, the differences are faulty, founded on the assumption that the Sam Pent text is the later. The same may be said of Kohn's. We would venture on another classification of these variations, deriving the principle of division from their origin. These variations were due either to (1) accident or (2) intention.

(a) The first of these classes arose from the way in which books were multiplied in ancient days. Most commonly one read and a score of scribes, probably slaves, wrote to this dictation. Hence errors might arise when from similarity of letters the reader mistook one word for another. (b) If the reader's pronunciation was not distinct the scribes might mis-hear and therefore write the word amiss. (c) Further, if the reader began a sentence which opened in a way that naturally was followed by certain words or phrases, he might inadvertently continue it, not in the way it was written before him, but in the customary phrase. In the same way the scribe through defective attention might also blunder. Thus the accidental variations may be regarded as due to mistakes of sight, hearing and attention. (2) Variations due to intention are either (a) grammatical, the removal of peculiarities and conforming them to usage, or (b) logical, as when a command having been given, the fulfillment is felt to follow as a logical necessity and so is narrated, or, if narrated, is omitted according to the ideas of the audience; or (c) doctrinal changes introduced into the text to suit the doctrinal position of one side or other. Questions of propriety also lead to alterations—these may be regarded as quasi-doctrinal.

(1) Examples of accidental variations.—(a) Due to mistakes of sight: The cause of mistakes of sight is the likeness of differing letters. These, however, differ in different scripts, as may be proved by consideration of the table of alphabets. Some of these may be found in connection with the Sam Pent text to be due to the resemblance of letters in the Sam script. Most of these are obvious blunders; thus in Gen 19 32, we have the meaningless 'tahuna instead of 'aki'nah, "our father," from the likeness of yod, to the yod of yod, a. In Gen 29 we have "gazed instead of yawzeth, "to seethe," because of the likeness of yod, to yod, or i. These, while in Blayney's transcription of Walton's text, are not in Petermann or the Sam MSS. The above examples are mistakes in Sam MSS, but there are mistakes also in the MT. In Gen 27 30 shows m and l, and the transposition of yod, d, and yod, d. The vb. 'adath, "to be strong," is rare and poetic, and so unlikely to suggest itself to reader or scribe. The renderings of the LXX and Pesh indicate confusion. There are numerous cases, however, where the resembling letters are not in the Sam script, but sometimes in the square character and sometimes in the angular. Some characters resemble each other in both, but not in the Samaritan. The cases in which the only letter in the square script may all be ascribed to variation in the MT. Cases involving the confusion of shadda and yodh are instances in point. It may be said that every one of the instances of variation which depends on confusion of these letters is due to a blunder of a Jewish scribe, e.g. Gen 25 13, where the Jewish scribe has written 'abadh instead of 'rabadh (Nebothi) as usual; 36 5, where the Jewish scribe has yodh instead of yod (Jehu). In the KJV rendering, writing 'raddh instead of 'raddh, the Jewish scribe in regard to the same letters has made a blunder which the Sam scribe has avoided. When d and r are confused, it must not be ascribed to the likeness in the square script, for those letters are alike in the angular also. As the square is admitted to be later than the date of the Sam script, these confusions point to a MS in angular. There are, however, confusions which apply only to letters alike in angular. Thus the word 'adamim, Invar, which Benjamin, binyamin, is written Benjamin; also in Ex 11 pithon instead of pithim, but m and n are alike only in the script of the Siloam inscription. In Dt 12 21, the Sam has yod instead of yod, fsokkken, as the MT has in 12 11, whereas the MT has fsqk, lssim. A study of the alphabets on p. 2314 will show the close resemblance between fsokk and lssim in the Siloam script, as well as the likeness above mentioned between m and n. This points to the fact that the MSS from which the MT and the Sam were transcribed in some period of their history were written in angular of the type of the Siloam inscription, that is to say of the age of Hosekiah.

(b) Variations due to mistakes of hearing: The great mass of these are due to one of two sources, either on the one hand the insertion or omission of a letter, in which case that the vowel is written penuim or the reverse, or, on the other hand, to the mistake of the gutturals. Of the former class the variations are frequency found in chapter. The latter also is fairly frequent, and is due doubtless to the fact that in the time when the originals of the present MSS were transcribed, the gutturals were not pronounced at all. Gen 27 36 shows and in Gen 47 9, and in Gen 23 18, in many Sam MSS, but the result is meaningless. This inability to pronounce the gutturals points to the time considerably before the Arab domination. Possibly this avoidance of the gutturals bore some fashionable element, as the language of law was Lat., a language without gutturals. A parallel instance may be seen in Aquila, who does not transcribe any gutteral, and the gutturals may be connected with the fact that in Assyrisp is practically the only guttural. The colonists
from Assyria might not unlikely be unable to pronounce the gutturals.

(c) Changes due to deficient attention. Another cause of variation in the MT is found in the phenomenon of the reader or scribe not attending sufficiently to the actual word or sentence seen or heard; this is manifested in an interchange of words in the text.

In Gen 26:31 the Sam has 'Lehah, 'to his friend,' instead of as the MT 'Ehah, 'to his brother,' and in Ex 5:20 the Sam has 'Tehorah' instead of 'M'sorah.' In other cases it is impossible to determine which represents the original text. We may remark that the assumption of Muhammad that the MT text is always correct is due to mere prejudice. More important is the occasional interchange of a verb in the text.

In Gen 24:10, where Sam has YWfH and the MT Selh, and Gen 7:1 where it has 'Elshim and Selh, this is an instance in which the MT is more singular, in that in the 9th verse of the same chapter the MT has 'Elshim and the Sam YWfH. Another class of instances which may be due to the same cause is the completion of a sentence by adding a clause or, it may be, dropping it from failure to observe it to be incorrect.

If the text is incorrect, the Sam adds the clause "a little water from thy pitcher": if the Sam then the MT has dropped it.

(2) Changes due to intention.—(a) Grammatical: This arises from the most frequent of all the many errors with which the writing in the Sam Pent are those necessary to conform the language to the rules of ordinary grammar. In this the Sam frequently coincides with the K'th of the MT. The K'th of the MT has been brought into the Sam by 'reading' in the personal pronoun sing. In both mas. and fem. it is k'th. The Sam with the K'th corrects this to k'th'. So with na'ar, "a youth":—this is common in the K'th of the MT, but in the k'th when a young woman is in question the fem. termination is added, and so the Sam writers also. It is a possible supposition that this characteristic of the Torah is late and due to blundering peculiar to the MS from which the Massoretes copied the K'th. That it is systematic is being due to the gender, and that the latest Heb books maintain distinction of gender, we must regard this as an evidence of antiquity. This is confirmed by another set of variations between the Sam and the MT. There are, in the latter, traces of case-endings which have disappeared in later Heb. These are removed in the Sam. That case terminations have a tendency to disappear is to be seen in Eng. and Fr. The sign of the accusative, 'eth, frequently omitted in the MT, is indicated in the Sam in the case of the demonstrative pronoun pl. ('el instead of 'elah) is restricted to the Pent and 1 Ch 20:8. The syntax of the cohortative is different in Sam from that in the Massoretic Heb. It is not to be assumed that the Heb is only correct in the Sam. There are cases where, with colloquial inexactitude, the MT has joined a pl. noun to a singular vb., and vice versa; these are corrected in the Sam. Conjugations which in later Heb have a definite meaning in relation to the root, but are used in the MT of the Torah in quite other senses, are brought in the Sam Pent into harmony with later use. It ought in passing to be noted that these pentecostal forms do not occur in the Prophets; even in Josh 2:15 we find the fem. 3d personal pronoun in Jgs 19:3 we have na'darah.

(b) Logical: Sometimes the context or the circumstances implied have led to a change on one side or another. This may be, e.g., the change of some of the numbers, as in Gen 2:2, where the Sam has "sixth" instead of "seventh" (MP), in this agreeing with the LXX and Pesh, the Jewish belief the thinking the "sixth" day could only be reckoned ended when the "seventh" had begun. In Gen 4:2, after the clause, 'A Cain and Abel," the Sam, LXX and Pesh add, "Let us go into the field." From the evidence of the VSS, from the historical character of the man, and from the "visa" not speaks, from the natural meaning also of the preposition 'el, "to," not "with," see Genesis, it is clear that the MT in this place and that the Sam, LXX and Pesh represent the true text. If this is not the case, it is a case of logical completion on the part of the Sam. Another instance is the addition to each name in the genealogy in Gen 11:10-24 of the sum of the years of his life. In the case of the narrative of the plagues of Egypt a whole paragraph is added frequently. What has been commanded Moses and Aaron is repeated as history, and the result was no better than the original.

(c) Doctrinal: There are cases in which the text so suits the special views of the Samarians concerning the character of God or the doctrine of redemption that the direction it may be supposed to be the likeliest explanation. Thus there is inserted at Gen 20:17 the Pesh. Gerizim being put for Ebal, the object of the addition being to give the consecration of Gerizim the sanction of the Torah; and it defends the authenticity of this passage as against the NT. Insertion or omission according to doctrinal predilections is also seen in Gen 25:4. The Sam harmonizes the command of Jec with the action of Moses. The passage of the people in the desert, which looks so difficult to defend, on the other hand, the Jewish hatred of idolatry might suggest itself in the context, and take all the passage of the people and hang them up before the Lord against the sun, and so might be inserted. There are cases also where the language is altered for reasons of propriety. In these cases the Sam agrees with the K'th of the MT.

These variations are of unequal value as evidence of the relative date of the Sam recension of the Pent. The intention is for this purpose of little value; they are evidence of the views prevalent in the northern and southern districts of Pal respectively. Only visual blinders are of real importance, and they point to a date about the days of Hezekiah as the time when the two recensions began to diverge. One thing is obvious, that the Sam, at least as often as the MT, represents the primitive text.

(1) Statement of hypotheses.—The frequency with which the points in which the Sam Pent differs from the MT agree with those in which the LXX agrees with the MT has the support of the NT. In Gal 3:17, the apostle Paul, following the Sam and LXX against the MT, makes the "430 years" which terminated with the exodus begin with Abraham. As a rule the attention of Bib. scholars has been so directed to the resemblances between the Sam and the LXX that they have neglected the more numerous points of difference. So impressed have scholars been, e.g., when Jews, by these resemblances, have still been more dependent on the other. Frankel has maintained that the Sam was tr4 from the LXX. Against this is the fact that in all their insulting remarks against them the Talmudists never assert that the "Cushanrasis" (Sam Pent) are tr4 from the Greeks. Further, even if they only got the Law through Manasseh, the son-in-law of Sanballat, and even if he lived in the time of Alexander the Great, this was nearly half a century before the earliest date of the LXX. Again, while there are many evidences in the LXX that it has been tr4 from Heb, there are none in the Sam that it has been tr4 from Gr. The converse hypothesis is maintained by Dr. Kohl with all the emphasis of an extended type. His hypothesis is that before the LXX was thought of a Gr tr on a Sam copy of the Law for the benefit of Samarians resident in Egypt. The Jews made use of this at first, but when they found it wrong in many points, they purposed a new tr, but were so much influenced by that to which they were accustomed that it was only an improved edition of the Sam which resulted. But it is improbable that the Samarians, who were few and who had comparatively little intercourse with Egypt, should precede the more numerous Jews with a Gr tr in Egypt, in making a Gr tr. It is further against the Jewish tradition as preserved to us by Jos. It is against the Sam tradition as learned by the present writer from the Sam high priest. According to him, the
Samaritans had no independent tr, beyond the fact that five of the LXX were Samaritan. Had there been any excuse for asserting that the Samaritans were the first translators, that would not have dis- 
adusted the fact that the Targums added by Manasseh, and had been, by his denunciation of foreign marriages, the cause of the banishment of Manasseh and his friends. Is it probable that he, Manasseh, would receive as Mosaic the enforcements from Ezra, or from the pronouncements of the Sama-
ristan church? In the introduction of the P, the latest portion of the Law, 
must accordingly be put considerably earlier than it is placed at present. We have seen that there are visual blunders that can be explained only on the assumption that the MS from which the Samaritan roll was copied was written in some variety of angular script. We have seen, further, that the peculiarities suit those of the Siloeam inscription executed in the reign of Hezekiah, therefore 
approximately contemporary with the Priest sent by Esarhaddon to Samaria to teach the people "the manner of the God of the land." As Amos and Hosea manifest a knowledge of the whole Pent 
appear before the captivity, it would seem that this "Book of the Law" was Perad [Am 5: LXX] without, which would be the historic end of the priest sent from Assyria taught as above "the manner of the God of the land," would contain all the portions—J, E, D, and P—of the Law. If so, it did not retain the Book of Josiah; notwithstanding the honor they give to the reign of Cama 
the Samaritans have not retained the book which relates his exploits. This is confirmed by the fact that the archaism in the MT of the Pent are not found in Josiah. It is singular, if the Prophets were before the Law, that there should be archaism which are not found in the Prophets. From the way the Divine names are interchanged, as we saw, sometimes Elohim in the Sam represents YHWH in the MT, sometimes vice versa, it becomes obviously impossible to lay any stress on this. This conclusion is confirmed by the yet greater frequency with which this inter-
change occurs in the LXX. The result of investigation of the Sam Pent is to throw very considerable doubt on the hypothesis of the interpolations as to the date, origin and structure of the Pent.

V. Targums and Chronicle.—As above noted, there are two Tgs or interpretations of the Sam Pent, an Ara-
bic and an Arabic-Chronicle. The Arabian Targum is a translation of the Western Aram.; in which the Jewish Tgs were written, sometimes contains the same blunders, and often in many strange words, some of which may be due to the language of the Assy 
chroniclers, but many are the result of blunders of copyists and corruption of the language. It agrees very closely to the original and is little given to paraphrase. Much the same may be said of the Arab. Tg. It is usually attribu-
ted to Abu Said of the 13th cent., but according to Dr. Cowley only revised by him from the Tg of Abulhassan of the 11th cent. There is reference occasionally in the 
works of the Patriarch to a Samaritan which has been taken to mean a Gr version. No indubitable quotations from it sur-
style—what seems to be so heinously tr of the text of the Sar 
recension. There is in Arab, a wordy chronicle called "The Book of Joshua," it has been edited by 
Jubalbin. It may be dated in the 13th cent. More recently a "Book of Joshua" in Heb and written in Sam 
characters was alleged to be discovered in New Zealand. But however, it is manifest forgery; the characters in which it is written is very late, it is partly because of Josiah Josh, and partly from the older Sam Book of Joshua with famous additions. The Chronicle of Abulfath 
containing the tolerably accurate account of the history of the 
Samarians after Alexander the Great to the 4th cent. AD.

LITERATURE.—The text in the Sam Pent is found in the 
polyglots—Paris and London. Walton's text in the London Polyglot is transcribed in square characters by 
Drayman, Oxford, 1709. The Longman's, which is of recent times are Mills, Noahs and the Samaritans, London, 1864; Nutt, Fragmenta S. Tg. Sam. Text. London, 1874; Montgomery, The Samaritans, Philadelphia, 1907 this has a very full bibliography which includes articles and periodicals. The Sam Pent and Modern Criticism, 1911, London. In 
Germany, Gesellschaft dissertation, De Pentateuchi Samar-
The old Jewish festival obtained a new significance, for the Christian church, by the promised outpouring of the Holy Spirit (Jn 16:7, 13). The incidents of that memorable day, in the history of the church, are by every vivid and dramatic way in the Acts of the Apostles. The old rendering of *sumperlóteiskhai* (Acts 2:1) by "was fully come" was taken by Lightfoot (Hor. Heb.) to signify that the Christian Pentecost did not coincide with the Jewish, just as Christ's Last Supper was not in the Jewish Passover. This diachronically considered is not to have coincided with the Jewish Passover, on Nisan 14. The bearing of the one on the other is obvious; they stand and fall together. RV translates the obnoxious word simply "was now come." Meyer, in his commentary on the Acts, treats this question at length. The tradition of the ancient church placed the first Christian Pentecost on a Sunday. According to John, the Passover that year occurred on Friday, Nisan 14 (18:26). But according to Mt, Mk and Lk, the Passover that year occurred on Thursday, Nisan 14, and hence Pentecost fell on Saturday. The Kairates explained the *shabbóth* of Lev 23:15 as pointing to the Sabbath of the paschal week and therefore not the Jewish Passover. But it is very uncertain whether the custom existed in Christ's day, and moreover it would be impossible to prove that the disciples followed this custom, if it could be proved to have existed. Meyer follows the Johannic reckoning and openly states that the other evangelists made a mistake in their reckoning. No offhand decision is possible, and it is but candid to admit that here we are confronted with one of the knottiest problems in the harmonizing of the Gospels. See Chronology of the NT.

The occurrences of the first Pentecost day after the resurrection of Christ set it apart as a Christian festival and invested it, together with the commemoration of the resurrection, with a new meaning. We will not enter here upon a discussion of the significance of the events of the pentecostal day described in Acts 2. That is discussed in the article under Tongues (q.v.). The Lutherans, in their endeavor to prove the inherent power of the Word, claim that "the effects then exhibited were due to the divine power inherent in the words of Christ; and that they had resisted that power up to the day of Pentecost and then yielded to its influence." This is well described as "an incredible hypothesis" (Hodge, Systematic Theol., III, 484). The Holy Spirit descended in order to "fulfill the explicit promise of the glorified Lord, and the disciples had been prayerfully waiting for its fulfillment (Acts 1:4.14). The Spirit came upon them as "a power from on high." The Holy Spirit proved on Pentecost His personal existence, and the intellects, the hearts, the lives of the apostles were on that day miraculously changed. By that day they were fitted for the arduous work that lay before them. There is some difference of opinion as to what is the significance of Pentecost for the church as an institution. The almost universal view among theologians and exegetes is this: that Pentecost marks the founding of the Christian church as an institution. This day is said to mark the dividing line between the ministry of the Lord and the ministry of the Spirit. The later church fathers had advanced the idea that the origin of the church, as an institution, is to be found in the establishment of the apostolate, in the selection of the Twelve. Dr. A. Kuyper holds that the church as an institution was founded when Jesus called the Twelve, and that these men were "qualified for their calling by the power of the Holy Spirit." He distinguishes between the institution and the constitution of the church. Dr. H. Bavinck
says: “Christ gathers a church about Himself, rules it directly so long as He is on the earth, and appoints twelve apostles who later on will be His witnesses. The institution of the apostolate is an esp. strong proof of the institutional character which Christ gave to His church on the earth” (Geref. Dogm., IV, 64).

Whatever we may think of this matter, the fact remains that Pentecost completely changed the apostles, and led them into a new horizon, to which the Holy Spirit enabled them to become witnesses of the resurrection of Christ as the fundamental fact in historic Christianity, and to extend the church according to Christ’s commandment. Jerome has an esp. elegant passage in which Pentecost is compared with the beginning of the Jewish national life on Mt. Sinai (Ad Tabith., § 7): “There is Sinai, here Sion; there the trembling mountain, here the trembling house; there the flaming mountain, here the flaming tongues; there the noisy thunderings, here the sounds of many tongues; there the clanger of the ramshorn, here the notes of the gospel-trumpet.” This vivid passage shows the close analogy between the Jewish and Christian Pentecost.

In the post-apostolic Christian church Pentecost belonged to the so-called “Semester Domini,” distinct from the “Semestre Ecclesiæs.”

3. Later Christian Christian As yet there was no trace of Christmas, Observance which began to appear about 360 AD.

Easter, the beginning of the pentecostal period, closed the “Quadragesima,” or “Lent,” the entire period of which had been marked by self-denial and humiliation. On the contrary, the entire pentecostal period, the so-called “Quinquagesima,” was marked by joyfulness, daily communion, abstention from fasts, standing in prayer, etc. Ascension Day, the 40th day of the period, ushered in the climax of this joyfulness, which burst forth in its fullest volume on Pentecost. It was highly esteemed by the Fathers. Chrysostom calls it “the metropolis of the festivals” (De Pentec., Hom. ii); Gregory of Nazianzen calls it “the day of the Spirit” (De Pentec., Orat. 44). All the Fathers sound its praises. For they fully understood, with the church of the ages, that on that day the dispensation of the Spirit was brought about in dispensation of greater privileges and of a broader horizon and of greater power than had hitherto been vouchsafed to the church of the living God. The festival “Octaves,” which, in accordance with the Jewish custom, devoted the whole week to the celebration of the festival, from the 8th cent., gave place to a two days’ festival, a custom still preserved by the Roman church and such Protestant bodies as follow the ecclesiastical year. The habit of dressing in white and of seeking baptism on Pentecost gave it the name “Whitsunday,” by which it is popularly known all over the world. HENRY E. DOSKER

PENUEL, pê-nô-ul, pen-ô-ul. See Penuiel.

PENURÍ, pen-u-ri (πενυρί, mahgâr): In Prov 14 23, with sense of “poverty,” “want”; “The talk of the lips tendeth only to penury.” In the NT the word in Lk 21 4 (lôrêpma, xustêrêma) is in RV tr. “want” (of the widow’s mites).

PEOPLE, pê’yl: In EV represents something over a dozen Heb and Gr words. Of these, in the OT, דַּעַ֔ג, ‘am, is overwhelmingly the most common (some 2,000 t.), with דִּינָֽו, le’môn, and גֹּי, next in order; but the various Heb words are used with very little or no difference in force (e.g. Prov 14 28; but, on the other hand, in Ps 44 contrast vs 12 and 14). Of the changes introduced by RV the only one of significance (cited evidence in the Preface to ERV) is the frequent use of the pl. “peoples” (strangely avoided in AV except Rev 10 11, 17 18), where 10 times the word, “people,” is used. So, for instance, in Ps 67 4; Isa. 55 4; 60 2, with the contrast marked in Ps 33 10 and 12; Ps 77 14 and 15, etc. In the NT, λαός, ñōs, is the most common word, with ἔθνος, òthnos, used almost as often in AV. But in RV the latter word is almost always rendered “nations,” “peoples” being used only in Lk 7 12; Acts 11 21 26; 19 26, and in the fixed phrase “the common people” (ὁ ἐθνὸς ἔθνος, ho òthnos othnos) in Mk 12 37; Jn 12 9.12 m (the retention of “people” would have been better in Jn 11 42, also) with “crowd” (Mt 9 23; 25; Acts 21 35). The only special use of “people” that calls for attention is the phrase “people of the land.” This may mean simply “inhabitants,” as Ezk 12 19; 33 2; 39 13; but in 2 K 11 14, etc. and the parallel in 2 Ch, it means the people as contrasted with the king, while in Jer 1 18, etc., and in Ezk 7 27; 22 29; 46 3.9, it means the common people as distinguished from the priests and the aristocracy. A different usage is that for the heathen, (Gen 10 12; Nu 23 8; Jer 9 1 2; 10 2 11; Neh 10 38; Is 35 10; Hos 10 16:31) inhabitants of Pal. From this last use, the phrase came to be applied by some rabbis to even pure-blooded Jews, if they neglected the observance of the rabbinic traditions (cf. Jn 7 49 AV). With “people of the East” see CHILDREN OF THE EAST.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

PEOR, pê’ôr (πηρ, ho-p’ôr; פֶּה, Phôgôr): (1) A mountain in the land of Moab, the last of the three heights to which Balaam was guided by Balak in order that he might curse Israel (Nu 22 32). It is placed by Onom on the way between Livias and Heshbon, 7 Rom miles from the latter. Buhl would identify it with Jebel el-Mesheikhkar, on which are the ruins of an old town, between Wady Aysin Misa and Wady Heshbon.

(2) A town in the Judaean uplands added by LXX (fôyvph, Phôgôr) to the list in Josh 16 9. It may be identical with Khirbet Fâghûr to the S. of Bethlehem.

(3) Peor, in Nu 26 15; 31 16; Josh 22 17, is a Divine name standing for “Basal-peor.”

(4) In Gen 36 39, LXX reads Phôgôr for “Pau” (MT), which in 1 Ch 1 50 appears as “Pai.”

W. W. Ewing

PERAEA, pê-rê’ã (περαία, hê Peraiâ, Êpeíâ, Êperâ, Peratîâ, Perâtîâ, Perâlîâ: This is not a Scriptural name, but the term used by Jos to denote the district to which the rabbis habitually refer as “the land beyond Jordan.” This corresponds to the NT phrase περαῖ τοῦ Ἰορδανοῦ (Mt 4 15; 19 1, etc.). The boundaries of the province are given by Jos (Bj IV, iii, 3). In length it reached from Pella in the N. to Machaerus in the S., and in breadth from the Jordan on the W. to the desert on the E. We may take it that the southern boundary was the Arnon. The natural boundary on the N. would be the great gorge of the Yarmuk. Gadara, Jos tells us (Bj IV, vii, 3, 6), was capital of the Perea. But the famous city on the Yarmuk was a member of the Decapolis, and so could hardly take that position. More probably Jos referred to a city the ruins of which are found at Jodâr— a reminiscence of the ancient name—not far from Pella. The northern frontier was held by the Arnon, the southern boundary of the Peræa would run, as Jos says, from Pella eastward. For the description of the country thus indicated see GILEAD, 2.

In the time of the Maccabees the province was mainly gentle, and Julius Josue, if necessary to
remove to Judea the scattered handful of Jews to secure their safety (1 Mac 5 45). Possibly under Hyrcanus Jewish influence began to
2. History prevail; and before the death of Jan-
the whole country was owned his sway (BTP, I, i, 297, 306). At the death of Herod the Great it became part of the tetrarchy of Ant-
us (Ant, XVII, vii, 1). The tetrarch built a city on the site of the ancient Beth-haram (Josh 13 27) and called it Julias in honor of the emperor’s wife (Ant, XVIII, ii, 1; BJ, II, ix, 1). Here Simon made his abortive rising (Ant, XVII, x, 6; BJ, II, iv, 2). Claudius placed it under the gov-
ernment of Felix (BJ, II, xii, 8). It was finally added to the Roman dominions by Phæadius (BJ, IV, vii, 3-4). Under the Moslems it became part of the province of Damascus.

Peræa, “the land beyond Jordan,” ranked along with Judæa and Galileæ as a province of the land of Israel. The people were under the same laws as regarded tithes, marriage and property.

Peræa lay between two gentle provinces on the E., as Samaria between two Jewish provinces on the W. of the Jordan. The fords below Besaḏa and other well-accorded communication with Galileæ and Judæa respectively. Peræa thus formed a link connecting the Jewish provinces, so that the pilgrims from any part might go to Jerusalem and return without setting foot on gentile soil. And what of equal importance, they could avoid peril of hurt or indignity which the Samaritans loved to inflict on Jews passing through Samaria (Lk 9 52; Ant, XX, vi, 1; Vita, 62).

It seems probable that Jesus was baptized within the confines of the Peræa; and thither He came from the turmoil of Jerusalem at the Feast of the Dedica-
tion (Jn 10 40). It was the scene of much quiet and profitable intercourse with His disciples (Mt 19; Mk 10 1-31; Lk 18 15-30). These passages are by many thought to refer to the period after His retirement to Ephraim (Jn 11 54). It was from Peræa that He was summoned by the sisters at Bethany (ver 3).

Peræa furnished in Niger one of the bravest men who fought against the Romans (BJ, II, xx, 4; IV, vi, 1). From Bethæzah, a village of Peræa, came Mary, whose story is one of the most appall-
ing among the terrible tales of the siege of Jerus (BJ, VI, iii, 4). Jos mentions Peræa for the last time; it was echoed by the dolorous groans and outcries that accompanied the destruc-
tion of Jerusalem.

W. Ewing

PERAZIM, per-a-zim, pær-’az-im, MOUNT (“per’-ez,” har-p’ræ’ah): “Jehovah will rise up as in mount Perazim” (Isa 29 21). It is usually considered to be identical with Bāal-perazim (q.v.), where David obtained a victory over the Philistines (2 S 5 20; 1 Ch 14 11).

PERDITION, per-di’thun (ἀπώλεια, ἀπόλεια, “ruin” or “loss,” physical or eternal): The word “perdition” occurs in the Eng. Bible 8 t (Jn 17 12; Phil 1 28); 2 Thess 2 3; 1 Tim 6 9; He 10 39; 2 Pet 3 7; Rev 17 11.8). In each of these cases it denotes the final state of ruin and punishment which forms the opposite to salvation. The vb. apōlyein, from which the word is derived, has two meanings: (1) to lose; (2) to destroy. Both of these pass over to the noun, so that apōleia comes to signify: (1) loss; (2) ruin, destruction. The former occurs in Mt 26 8; Mk 14 4, the latter in the passages cited above. Both meanings had been adopted into the religious terminology of the Church, as early as the LXX. “To be lost in the religious sense may mean “to be missing” and “to be ruined.” The former meaning attaches to it in the teaching of Jesus, who compares the lost sinner to the missing coin, the missing sheep, and makes him the object of a seeking activity (Mt 15 24; 18 11; Lk 15 32).

“To be lost” here signifies to have become estranged from God, to miss realizing the relations which man normally sustains toward Him. It is equivalent to what is theologically called “spiritual death.” This conception of “loss” enters also into the de-
scription of the eschatological state of the sinner as assigned in the judgment (Lk 9 24; 17 33), which is a loss of life. The other meaning of “ruin” and “destruction” describes the same thing, from a different point of view. Apōleia being the oppo-
site of σωτηρία, and σωτηρία in its technical usage de-
noting the reclaiming from death unto life, apōleia also acquires the specific sense of such ruin and destruction as involves an eternal loss of life (Phil 1 28; He 10 39). Perdition in this latter sense is equivalent to what theology calls “eternal death.” When in Rev 17 8.11 it is predicated of “the beast,” one of the forms of the world-power, this must be understood on the basis of the OT pro-
phetic representation according to which the com-
ing judgment deals with powers rather than persons.

The Son of Perdition is a name given to Judas (Jn 17 12) and to the Antichrist (2 Thess 2 3). This is the well-known Heb idiom by which a person typically embodying a certain trait or character of sin is called the son of that thing. The name therefore represents Judas and the Antichrist (see MAN OF SIN) as most irrecoverably and completely devoted to the final apōleia. GEBHARDUS VOS

PERES, pér’e-zee. See MENE.

PERESH, pér’ē-sh (פרש, perez; “dung”): Son of Machir, grandson of Manasseh through his Aramitic concubine (1 Ch 7 14.16).

PEREZ, pér’e-zee, PHAREZ, fā’rez (“fa’rez, perez,” “breach”): One of the twins born to Judah by Tamar, Zerah’s brother (Gen 38 29.30). In AV Mt 1 3 and Lk 3 33, he is called “Phares,” the name in 1 Esd 5 5. He is “Pharez” in AV Gen 46 12: Nu 26 20.21; Lk 3 25.39; 2 Ch 3 4.5; 4 1; 4 9.4. In AV and RV 1 Ch 27 3; Neh 11 4.6, he is “Perez.” He is important in the fact that by way of Ruth and Boaz and so through Jesse and David his genealogy comes upward to the Saviour. The patronymic “Pharzite” occurs in Nu 26 20 AV.

Perezites (Nu 26 20, AV “Pharzites”). The patronymic of the name Perez.

PEREZ-UZZA, pér’ē-zoo’-za. See UZZA.

PERFECT, pār’fekt, PERFECTION, pār-fek’-shun, shālām, שָלָם, tāmím; צָלָוס, צָלָוס, תָלֶעֹת, teleshوت; “Perfect” in the
1. In the OT is the tr of shālām, “finished.”
2. In the NT “perfect,” “complete, used (except in Dt 15 15, “perfect weight”) of persons, e.g. a “perfect heart,” i.e. wholly or com-
pletely devoted to Jehovah (1 K 8 6 11, etc; 1 Ch 12 38; Isa 38 3, etc); tāmím, “complete.” “perfect,” “sound or unblemished,” is also used of persons and of God; His way, and law (“Noah was a just man and perfect, RV” “blameless” Gen 6 9); “As for God, His way is perfect” (Ps 18 30); “The law of Jehovah is perfect” (Ps 19 7, etc); tām, with the same meaning, occurs only in Job, except twice in Ps
3. 118; 2. 3, etc; Ps 37 37; 64 4); kalid, “complete,” and various other words are trd “per-
fected.”
Perfection is the tr of various words so tr once only: ἀποκατάστασις (Lam 2 15); ἀποκατάστασις, "completeness" (Ps 50 2); ἀποκατάστασις, "possession" (Job 15 20, AV "neither shall he by the perfection (or possession) upon the earth.") AV "neither shall their possessions be extended on the surface of the earth". Red reverses this text and m; ἀποκατάστασις, "completeness," or "perfection" (Ps 119 96); ὠρθοσκευή (twice), "end." 2. In the "perfect" (Mt 5 48, "Ye therefore NT shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect" Mt 19 21, "if thou wouldst be perfect"; Eph 4 13, AV "till we all come... unto a perfect man," RV "full-grown"; Phil 3 15, "as many as are perfect," ARV "men full-grown," 1 Cor 2 6; Col 1 28, "perfect... every perfect man has his end." 3. The Christian Ideal must be forever beyond, not only any human, but any finite, being; it is a Divine ideal forever shining before us, calling us upward, and making endless progression possible. As noted above, the perfect man, in the OT phrase, was the man whose heart was set or wholly devoted to God. Christian perfection must also have its seat in such a heart, but it implies the whole conduct and the whole man, conformeth thereto as knowledge grows and opportunity arises, or might be found. There may be, of course, relative perfections, e.g., a child as a child compared with that of the man. The Christian ought to be continually moving onward toward perfection, looking to Him who is able to "make you perfect in every good thing (or work) to do his will, working in us that which is well-pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be the glory for ever and ever. Amen" (He 13 20).

W. L. WALKER

PERFORM, pér-form′ (Lp, perfomir, "to furnish completely," "to complete," "finish entirely") In modern Eng., through a mistaken connection with "form," "perform" usually suggests an act in its continuity, while the word properly should emphasize only the completion of the act. AV seems to have used the word in only one passage, of 3 sense (cf. Rom 15 28; 2 Cor 8 11, Phil 1 6, where RV has respectively "accomplish," "complete," "perfect"), but usually with so little justification in the Heb or Gr that "do" would have represented the original even better. RV has rarely changed the word in the OT, and such changes as have been made (Dt 23 23; Est 1 15, etc) seen based on no particular principle. In the NT the word has been kept only in Mt 5 33 and Rom 8 1, but in the latter verse vs. 13, RV renders the completion of the act, in the former case a perfect, "lit. to give back," in the latter postē, "to make," "to do," being used.

Performance is found in AV Sir 19 20 (RV "doing"; 2 Macc 11 17, inserted needlessly and omitted by RV), Lk 4 18 (RV "fulfillment); 2 Cor 8 11 (RV "completion").

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

PERFUME, pér-fyüm, pér-fy-üm, PERFUMER (πυραμήν, ἐφαρμός, κατάρ, lit. "incense"). The ancients were fond of sweet perfumes of all kinds (Pro 7 17), and that characteristic is still esp. true of the people of Bible lands. Perfumed oils were rubbed on the body and feet. At a feast in ancient Egypt a guest was anointed with scented oils, and a sweet-smelling water lily was placed in his hand or suspended on his forehead. In their religious worship the Egyptians were lavish with their incense. Small pellets of dried mixed spices and resins or resiny woods were burned in special censers. In the preparation of bodies for burial, perfumed oils and spices were used. Many Bib. references indicate the widespread use of perfumes. Cant 7 8 suggests that the breath was purposely scented; clothing as well as the body was perfumed (Ps 45 8; Cant 3 6; 4 11); clothes and beds were sprinkled with savory scents (Ez 7 17); anoints were used in the last rites in honor of the dead (2 Ch 16 14; Lk 24 1; Jn 19 39). The writer has in his collection a lump of prepared spices and resins taken from a tomb dating from the 1st or 2d cent. AD, which apparently fused and ran into the thoracic cavity, since an impression of the ribs has been made on the perfume. Its odor is similar to that of the incense used today, and it perfumes the whole case where it is kept. The above collection also contains a small glass vial in which is a bronze spoon firmly held in some solidified ointment, probably formerly perfumed oil. Perfumes were commonly kept in sealed alabaster jars or cruces (Lk 7 38). Thousands of these cruces have been unearthed in Pal and Syria.

Perfumes were mixed by persons skilled in the art. In AV these are called "apothecaries" (παραγωγης, ῥακακος). The RV "perfumer" is probably a more correct rendering, as the one who did the compounding was not an apothecary in the same sense as is the person now so designated (Ex 30 25 35; 37 29; Eccl 3 1).

Today incense is used in connection with all religious services of the oriental Christian churches. Although there is no direct mention of the uses of incense in the NT, such allusions as Paul's "a-sac-
The delights of the people of Syria in pleasant odors is recorded in their literature. The altar of roses (from Arab. 'hr, "a sweet odor") was a well-known product of Damascus. The guest in a modern Syrian home is not literally anointed with oil, but he is often given, soon after he enters, a bunch of aromatic herbs or a sweet-smelling flower to hold and smell. During a considerable portion of the year the country air is laden with the odor of aromatic herbs, such as basil, lavender, thyme. The Arabic phrase for taking a walk is *sewam el-hvwah*, lit. "smell the air." See Incense; Oil; Ointment.

JAMES A. PATCH

PERFUME-MAKING. See Crafts, II, 14.

PERGA, pér'ga (Πηγή, Perga): An important city of the ancient province of Pamphylia, situated on the river Cestrus, 12 miles N.E. of 1. Location Attalia. According to Acts 13:13, and History Paul, Barnabas and John Mark visited Perga on their first mission journey, and 2 years later, according to Acts 14:24-25, they may have preached there. Though the water of the river Cestrus has now been diverted to the fields for irrigating purposes, in ancient times the stream was navigable, and ships took off on the sea might reach the city. It is uncertain how ancient Perga is; its walls, still standing, seem to come from the Seleucid period or from the 3d cent. BC. It remained in the possession of the Seleucid kings until 189 BC, when Rom influence became strong in Asia Minor. A long series of coins, beginning in the 2d cent. BC, continued until 286 AD, and upon them Perga is mentioned as a metropolis. Though there is a strong hold of Christianity, it was the bishopric of Western Pamphylia, and several of the early Christians were martyred there. During the 8th cent. under Byzantine rule the city declined; in 1084 Attalia became the metropolis, and Perga rapidly fell to decay. While Attalia was the chief Gr and Christian city of Pamphylia, Perga was the seat of the local Asiatic goddess, who corresponded to Artemis or Diana of the Ephesians, and was locally known as Leito, or the queen of Perga. She was represented on the coins as a huntress, with a bow in her hand, and with sphinxes or stags at her side.

The ruins of Perga are now called Murtana. The walls, which are flanked with towers, show the city to have been quadrangular in shape.

2. The Ruins

Very broad streets, intersecting through the town, and intersecting each other, divided the city into quarters. The sides of the streets were covered with porticoes, and along their centers were water channels in which a stream was always flowing. They were on open at short intervals by bridges. Upon the higher ground was the acropolis, where the earliest city was built, but in later times the city extended to the S. of the hill, where one may see the greater part of the ruins. On the acropolis is the platform of a large structure with fragments of several granite columns, probably representing the temple of the goddess Leito; others regard it as the ruin of an early church. At the base of the acropolis are the ruins of an immense theater which seated 13,000 people, the agora, the baths and the stadium. Without the walls many tombs are to be seen. E. J. BANKS

PERGAMOS, pér'ga-mos, or PERGAMUM, pér'ga-mum (ἡ Πέργαμου, hē Pergamou, or τὸ Πέργαμον, to Pergamon): Pergamos, to which the ancient writers also gave the neuter form of the name, was a city of Mysea of the ancient Rom province of Asia, in the Caicus valley, 3 miles from the river, and about 15 miles from the sea. The city is navigable, and a fine harbor was the natural craft. Two of the tributaries of the Caicus were the Selinus and the Rteos. The former of these rivers flowed through the city; the latter ran along its walls. On the hill between these two streams the first city stood, and there also stood the acropolis, the chief temples, and the theaters of the later city. The early peoples of the town were descendants of Gr colonists, and as early as 420 BC they struck their coins at the possession of the town, deposited there 9,000 talents of gold. Upon his death, Philetaerus (283-263 BC) used this wealth to found the independent Gr dynasty of the Attalids kings. The first of this dynasty to bear the title of king was Attalus I (241-197 BC), a nephew of Philetaerus, and not only did he adorn the city with beautiful buildings until it became the most wonderful city of the East, but he added to his kingdom the countries of Mysia, Lydia, Caria, Pamphylia, and Phrygia. Eumenes II (197-159 BC) was the last of the Attalid kings of the dynasty, and during his reign the city reached its greatest height. Art and literature were encouraged, and in the city was a library of 200,000 volumes which later Antony gave to Cleopatra. The books of this library were first used; hence the word "parchment," which is derived from the name of the town P. Of the structures which adorned the city, the most renowned was the altar of Zeus, which was 90 ft. in height, and also one of the wonders of the ancient world. When in 133 BC Attalus III, the last king of the dynasty, died, he gave his kingdom to the Rom government. His son, Aristionus, however, attempted to set up for himself, but in 129 he was defeated, and the Rom province of Asia was formed, and P. was made its capital. The term Asia, as here employed, should not be confused with the continent of Asia, nor with Asia Minor. It applied simply to that part of Asia Minor which was then in the possession of the Romans, and formed into the province of which P. was the capital. Upon the establishment of the province of Asia there began a new series of coins struck at P., which continued into the Rom. AD. The magnificence of the city continued.

There were beautiful temples to the four great gods Zeus, Dionysus, Athena and Asclepius. To the temple of the latter, invalids from 2. Religions all parts of Asia flocked, and there, bowing in gratitude to the god revealed to the priests and physicians by means of dreams the remedies which were necessary to heal their maladies. Thus opportunities of deception were numerous. There was a school of medicine in connection with the temple. P. was chiefly a religious center of the province. A title which it bore was "Thrice Neokoros," meaning that in the city the 3 temples had been built to the Rom emperors, in which the emperors were worshipped as gods. Smyrna, a rival city, was a commercial center, and as it increased in wealth, it gradually became the political center. Later, when it became the capital, P. remained the religious center. As in many of the towns of Asia Minor, there were at P. many Jews, and in 130 BC the people of the city passed a decree in their favor. Many Jews were more or less assimilated with the Greeks, even to the extent of bearing Gr names.

Christianity reached P. early, for there one of the Seven Churches of the Book of Rev stood, and there, according to Rev 2, Antipas was martyred; he was the first Christian to be put to death by the Rom state. The same passage speaks
of P. as the place "where Satan's throne is," probably referring to the temples in which the Rom emperors were worshiped. During the Byzantine times P. still continued as a religious center, for there a bishop lived. However, the town fell into the hands of the Seljuk in 1304, and in 1336 it was taken by Suleiman, the son of Orkhan, and became Turkish.

The modern name of the town, which is of considerable size, possessing 15 mosques, is Bursa, the Turkish corruption of the ancient name. One of its mosques is the early Byzantine church of St. Sophia. The modern town is built among the ruins of the ancient city, but is far less in extent. From 1870 to 1880 excavations among the ruins were conducted by Herr Humann at the expense of the German government. Among them are still to be seen the base of the altar of Zeus, the friezes of which are now in the Pergamon Museum, Berlin; the theater, the agora, the gymnasium, and several temples. In ancient times the city was noted for its ointments, pottery and parchment; at present the chief articles of trade are cotton, wool, opium, valonia, and leather.

E. J. Banks

PERIDA, pé-rí'da (Πηρίδα, πηρίδαθα), "recluses": A family of "Solomon's servants" (Neh 7:57). In Ex 2:5, a difference in the Hebrew spelling gives "Peruda" for the same person, who is also called the "Pharida" of 1 Esd 5:33.

PERIZZITE, peri'zít, pe-ri'zít (πηρίζιτος, φαρκεατος): Signifies "a village" and so corresponds with the Egyptian fellah. Hence the Perizzite is not included among the sons of Canaan in Gen 10, and is also coupled with the Canaanite (Gen 13:7; 34:30; Jgs 4:4). We hear, accordingly, of Canaanite and Perizzite ancestors at Shechem (Gen 34:30), at Bezek in Judah (Jgs 4:4) and, according to the reading of LXX, at Gezer (Jsh 16:10). In Dt 3:5 and 1 S 6:18, where AV has "unwalled towns" and "countryside villages," LXX has "Perizites," the lit. tr. of the Heb. "cities of the Perizite" or "villages" and "village of the Perizzite." The same expression occurs in Est 9:19, where it is used of the Jews in Elam. In Josh 17:15,18, where the Manassites are instructed to take possession of the forest land of Carmel, "Perizites and Rephaim" are given as the equivalent of "Canaanite." A. H. Sayce

PERJURY, pérjú'rì. See Crimes; Oath; Punishments.

PERPETUAL, pér-pét'ú-al, PERPETUALLY, pér-pé-tú'i-ti (παρετερία, παρεκατάρχου, παρεκτάρχονσα, παρεκτάρχησα, παρεκτάρχησα, παρεκτάρχησα, têmâdite), "perpetual": Perpetual is usually the tr. of oâdâm, properly, "a wrapping up" or "hiding," used often of time indefinitely long, and of eternity when applied to God; hence we have, "for perpetual generations" (Gen 9:12); "the priesthood by a perpetual statute" (Ex 23:9; cf. 31:16; Lev 3:17; 24:9, etc.); "placed the sand for the bound of the sea, by a perpetual decree, that it cannot pass it" (Jer 5:22, RVn "an everlasting ordinance which it cannot pass"); "sleep a perpetual sleep" (Jer 61:39,57); "Mosab shall be for a perpetual possession" (Ex 29:9), etc., "prêcmînêne, "perpetuity," "eternity" (often tr. "for ever," Ps 9:6), is tr. "perpetual" (Ps 74:3; Jer 15:18); nâcoth (part.) (Jer 8:5); têmâdite, "continuance," generally rendered "continually," but sometimes "perpetual" or "perpetually" (Ex 30:8; Lev 6:20).

Perpetually is the rendering of 'êdâkh, properly "progress," "duration," hence long or indefinite time, eternity (usually AV rendered "for ever"); in Am 1:1, "his angel appeared to him perpetually"; and of kâl hâ-yâmîm, "all the days," of K 9:2; 2 Ch 17:16, "my heart shall be there perpetually"; of Mt 28:20, pânas tois himârâs, lit. "all the days").

Perpetuity is found in RV of Lev 25:33, "The land shall not be sold in perpetuity," "The house . . . shall be made sure in perpetuity." Perpetual is frequent in Apoc, most often as the tr. of .background and kindred words, e.g. Jsh 13:20, a "perpetual praise"; Wind, 1:14, "perpetual glory," RV "eternal"; Re 11:13, "a perpetual blot," RV "blame for ever"; and in Matt 6:4, of a "perpetual name," RV "everlasting;" ãthanos, "ever-flowing," occurs in Wind 11:6 (so RV); endechôs, "constant" (Re 41:6, "perpetual reproof").

For perpetual (Jer 50:5; Hab 3:6) RV has "everlasting," for "the old hatred" (Ezk 25:15), "perpetual enmity," for "perpetual desolation" (Jer 29:12), "desolato for ever," in "Inb everlasting desolations." W. L. Walker

PERSECUTION, pûr-sê-kû'zhûn (στίχωμα, διαδηλώματος [Mt 13:21; Mk 4:17; 10:30; Acts 8:1; 13:50]; Rom 8:35; 2 Cor 12:10; 2 Thess 1:4; 2 Tim 3:11):

1. Persecution in OT Times
2. Between the Testaments
3. Foretold by Christ
4. A Test of Disobedience
5. A Means of Blessing
6. Various Forms
7. In the Cause of Jesus
8. Instigated by the Jews
9. Stephen
10. The Apostles James and Peter
11. Gentile Persecution
12. Christianity at First Not a Forbidden Religion
13. The Neronian Persecution
14. The Decian Persecution
15. Licinius
16. The Edict of Milan
17. Results of Persecution

The importance of this subject may be indicated by the fact of the frequency of its occurrence, both in the OT and NT, where in AV the words "persecute," "persecuted," "persecuting" are found no fewer than 53 t, "persecution" 44 t, and "persecutor" 9 t.

It must not be thought that persecution existed only in NT times. In the days of the OT it existed too. In what Jesus said to the Pharisees, He especially referred to the inhuman blood which had been shed in those times, and told them that they were showing themselves heirs—to use a legal phrase—to their fathers who had persecuted the righteous, "from the blood of Abel the righteous unto the blood of Zachariah" (Mt 23:35).

In the period between the close of the OT and the coming of Christ, there was much and protracted suffering endured by the Jews, because of their refusal to embrace idolatry, and of their fidelity to the Mosaic Laws and the worship of God. During that time there were many patriots who were true martyrs, and those heroes of faith, the Macabees, who accompanied those who "know their God . . . and do exploit" (Dan 11:32). "We have no need of human help," said Jonathan the Jewish high priest, 'having for our comfort the sacred Scriptures which are in our hands" (1 Mac 12:9).

In the Ep. to the He, persecution in the days of the OT is summed up in these words: "Others had
trial of mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonment; they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, they were tempted, they were slain with the sword: they went about in sheepskins, in goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, ill-treated (of whom the world was not worthy)" (He 11.37).

Coming now to NT times, persecution was frequently foretold by Christ, as certain to come to those who were His true disciples and followers. He forewarned them again and again that it was inevitable. He said that He Himself must suffer it (Mt 16.21; 17.22-23; Mk 8.31).

It would be a test of true discipleship. In the parable of the Sower, He mentions this as one of the causes of defection among those who are Christians in outward appearance only. When affliction or persecution ariseth for the word's sake, immediately the stony-ground hearers are offended (Mt 13.21).

It would be a sure means of gaining a blessing, whenever it came to His loyal followers when they were in the way of well-doing; and He thus speaks of it in two of the Beatitudes (Mt 5.10; 11).

5. A Means of Blessing

"Blessed are ye when men shall reproach you, and persecute you . . . for my sake" (Mt 5.10.11; see also ver 12).

It would take different forms, ranging through every possible variety, from false accusations to the infliction of death, beyond which, He pointed out (Mt 10.28; Lk 12.4), persecutors are unable to go. The methods of persecution which were employed by the Jews, and also by the heathen against the followers of Christ, were such as these: (1) Men would revile them and would say all manner of evil against them falsely, for Christ's sake (Mt 5.11). (2) Contempt and disparagement: "Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan, and hast a demon?" (Jn 8.48); "If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more them of his household!" (Mt 10.25). (3) Being, solely on account of their loyalty to Christ, forcibly separated from the company and the society of others, and expelled from the synagogues or other assemblies for the worship of God: "Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from among their countrymen, and reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake!" (Lk 6.22); "They shall put you out of the synagogues" (Jn 16.2). (4) Illegal arrest and spoliating of goods, and death itself. All these various methods, used by the persecutor, were foretold, and all came to pass. It was the fear of apprehension and death that led the eleven disciples to forsake Jesus in Gethsemane and to flee for their lives. Jesus often forewarned them of the severity of the persecution to which they would need to encounter if they were loyal to Him: "The hour cometh, that whosoever killeth you shall think that he offereth service unto God" (Jn 16.2); "I send unto you prophets . . . some of them shall ye kill and crucify; and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute from city to city" (Mt 23.34).

7. In the Case of illegal arrest; the heapsing of every insult upon Him as a prisoner; false accusation; and a violent and most cruel death.

After Our Lord's resurrection the first attacks against His disciples came from the high priest and his party. The high-priesthood was then in the hands of the Sadducees, and one reason which moved them to take action of this kind was their 'secure position' because apostles "proclaimed in Jesus the resurrection from the dead!" (Acts 4.2; 5.17). The gospel based upon the resurrection of Christ was evidence of the untruth of the chief doctrines held by the Sadducees, for they held the 'dead are not raised.' But instead of yielding to the evidence of the fact that the resurrection had taken place, they opposed and denied it, and persecuted His disciples. For a time the Pharisees were more moderate in their attitude toward the Christian faith, as is shown in the case of Gamaliel (Acts 5.34); and on one occasion they were willing even to defend the apostle Paul (Acts 23.9) on the doctrine of the resurrection. But gradually the whole of the Jewish people became bitter persecutors of the Christians. Thus in the earliest of the Pauline Epis., it is said, "Ye also suffered the same things of your own countrymen, even as they [in Judaea] did of the Jews; who both killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and drove out us, and persecute us, and are contrary to all men" (1 Thess 2.14.15).

Serious persecution of the Christian church began with the case of Stephen (Acts 7.1-60); and his lawless execution was followed by "a great persecution" directed against the Christians in Jerusalem. This "great persecution" (Acts 8.1) scattered the members of the church, who fled in order to avoid bonds and imprisonment and death. At this time Saul signalized himself by his great activity, persecuting "this Way of death", and captured into prisons both men and women" (Acts 22.4).

By and by one of the apostles was put to death—the first to suffer of "the glorious company of the apostles"—James the brother of John, who was slain with the sword by Herod (Acts 12.2). Peter also was imprisoned, and was delivered only by an angel (13.7-11).

During the period covered by the Acts there was not much purely gentle persecution; at that time the persecution suffered by the Christian church was chiefly Jewish. There were, however, great dangers and risks of persecution encountered by the apostles and by all who proclaimed the gospel then. Thus, at Philip's (Acts 13.19-40), and, even before that time, Paul and Barnabas had suffered much at Iconium and at Lystra (Acts 14.1-16). And when Paul had pleaded in his own defence before King Herod Agrippa and the Roman governor Festus, these two judges were agreed in the opinion, "This man doeth nothing worthy of death or of bonds!" (Acts 26.31). Indeed it is evident (see Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller and the Rom Citizen, 308) that the purpose of Paul's trial being recorded at length in the Acts is to establish the fact that the gospel was not forbidden by the laws of the Roman empire, but that Christianity was a religio licita, a lawful religion.

Christianity, as first, not a forbidden religion.—This legality of the Christian faith was illustrated and enforced by the fact that when Paul was at first tried by the supreme court of appeal at Rome, he was
set free and resumed his missionary labors, as these are recorded or referred to in the Pastoral Ep. "One thing only, however, I may mention, not from a comparison of Phil with 2 Tim. There had been in the interval a considerable change in the policy toward Christianity of the Roman government. The change was due to the great fire of Rome (July, 64). As part of the persecution which then broke out, orders were given for the imprisonment of not a few. Besides, the many Nero's Jewish friends were not likely to forget the prisoner of the previous time. So, when news of the fire reached Rome, but steps were taken instantly for his arrest. The apostle was brought back to the city in the autumn of the same year, to what he had said at all. Indeed, of the summary punishment of his brethren, witnesses to the story of his imprisonment and the assent to a show of legality in the persecution of the leader" (Workman, Persecution in the Early Church, 38). See Pastoral Epistles; Acts; Revelation.

The legal decisions which were favorable to the Christian faith were soon overturned on the occasion of the great fire in Rome, which

12. The occurred in July, 64. The public

Neronic feeling of resentment broke out against

Persecution the emperor to such a degree that, to

avoid the stigma, just or unjust, of being himself guilty of setting the city on fire, he made the Christians the scapegoats which he thought he needed. Tacitus (Annals xv.44) relates all that occurred at that time, and what he says is modeled after the one of the very early notices found in any profane author, both of the Christian faith, and of Christ Himself.

(1) Testimony of Tacitus.—What Tacitus says is that nothing that Nero could do, either in the way of gifts to the populace or in that of sacrifice to the Roman deities, could make the people believe that he was innocent of causing the fire. Hence to relieve himself of this infamy he falsely accused the Christians of being guilty of the crime of setting the city on fire. Tacitus uses the strong expression of persons commonly called Christians who were hated for their religion, which is an instantiation of the saying, all manner of evil against them falsely, for Christ's sake.

The Christians, whose lives were pure and virtuous and beneficent, were spoken of as being the sufferers of the earth.

(2) References in 1 Pet.—The First Ep. of Peter is one of the parts of the NT which seem to make direct reference to the Neronic persecution, and he uses words (1 Pet. 4.12ff) which may be compared with the narrative of Tacitus: "Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial among you, which cometh upon you, as though some strange thing happened unto you: but insomuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings, comfort ye one another with these words. For Christ also suffered for sins once; the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God. To whom he was made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." If read in the light of the persecution, it is clear that Peter was not thinking of the suffering of Christ alone, but also of their sufferings, the suffering of God's people in their suffering according to the will of God, and commit their souls in well-doing unto a faithful Creator.

(3) References in 2 Pet.—How aptly and appropriate was the comforting exhortation to the case of those who suffered in the Neronic persecution. The description which Tacitus gives is as follows: "Christians, the founder of that name, was put to death as a criminal by Pontius Pilate, procurator in the reign of Tiberius. But the pernicious superstition, repressed for a time, broke out again not only through Judaea, where the mischief originated, but through the city of Rome also whither all things horrible and disgraceful flew from all quarters as to sink, and they were encouraged. Accordingly, first, those were seized who confessed they were Christians; next, on their information, as fast multitudes were convicted, not so much on the charge of setting the city on fire, as of hating the human race. And in their deaths they were made the subjects of sport, for they were covered with the skins of wild beasts and were tortured to death by dogs, or nailed to crosses, and thus mocked and burnt to serve for nocturnal lights. Nero offered his own gardens for the spectacle, and exhibited circuses, games, indiscriminately mingling with the common people dressed as a charioteer, or else standing in his chariot. With his own hands he blessed those who died the sufferers, though guilty and deserving to be made examples of by capital punishment, because they seemed not to be cut off for the public good, but to be vipers to the ferocity of one man." See Nero.

(4) NT references.—Three of the books of the NT bear the marks of that most cruel persecution under Nero, the Second Ep. to Timothy, the First Ep. of Peter—already referred to—and the Rev. of John. In 2 Tim, Paul speaks of his impending condemnation to death, and the terror inspired by the persecution causes "all" to forsake him when he is brought to public trial (2 Tim. 4.10).

The "fierce and intractable" of Christians and Christians are exhorted to maintain their faith with patience; they are pleaded with to have their "conversation honest" (1 Pet. 2.12 AV), so that all accusations directed against them may be seen to be unfounded, and under no circumstances does a show of legality in the persecution of the leader." (Workman, Persecution in the Early Church, 38).

This important ep. proves a general persecution (1.6, 12.16) in Asia Minor, of the Taurus (1.1; note esp. Bithynia) and elsewhere (5.9). The Christians suffer 'for the name,' but not the name alone (4.14). They are the objects of vile slanders (2.12.15, 3.14-16, 4.4, 15), as well as of considerable acal on the part of officials (5.8 Gr 3.15).

As regards the slanders, the Christians should be circumspect (2.15.16, 3.16.17, 4.15). The persecution will be short, for there is none of all things at hand (4.7.13, 5.4) (Workman, Persecution in the Early Church, 354).

In Rev. the apostle John is in "Patmos, for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus" (Rev. 1.9). Persecution has broken out against the Christians in the province of Asia.

13. Persecution in At Smyrna, there is suffering, imprisonment and prolonged tribulation; but the sufferers are cleared when they are told that if they are found unto death, Christ will give them the crown of life (Rev. 2.10). At Pergamum, persecution has already resulted in Antipas, Christ's faithful martyr, being slain (2.13). At Ephesus and at Thyatira the Christians are commended for their patience and for the fact that there had been persecution (2.219). At Philadelphia there has been the attempt made to cause the members of the church to deny Christ's name (3.8); their patience is also commended, and the hour of temptation is spoken of, which comes to try all the world, but from which Christ promised to keep the faithful Christians in Philadelphia. Strangely enough, there is no distinct mention of persecution having taken place in Sardis or in Laodicea.

As the book proceeds, evidences of persecution are multiplied. In 6.9, the apostle sees under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God and for the testimony of Jesus, which means that these souls are hidden to rest yet for a little season "until their fellow-servants also and their brethren, who should be killed even as they were, should have fulfilled their course" (6.11). The meaning is that there is not yet an end to suffering for Christ's sake; persecution may continue to be as severe as ever. Cf. 20.4, "I saw the souls of them that had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God, and for the witnesses of Jesus" (20.4); and 21.24, "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. But the city of Jerusalem came down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I saw no temple therein, for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. And he that leads into glory, as a assurance departed from me, and stood and became as a lampstand before the throne of God and of the Lamb, and the twelve tribes were standing with him, clothed in white robes, and they had this name written on their foreheads, "the name of the city of the living God, the new Jerusalem, which cometh down from out of heaven from God." And I John saw, and bare record, that these things are true. And the grace of God was upon me, that the word of God might be established unto them who hear." (John 21.24). Paul's martyrdom is implied in 2 Tim, throughout the whole ep., and esp. in 4.6.7.8. The martyrdom of Peter is also implied in 2 Peter 1.19.19, and in
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2 Pet 1:14. The abiding impression made by these three times of persecution of the mind of the apostle John is also seen in the defence of the world found throughout his First Ep. (2:17; 5:19), and in the rejoicing over the fall of Babylon, the great persecution. The great means of the fall is described in such passages as Rev. 14:8; 16:2, 3; 17:14; 18:24.

Following immediately upon the close of the NT, there is another remarkable witness to the continuance of the Rom persecution against the Christian church. This is Pliny, proconsul of Bithynia.

In 111 or 112 AD, he writes to the emperor Trajan a letter in which he expresses his concern for the Christian faith. He goes on to say that "many of all rank and order of both sexes are being called into danger, and will continue to be so. In fact the contagion of their faith has not confined itself to its own cities only, but has spread to the villages and country districts. I am therefore putting into your hands a copy of a passage in which he [Trajan] narrate how the heathen temples had been deserted and the religious rites had been abandoned for any other observance of their faith, that the flesh of the sacrificial victims—could scarcely find a purchaser."

But Pliny had endeavoured to stem the tide of the advancing Christian faith, and he tells the emperor how he had succeeded in bringing back a number of these repentant Christians. That is to say, he had used persecuting measures, and had succeeded in forcing some of the cases. This was intended to help. He tells the emperor how he used the methods he had used. "The method I have observed to be most effectual is to bring them before me as Christians. This I asked them whether they were Christians. If they admitted it, I repeated the question a second and a third time, and threatened them with punishment if they persisted. If I ordered them to be punished, I neither spoke nor used any severe language."

"But if they confessed that they were Christians, or that they had confessed, I have, as it were for the example of the case, while it was actually under legal prosecution, several cases occurred. An anonymous information was laid before me, and I caused to be brought in the persons of those who denied that they were Christians, or that they had ever been so, repeated after me an invocation of the gods, and offered prayer with wine and water, to the statue, which I had ordered to be brought in for this very purpose, along with the statues of the gods, and they even reviled the name of Christ; whereas there is no forcing. It is said, those who are really Christians into any one of those cases, even if it should be proper to change them. Others were accused by a witness at first confessed themselves Christians, but afterward denied it. Some owned indeed that they had been Christians formerly, but had now, some for several years, and others for a few months, and even weeks and days, and had sworn to a statue, which I had ordered to be brought in for this very purpose, that they had denied that he is a Christian, and when his statement was proved by his invoking the deities, such a person, although suspected for past conduct, must nevertheless be forgiven, because of his repentance."

These letters of Pliny and Trajan treat state-persecution as the standing procedure—and this not a generation after the death of the apostle John. The sufferings and tribulation predicted in Rev. 2:10, and in many other passages, had indeed come to pass. Some of the Christians had denied the name of Christ and had worshipped the images of the emperor and of the idols, but multitudes of them had been put to death, and others had received the martyr's crown of life.

Speaking generally, persecution of greater or less severity was the normal method employed by the Rom empire against the Christian church during the 3rd and 3rd centuries. It may be said to have come to an end only about the end of the 3rd or the beginning of the 4th cent., when the empire became nominally Christian.

When the apostolic period is left, persecution becomes almost the normal state in which the church is found. And persecution, instead of abolishing the name of Christ, as the persecutors vainly imagined they had succeeded in doing, became the cause of the spread of Christianity, the suffering increasing the purity. Both of these important ends, and others too, were secured by the severity of the means employed by the persecuting power of the Rom empire.

Under Trajan’s successor, the emperor Hadrian, the lot of the Christians was full of uncertainty; persecution might break out at any moment. At the best Hadrian’s régime was only that of an unauthorized toleration.

With the exception of such instances as those of Nero and Domitian, there is the surprising fact to notice, that it was not the worst emperors, but the best, who became the most violent persecutors. One reason probably was that the ability of those emperors led them to see that the religion of Christ is a really a divisive factor in any kingdom in which civil government and pagan religion are indissolubly bound together. The more that such a ruler could be in the way of his followers, the more would he persecute the Christian faith. Hence among the rulers who were persecutors, there are the names of Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius the philosopher-emperor, and Septimus Severus (died at York, 211 AD).

Persecution was no accident, which chanced to happen, but which might not have occurred at all. It was the necessary consequence of the principles embodied in the heathen Rom government, when these came into contact with the Christian church. The essential principles of the Christian faith. The reasons for the persecution of the Christian church by the Rom empire were (1) political; (2) on account of the claim which the Christian church made, and which it cannot help making, to the exclusive allegiance of the heart and of the life. That loyalty to Christ which the martyrs displayed was believed by the authorities in the state to be incompatible with the duties of a Roman citizen. Patriarchy was a fiction. They displaced the traditional attitude, and threatened the unity of worship. Hence the absence of victory, the Roman acceptance of the Christian faith made to the absolute and exclusive loyalty of all who obeyed Christ was such that it admitted of no compromise with heathenism. To receive Christ into the pantheon as another divinity, as one of several—this was not the Christian faith. To every loyal follower of Christ compromise with other faiths was an impossibility. An accommodated Christianity would itself have been false to the only true God and Jesus Christ whom He had sent, and would never have conquered the world. To the heathen there were lords many and gods many, but to the Christians there was but one God the Father and one Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world (1 Cor 8:5, 6). The essential absoluteness of the Christian faith was its strength, but this was also the cause of its being hated.

"By a correct instinct paganisms of all sorts discerned in the infant church their only rival. So, while the new Herod was yet in the cradle, they sent their snakes to kill him. But Hercules lived to oust the Augean stables" (Workman, op. cit., 88).

"For 200 years to become the meaning great renunciation, the joining a despised and persecuted sect, the swimming against the tide of popular prejudice, the coming under the ban of the authorities at any moment of imprisonment and death under its
most fearful forms. For 200 years he that would follow Christ must pay the cost, and be prepared to pay the same with his liberty and life. For 200 years the more professing of Christianity was itself a crime. The Acts of the Apostles runs: "The Christian saith with Christ. We must say with Christ, with our pursuers." But he who makes it was made it by itself, and it was the same with him. Be assured, the Church of Christ is a钮ere that was necessary as a title on the back of the coin. The Hebrews had a word for that, and it is written in Genesis, "The Lord will send the sword upon the land of Egypt, and his poison upon his land; he will frustrate the anger of Egypt." (Gen. 50:20) And the Roman religious authority, "Let the God of war be risen against the Gentiles, and let him bring them down to the ground!" (Rev. 19:11) And the Christian put it otherwise: "Let the Lord be exalted in Jacob, and let the name of the Lord be praised in Israel!" (Num. 10:35) And the Hebrews put it otherwise: "Let the Lord be exalted in Jacob, and let the name of the Lord be praised in Israel!" (Num. 10:35) And the Roman religious authority, "Let the God of war be risen against the Gentiles, and let him bring them down to the ground!" (Rev. 19:11) And the Christian put it otherwise: "Let the Lord be exalted in Jacob, and let the name of the Lord be praised in Israel!" (Num. 10:35) And the Hebrews put it otherwise: "Let the Lord be exalted in Jacob, and let the name of the Lord be praised in Israel!" (Num. 10:35)

Service in the Roman army involved, for a Christian, increasing danger in the midst of an organized and aggressive heathenism. Hence arose the persecution of the Christian soldier, who refused compliance with the idolatrous ceremonies in which the army engaged, whether those ceremonies were concerned with the worship of the Roman deities or with that of the emperor. The sacred and invincible sword, as Mithra was called, had become, at the time when Tertullian and Origen wrote, the special deity of soldiers. Shrines in honor of Mithra were erected through the entire breadth of the Roman empire. Pammus, the Cheviot Hills in Britain. And wrote to the soldier who refused compliance with the religious sacrifices to which the legions gave their adhesion! The Christians in the Roman legions formed no inconsiderable proportion of the "noble army of martyrs." It being easier for the persecuting authorities to detect a Christian in the ranks of the army than elsewhere.

In the 2d and 3d cents. Christians were to found everywhere, for Tertullian, in an oftentimes quoted passage of his Apology, says, "We live beside you in the world, making use of the same water, air, sun, and moon, and all other places of trade. We sail with you, fight shoulder to shoulder, till the soil, and traffic with you; yet the very existence of Christian faith, and its profession, continued to bring the greatest risks. With the best will in the world, they remained a peculiar people, who must be prepared at any moment to meet the storm of hatred." (3 Tim 3:12) For this reason it remained the case in the way or another, hatred on the part of the world inevitably fell to the lot of the Christian, who adhered to the footsteps of the Master, "All that would live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." (2 Tim 3:12)

21. Tertullian's Apology

"The Third Race" was probably invented by the heathen, but willingly accepted by the Christians without demur, because they were for what a bishop of the church in the first race called the "third race." "The first race" was "indifferently called" the Greek, or Gentile; "the second race," was the Jews; while "the third race" was the Christian. The cry in the circus of Carthage was "[Greek: Eoig to be ta teratain]. How long must we endure this third race?"

But one of the most powerful causes of the hatred entertained by the heathen against the Christians was, that though there were no citizens so loyal as they, yet in every case where the laws and customs of the empire came into conflict with the will of God, their supreme rule was loyalty to Christ, they must obey God rather than man. To worship Caesar, to offer even one grain of incense to the shrine of Diana, no Christian would ever consent, not even when this minimum of compliance would save life itself.

The Roman empire claimed to be a kingdom of universal sway, not only over the bodies and the property of all its subjects. It invested the empire with the temporal power of the whole world. It demanded absolute obedience to its supreme lord, that is, to Caesar. This obedience the Christian could not render, for unlimited obedience of body, soul and spirit is due to God alone, the only Lord of the conscience. Hence it was that there arose the antagonism of the government to Christianity, with persecution as the inevitable result.

These results, hatred and persecution, were, in such circumstances, the natural and inevitable consequence of the fundamental tenet of primitive Christianity, that the Christian was to be true to himself, and be in accord with his own environment.ceased to hold his old connections with the state; in everything he became the bond-servant of Jesus Christ, the head of the new creation, and fealty to the new empire and the Crucified Head.

We engage in the description of Tertullian, "as men whose very lives are not our own. We have no master but God." (Workman, 195).

The persecution inaugurated by the emperor Decius in 250 AD was particularly severe. There was hardly a province in the empire where there were no martyrs; but there were also many who abandoned their faith and rushed to the magistrates to obtain their libelli, or certificates that they had offered heathen sacrifice. When the days of persecution were over, those persons usually came with cagerness to seek readmission to the church. It was in the Decian persecution that the great theologian Origen, who was then in his 89th year, suffered the cruel torture of the rack; and from the effects of what he then suffered he died at Tyre in 254.

Many libelli have been discovered in recent excavations in Egypt. In the Expos T for January, 1909, Dr. George Milligan, for example, and prints the Gr text of one of these recently discovered Egyptian libelli. These libelli are most interesting, illustrating as they do the account which Cyprian gives of the way in which some faint-hearted Christians during the Decian persecution obtained certificates—some of these certificates being true to fact, and others false—to the effect that they had sacrificed in the heathen manner. The one which Dr. Milligan gives is as follows: to these certificates of superintendence, the village of Alexander Island, from Aurelius Diogenes, the son of Sabaus, of the village of Alexander Island, being about 72 years ago, it is a sad specimen of the hardness of many. I have sacrificed and poured libations and tasted the offerings, and I request you to countersign my statement. May good fortune attend you. I Aurelius Diogenes, have made this request." (3d Hand). "I Aurelius Syrus, as a participant, have certified Diogenes as sacrificing along with us."

25. Libelli

Under Valerian the persecution was again very severe, but his successor, Gallienus, issued an edict of toleration, in which he guaranteed freedom of worship to all Christians. The empire was, so to say, definitely a religio licita, a lawful religion. This freedom from persecution continued until the reign of Diocletian.

The persecution of the Christian church by the empire of Rome came to an end in March, 313 AD, when Constantine issued the document known as the "Edict of Milan," which assured to each individual freedom of religious belief. This document marks an era of the utmost importance in the history of the world. Official Rom persecution had done its worst, and had failed; it was ended now; the Galilean had conquered.

The results of persecution were: (1) It raised up witnesses, true witnesses, for the Christian faith. Men and women, even children and even children of the martyrs whom no cruelties, however refined and protracted, could terrify into denial of their Lord. It is to a large extent owing to persecution that the Christian faith has been preserved. (2) It gave rise to a literature in itself rare, even when Quadratus and Tertullian and Origen and Cyril and many others. While some who have the Christian faith in an external and formal manner only generally went back from their profession, the true Christian, as from the Roman Empire, whose heart could not be made to do this. The same stroke which crushed the straw—such is a saying of Augustine—separated the pure grain which the Lord had chosen.
(2) Persecution showed that the Christian faith is im- mortal even in this world. Of Christ's kingdom there shall be no end, ye shall pull away not, even when the hands, yea, the hammers break, God's altar stands."—Pagan Rome, Babylon was called the name of the great apostle John in the Apocalypse, tried hard to destroy the church of Christ; Babylon was drunk with the blood of the saints. God allowed them to exist for ever years, and the blood of His children was shed like water. Why was it not expected that such a terrible and prolonged an experience of suffering? It was in order to convince the world that though the kings of the earth gathered together against the Lord and His Christ, yet all that they can do is vain. God is in the midst of it, and shall help His church and His right early. The Christian church, as it suspended between heaven and earth, had no need of other help than that of the un- speaking God, which at every moment held it up and kept it from falling. Never was the church more free, never stronger, less disfigured, perished; never more extensive in its growth, than in the days of persecution.

And what became of the great persecuting power, the hated Roman, that once trembled in fear of the true doctrine of the person and the work of Christ? It was in the ages of persecution that Gnosticism died, though it died slowly. It was in the ages of persecution that Arrianism overthrew. At the Council of Nicea in 325 AD, among those who voted in favor of the definition and the decision of the council, there were those who "bore in their bodies the brandings marks of Jesus," who had stood for Christ.

Persecution was followed by these important results. for God in His wisdom had seen fit to permit these evils to happen, in order to change them into permanent good; and thus the wrath of man was turned to good, and if the persecutors had not taken place at all. What, in a word, could be more fitted than to draw up into a firm and overrule evil itself and change it into good? God lets iniquity do what it pleases, according to its own designs; but in per- secution, the Church is not one woman, but thousands. It overrules it and makes it enter into the order of His purposes. This was the effect of this fury against the Christian faith kindled in the hearts of persecutors, so that they afflict the saints of the Most High. But the church remains safe, for persecution can work nothing but ultimate good in the hand of God. "The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church." So said Tertullian, and what he said is true.

Persecution has permanently enriched the history of the church. It is seen as the mark of the unknown. For it would not permit "dragged them into fame and chased them up to heaven."

Persecution made Christ very near and very precious to those who suffered. Many of the martyrs bore witness, even when in the midst of the most cruel tortures, that they felt no pain, but that Christ was with them. Instances to this effect could be multiplied. Persecution made them feel how true Christ's words were, that even as He was not of the world, so they also were not of it. If they had been of the world, the world would love its own, but because Christ had chosen them out of the world, therefore the world hated them. They were not greater than their Lord. If men had per- secuted Jesus, they would also persecute His true disciples. But though they were persecuted, they were of good cheer, Christ had overcome the world; He was with them; He enabled them to be faithful unto death. He had procured them the crown of life.

Browning's beautiful lines describe what was a common experience of the martyrs, how Christ "in them" and "through them" was "the power of life," and made them more than conquerors:

"I was some time in burning, but I was come to a Hand carried through The fire above my head, and drew My soul from Christ, whom I see. Sergius, a brother, writes for me. Tais testimony on the wall—

For me, I have forgot it all.

JOHN RUTHERFORD

2. History and the black stone. The city was captured, pillaged and burned by Alexander in 324 BC, most of the inhabitants being massacred or enslaved. Much of the treasure and the Pers kings was found there. Curtius says the palace was never rebuilt. Antiochus Epiphanes (166 BC) tried but failed to plunder the temple (of Amatis, Anahita?), there (2 Mac 2; p. 54, this is the incident referred to in 1 Mac 6:1 ff, and Polyb., xxxi, 11). At Persepolis were the sepulchers of the Achaemenian kings (except Cyrus). Long and important inscriptions of Darius and Xerxes are found at Persepolis and the neighboring Naxos, Rustam, in the Fars province, and in the Achaemenian Pers, Assy and neo- Susian tongues (published by Spiegel, Rawlinson and Bechtah), Chitarchus first among Europeans mentions the city. The writer of this article visited it in 1892. Since then it has been relieved.

LITERATURE—Inscriptions (as above), Arrian, Curtius, Polybius, Phily, Dio, Siculus, mediaeval and modern travelers.

W. ST. CLAIR TIDBALL

PERSEUS, pərˈsiːəs, pərˈsɪəs (Πέρσεις, Perseus): In 1 Mac 8:5 the conquest of "Perseus, king of the Cimmerians" (RV "king of Chittim") was part of the change of the "fate of the infant in the cradle." This Perseus, the son and successor of Philip III of Macedonia, came to the throne in 178 BC and was the last king of Macedonia. In 171 BC began the war with Rome which ended in his disastrous defeat and capture at Pydna, 168 BC (to which 1 Mac 8:5 refers), by L. Aemilius Pau- lus. Macedonia soon became a Roman province. Perseus was led to Rome to grace the triumph of his conqueror, by whose clemency he was spared, and died in captivity at Rome (Polyb. xxix, 17; Livy xlv, 40 ff).

Kittim or Chittim, properly the people of the town of Citium in Cyprus, then signifying Cyprians, and extended by Jewish writers (Gen. 10:12; Josh. 13:18; 23:1; Jer. 2:10; Ezek. 27:6; Dan. 11:30; see Jastrow, Art. 1, v1) to include the coasts of Greece generally, is here applied to Macedonians. In 1 Mac 1:1 Macedonia (in Greek "kindred of the Greeks") is called "the land of Chittim." The term is meant to suggest anything that is evil and base.

S. ANGUS

PERSEVERANCE, pərˈsɪvərəns; The word occurs only once in AV (Eph 6:18), where it refers quite simply to persistence in prayer. In theology (esp. in the phrase "final perseverance") the word has come to denote a special persistency, the undying continuance of the new life (manifested in faith and holiness) given by the Spirit of God to man. It is questioned whether such imparted life is (by its nature, or by the law of its impartation) necessarily permanent, indestructible, so that the once regenerate and believing man has the prospect of a final glory infallibly assured. This is not the place to trace the history of a great and complex debate. It is more fitting here to point to the problem as connected with that supreme class of truths in which, because of our necessary mental limitations, our true nature can only be apprehended as the unrevealed but certain harmony of seeming contradictions. Scripture on the one hand abounds with assurances of "perseverance" as a fact, and largely intimates that an excelling anticipation of it is the intended experience of the believer (see Jn 10:28 above all,
and of among other passages Rom. 8 31-37; 1 Pet. 1 8, 9. On the other hand, we find frequent and urgent warnings and cautions (see e.g. 1 Cor. 8 11; 9 27). The teacher dealing with actual cases, as in pastoral work, should be ready to adopt both classes of utterances, each with its proper application; applying the first, e.g. to the true but timid disciple, the latter to the self-confident. Meanwhile Scripture on the whole, by the manner and weight of its positive statements, favors a humble belief of the permanence, in the plan of God, of the once-given new life. It is as if it laid down "perseverance" as the Divine rule for the Christian, while the negative passages came in to caution the man not to deceive himself with appearances, nor to let any belief whatever palliate the guilt and minimize the danger of sin. In the biographies of Scripture, it is noteworthy that no person appears who, at one time certainly a saint, was later certainly a castaway. The awful words of He 6 3-6; 10 20-27 appear to deal with cases (such as Balaam's) of much light but no loving life, and so are not precisely in point. Upon the whole subject, it is important to make "the Perseverance of the Saviour" our watchword rather than "the Perseverance of the saint."

**Handley Dunse**
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LITERATURE

I. **Language (Introductory)** — The Perselanguage, ancient and modern alike, is an Aryan tongue. In its ancient forms it is more closely connected with Vedic Sanskrit than with any other language except Armenian. Most of its roots are to be found also in Slavonic, Gr. Lat. and other tongues of the same stock.

There were two main dialects in the ancient language of Iran (Aryanen), (1) that of the Persians proper, and (2) that of the Medes.

Dialects The former is known to us from the inscriptions of the Achaemenid kings, the latter from the Avesta, and a few Median words preserved for us by Herodotus and other Gr. writers.

II. **OLD PERSIAN INSRIPTIONS.**—These fall between 550 and 350 BC, and contain about 1,100 lines and 400 words. They are carved upon the rocks in a cuneiform character, simplified from that of the neo-Susian, which again comes from the neo-Babylonian. In Old Pers. inscriptions only 44 characters are employed, of which 7 are ideographs or contractions. The remaining 37 phonetic signs are syllabic, each consisting of an open syllable and not merely of a single letter, except in cases of separate vowels. The syllabary, though much simpler than any other cuneiform system, does not quite attain to being an alphabet. It was written from left to right, like the other cuneiform syllabaries. Of Cyrus the Great only one Pers. sentence has been found: *Adam Kūrukh Khshayāthiya Hakhāmānsīsha, "I am Cyrus the King, the Achaemenid."* Duris I has left us long inscriptions, at Behistūn (Besītūn), Mt. Alvand, Persopolis, Naqsh-i Rustam, etc., and one at Suse, the latter mentioning his conquest of Egypt and the construction of the first (?) Suez canal:

Adam niyashāyam imām yuviṣaḥ kāśānaiy hacā *Pirām nāmā raṁa iya Mudrāyā dinānāy i sā-parā yē kā Nasid māna.*

("I commanded to dig this canal from the river named the Nile, which flows through Egypt, to the sea which comes from Persia."

We have also inscriptions of Xerxes at Persopolis and many short ones of Artaxerxes I, Artaxerxes Mnémon, and Artaxerxes Ochus. From them all taken together we learn much concerning the history and the religion of the Achaemenid period.
It is from Achaemenian or Old Pers, and not from the Medic or Avestic, that modern Pers has sprung through Pahlavi and Dari as intermediate stages. This is probably due to the political supremacy which the Persians under the Achaemenides gained over the Medes. The few words in the inscriptions which might be doubted can be understood through comparison with Armenian and even with the modern Pers, e.g. yavigna in the above inscription is the modern vulgar Pers yib.

III. Medico Dialect.—The Medecal dialect is represented in literature by the Avesta or sacred books of the Zoroastrians (Pānīs). The word Avesta does not occur in the book itself and is of uncertain meaning and significance. It is probably the Avashta of Beq. Inscr., IV, 64, and may mean either (1) an interview, meeting (Skt. avashtha, "appearance before a judge"); or a gām-tash, "to stand near"), or (2) a petition (Pahl. apastān, "petition"); or Arm. apastun, "asylum"), in either case deriving its name from Zoroaster's drawing near to Ahura Mazda in worship.

The first Gāthā is composed of strophes of 3 lines each (as above). Each line contains 16 syllables, with a caesura after the 7th foot.

IV. Zoroaster.—Many of the Gāthās are generally acrified to Zoroaster himself, the rest to his earliest disciples. The 1. His Date, etc. now becomes a matter of very great probability that Zoroaster lived at earliest in the middle of the 7th cent. BC, more probably a century later. The former view of Zoroaster as a Persian who composed pure for 300 years, and connects its corruption with the alleged destruction of much of the Avesta in the palace burned by Alexander at Persepolis, 324 BC. This traditional indication of date is confirmed by other evidence. Zoroaster's name Vaištāpa (in Gr Hūstāpēs) bears the same name as the father of Darius I, and was probably the same person. Vaištāpa's queen Hutaosa, who also protected and favored Zoroaster, bears the same name (in Gr Adēsā) as Cambyses' sister who afterward married Darius, and probably belonged to the same family. Zoroastrianism comes to the fore under Darius, whereas Cyrus in his inscriptions speaks as a decided polytheist. Hence we conclude that the earliest part of the Avesta belongs to c. 500 BC. Of Zoroaster himself we learn much from the Avesta, which traces his genealogy back for 10 generations. It mentions his wife's name (Hyōvi), and tells of his 3 sons and 3 daughters. His first disciple was Frashōstro, his wife's natural uncle. His own name means "Owner of the yellow camel," and has none of the higher meanings sometimes assigned to it by those who would deny his existence. Tradition says he was born at Rūgha (Ragha, Ray), about 51 miles S. of the present Tehran, though some think his native place was Western Atropatene (Azərbiyān). Rejected by his own tribe, the Magi, he went to Vistāpa's court in Bactra. The faith which he taught spread to the Pers court (very naturally, if Vaištāpa was identical with Darius' father) and thence throughout the country. Tradition (Yazšt XIX, 2, etc) says that the Avesta was revealed to Zoroaster on Mt. Ushi-dārena ("intellect-holding") in Sisān. But it is not the composition of one man or of one generation.

Herodotus makes no mention of Zoroaster, but speaks of the Magi (whom he calls a Median tribe [i.101]) as already performing priestly functions. His description of their repetition of charms and theological compositions (i.129) fits very well with recitation of the Gāthās and Yasna, Mention of controversies with Gautama, Buddha's disciples (Yazšt XIII, 16) who probably reached Persia in the 2d cent. BC, is another indication of date. The fact that in both the Yasna and the Vandtād heretics (zaibā) are mentioned who preferred the comm. (zaib) on the Avesta to the Avesta itself, is a sign of late date. Names of certain persons found in the Avesta (e.g. Atare-pāts, a Dastur who lived under Hormoud I, 273 AD, and Rāt̄are-yāgyēti, whom the Dinkirt identifies with the chief Mūd of Sapor II, 300-379 AD, Aşerpā Mārespand, and who, according to the Pattī, §28, "purified" the revelation made to Zoroaster, i.e. revised the text of the earlier parts of the Avesta) enable us to prove that certain portions of the work were composed as late as near the end of the 4th cent. of our era. It is said that the text was in confusion in the time of Vologases I (51-78 [?] AD).

The final recension thus begun, and continued with much zeal by Ardashīr Papakhd, 226-40 AD. According to Geldner (Prolegomena, xlvii) the final recension took place some considerable time after Yazdigird III (overthrown 642 AD). In the times
of the Sāsānides there were, it is said, 21 Nasbās or volumes of the Avesta, and the names of these are given in the Dinbārt (Book IX). Of these we now destructive of the entire Nasba, the Vendīdād, and portions of three others.

The present Avesta is divided into 5 parts: (1) The Yasna (vis. yag, Skt. yaj, "to invoke," "to praise") contains 72 chapters of hymns for sacrifices, etc., including the Avesta hymns, the "Older Yasna" or Gāthās, (2) The Present Vissyāna (vispa, "every," "all," and rdāna, "a lord") is divided into 24 chapters in Gellner's edition; it is supplementary to the Yasna. (3) The Vendīdād (rīn+dāsā+dāsā, "law for vanquishing the demons") contains 22 chapters. The first chapter contains the Iranian myth about the order in which the provinces of the Iranian world were created by Ahura Mazda. It tells how the Evil Spirit, Ahū Mainyu, created plagues, sins and death, to destroy the good creatures of the Good Spirit. The greater part of the book contains ceremonial laws and formulae, some of them boastsome and all rather paraphrased, in character. (4) The Yāhta, in all, are hymns, telling many mythological tales about Mithra, Tishtrya, etc. (5) The Khorda Avesta ("Little Avesta") consists of a number of short compositions, hymns, etc., compiled by the Aherpād Mārespad (Adharpād Maharspad, Arvōiti Mārspresspad) apparently already mentioned, in Sapor II's reign.

Much of the Avesta is said to have been destroyed by the Khalifāh 'Umar's orders when Persia was conquered by the Arabs after the battle of Nahavand (642 AD). Certainly, 'Umar ordered the destruction of the Perse libraries, as we learn from the Kēshf al Zunā (p. 341).

V. Pahlavi.—Under ancient Pers literature may be classed the Pahlavi (a) inscriptions of Sapor at Bāb-e Bākāb and elsewhere, (b) legends on Sāsānian coins, (c) translations of certain parts of the Avesta, made under the Sāsānian part, (d) such books as the Arta Vīrf Nāmā, the Zād starva, Dinbārt, Ormazd vaseh, Poly, Rākshā, etc. They are mostly of religious import. The Arta Vīrf Nāmā gives a description of the visit of the young dōxtar Arta Vīrf, to the zoroastrian heaven. The Bāzīsadānā ("creation") tells how Arzād and Ahrudiva came into being, and teaches that the fight between them. The Arta Vīrf Nāmā contains an immense number of Aram. words, but the Pers terminations are added to them, and these words are rare in Persus: thus yazagbānt-ana is written, and dātana ("to(calcite)"", in Pahlavi works that are no longer extant are the sources of the Yazag hān, Zardvastā Nāmā, Shāh-māhā, etc.

In order to understand the relation in which the Perse dialects and stages in the history of the language stand to one another, it may well be to subjoin a list of words in Old Parthian, Pahlavi, and modern Pers. It will be seen that Avestic is not the source of the Aryan part of the present tongue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Avestic</th>
<th>Old Pers</th>
<th>Pahlavi</th>
<th>Modern Pers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friend...</td>
<td>zaikā</td>
<td>dāšād</td>
<td>dasti</td>
<td>dāst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand...</td>
<td>haštā</td>
<td>dāšād</td>
<td>dasti</td>
<td>dāst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptism...</td>
<td>hāhād</td>
<td>dāšād</td>
<td>dasti</td>
<td>dāst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight...</td>
<td>dāhād</td>
<td>dāšād</td>
<td>dasti</td>
<td>dāst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greatest...</td>
<td>mahāša</td>
<td>māhāša</td>
<td>māhāša</td>
<td>māhāša</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most...</td>
<td>māhan</td>
<td>māhan</td>
<td>māhan</td>
<td>māhan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abode...</td>
<td>Gāthic doma</td>
<td>māhan</td>
<td>māhan</td>
<td>māhan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Superseded
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W. S. CLAIR TISDALL

PERSIAN RELIGION (ANCIENT):

I. Before Zoroaster.—There are clear indications in the Avesta that the religion of the Medes and Persians before Zoroaster's time agreed in most respects with that of the Indians, Aryan, and in a less degree with some of the beliefs of the Aryans in general.

Religion.

All the Aryan tribes in very ancient times showed great respect for the dead, though they carefully distinguished them from the gods (e.g. Rig-Veda X, 56, 4). The latter were principally the powers of Nature, the wind, fire, water, the sky, the sun, the earth, and a host of personifications. The procreative powers in Nature, animate and inanimate, seeming to be the source of animal and vegetable life, received adoration, which ultimately led to unseemly corruption. Herodotus tells us that the Persians in his time worshipped the sun, moon, sky, earth, fire, wind, and water (i.131). Offerings to the gods were laid on a mass of pomegranate twigs (boreasm, Skt. bhrks), and the flesh of victims was boiled, or boiled, now and then mixed with haoma-juice were poured out, just as in India the soma was the drink of both gods and their worshippers.

A comparison between the spiritual beings mentioned in the Avesta and those spoken of in the Rig-Veda is most instructive in two ways. It shows that the original religion of the Iranians and of the Indian Veda Aryans agreed very closely; and it also enables us to realize the immensity of the reformation wrought by Zoroaster. Many of the names of supernatural beings are practically the same; e.g. Indra (Indra, Andra), Mitra (Mithra), Aryaman (Aryanman), Astra (Ahura), Apam Napat (Apa Mana), Tyashtir (Tishtir), Rama (Rama), Vayu (Vāyu), Vētra (Vētra). So are many words of religious import, as Sōna (Hashma), Mantra (Mātra), Hōtra (Zotār). The Yama of India is the Yima of Persia, and the father of the one is Vivasvat and that of the other Vivasvat, which is the same word with dialectical change. The Holy River of the Avesta, Avedhī Sūra, the Unstained (Anāhīta), is represented by the Saravat, the Gangā (Ganges) and other sacred streams worshipped in India. In Persia Atrō (or Fire) is a son of Ahura Mazda (Yasna LXIV, 46-33), as Agni (Ignis) is of Tvāshtir in the Rig-Veda. Armitā is Ahura Mazda's daughter, as Saranyu in the Rig-
Veda is the daughter of Tvāṣṭṛi, the “Creator.” The use of goméz (bois urina) for purification is common to both India and Persia. Though the soma-plant is not now the same as the haoma, the words are the same, and no doubt they at one time denoted one and the same plant. Many of the myths of the Avesta have a great resemblance to those of the Rig-Veda. This comparison might be extended almost indefinitely.

In another respect also there is an important agreement between the two. Though some 33 deities are adored in the Vedic Hymns, yet, in spite of polytheism and low ideas of the Divine, traces of something higher may be found. Varuna, for instance, represents a very lofty conception. In the closest connection with him stands Ašura, who is a being of great eminence, and whose sons are the gods, esp. the Ādityas.

Tvāṣṭṛi again is creator of heaven and earth and of all beings, though his worship was ultimately in Vedic times displaced by that of Indra.  

3. The Creator. It is clear then that the Indian Aryans were worshippers of the Creator and that they knew something of Him long before they sank into polytheism. In the Avesta and in the Pahlavi inscriptions alike, Ahura Mazda occupies much the same position as Varuna, Ašura (the same word as Ašura), or Tvāṣṭṛi in the Rig-Veda, or rather in the ancient belief of which traces are retained in the latter work. Hence, as the Avesta teaches, Zoroaster was not for the first time preaching the existence of Ahura Mazda, but he was rather endeavoring to recall his people to the belief of their ancestors, the doctrine which Ahura Mazda had taught Yima in primeval time in his first revelation (Yaadwít PL II, 1-16,42). The great truth of the existence of the Creator, testified to by tradition, reason and conscience, undoubtedly contributed largely to Zoroaster’s success, just as a similar proclamation of the God Most High (Allāh Ta’ālā), worshipped by their ancestors, helped the thoughtful among the Arabs in later years to accept Muhammad’s teaching. The consciousness in each case that the doctrine was not new but very ancient, materially helped men to believe it true.

II. Zoroastrianism.—The reformation wrought by Zoroaster was a great one. He recognized—as Euripides in Greece did later—that Principle “if the gods do ought shameful, they are not gods.” Hence he perceived that many of the deities worshipped in Iran were unworthy of adoration, being evil in character, hostile to all good and therefore to the “All-Wise” Spirit (Ahura Mazda) and to men. Hence his system of dualism, dividing all beings, spiritual or material, into two classes, the creatures of Ahura Mazda and those of the “Destroying Mind” (Aūrō Mainyus). So many of the popular deities were evil that Zoroaster used the word dātera (the same as deva, deks, and Aram, dē) to denote henceforth an evil spirit, just as Christianity turned the Greek daimones and daiminēs (words used in a good sense in classical authors) into “demons.” Instead of this now degraded word dātera, he employed baga (Old Pers; Av. bagha, Vedic bhaga, “distribution,” “patron,” “lord”) for “God.”

But it may be remembered that Zoroaster did not teach monotheism. Darius says that “Auramazda and the other gods that there are” brought him aid (Beh. Inscri., IV, 60-63), and both he and Xerxes speak of Ahura Mazda as “the greatest of the gods.” So, even in the first Gilgāti, Zoroaster himself invokes Aša, Vohu-Maō, Ar- pattī, Sraošha, and even Gōš-sūrvan (“the Soul of the Bull”), as well as Ahura Mazda.

(1) Darius and Xerxes.—Darius mentions the “elan-gods,” but does not name any of them. He and Xerxes understood the creation of heaven and earth to Auramazda, and say that the latter, “Who made this earth, who made yon sky, who made man, who made happiness for man,” has appointed each of them king. It is “by the grace of Auramazda” (the king of Ahuramazda) that Darius conquers his enemies. But both Artaxerxes Mōrmān and Artaxerxes Ochus couple Mithra and Anāhita (Anāhita) with Auramazda (Ahura Mazda) in praying for the protection of the empire.

Ahura Mazda.

(2) Ahura Mazda.—In the Avesta, Ahura Mazda is one of the seven Amesha Spentas or “Bountiful Immortals.” Xerxes is the father of one of them, Spentā Armaiti, who is also his spouse. He is prīnum inter pares among them, their chief, but by no means the only god. Monotheism is distinctly taught in later Zoroastrian works, for instance, in the Zardusht-Nāmah, composed 1278 AD, but it is due to Christian and Islamic influence.

The modern Zoroastrian view, clearly stated in the Dāsitār i Āsmānāk and elsewhere, that all the good creatures of Ormazd (Ahura Mazda) are entitled to adoration, undoubtedly of Worship rests upon the Avesta. There we find, in the first place, the Amesha Spentas, who occupy in regard to Mazda the same position as do the Vedic Ādityas toward Varuna, though not one of the Ādityas is identical with any of the Amesha Spentas.

The names of these are: (1) Ahura Mazda (otherwise called Spentā Mainyius or “Bountiful Mind”); (2) Vohu Mano (“Good Mind”); (3) Aša Vahista (“Hast Righteousness”); (4) Khshathra Vairya (“Excellent Ruler”); (5) Spentā Armaiti (“Bounteous Piety”); (6) Haurvatāt (“Health”); (7) Amerētāt (“Immortality”). Each has a special province: thus Armaiti is the general spirit of earth and presides over its fruitfulness. She is the patroness of virtuous maidens. Khshathra is the guardian of metals. Vohu Mano guards sheep and cattle and introduces to Ahura Mazda the spirits of the just. Next in rank come the Yazatas (“Worshipful Ones”), of whom there are a large number. Three of them, Mithra, Rashnu and Spangh, preside at the judgment of the dead on the 4th day of death. Rashnu holds the scales in which a man’s deeds are weighed. Spangh guards the soul during the first three nights after death. Aryanma Isya (“the longed-for comrade”) is the protector of mankind, the bestower of peace and happiness. On one occasion (Zend., Paris, XXII, 22-24) Ahura Mazda sends his messenger Nairyō Sahha (“male instructor”) to ask for food and water at the door of Rāman Hyavāstra, the bosom friend of Mithra, presides over the atmosphere and also gives its taste to food. Mithra is the spirit of truth. The Ohrmazd of Ohrmazd, and riding in a single-wheeled chariot (the sun), while wearing golden diadem and driving fiery steeds, and identified with the dog-star Sirius, sends rain and is by Ahura Mazda endowed with his own power and dignity (Yesh VII). The many who have translated Rāman Hyavāstra, the bosom friend of Mithra also (Yesh X, 1), Ātēr (“Fire”), Vēyū (“Air”), Vātā (“Wind”), Vēchvaragān (“Stars”), Sākhs (“Prosperity”), Arītā (“genius of Justice”), Yāvēsā (“Lightning”), Predēz (“the guardian of cattle”), Bērojā (“genius of corn”),
Ostā and Daēnā ("Knowledge" and "Religion"), who are others of the Yazatas. All these are entitled to worship at the hands of the true adherent of Mazda (Mazda
ya, opposed to Daēnāya, or worshipper of the demons).

In opposition to the creatures of Ahura Mazda are those of Ahrō Mainyūs, who is the source of all moral and material evil. The first chapter of the Vendidad tells how he created something bad in opposition and his to everything good made by Ahura Creatures Mazda.

A demon is the adversary of each Anahīva Spēhta: Aka Mano ("Evil Mind") that of Vēlot Mano, and so in order: Indra (or Angra, "demon of untruthfulness"). Sāvyra ("Evil government"). Nāyabhatya ("discontent"). Tāuro ("who poisons water") and Zārī ("poison")—being antagonistic to the other Bountiful Immortals. Āēṃa-Dāevā ("Demon of Wrath")—the Asmodeus of Tob 3 8—is the special foe of Sraoehas, the genius of obedience. Aporōsha, demon of drought, is the enemy of Tishtrya. Būtī (or Būddhi) teaches men to worship idols, and also causes death. Būshībāta is the demon of sloth. Vidyorūt or Astuvirdhūtās causes death by destroying the body. Other evil beings, Drujes, Pārīkshas, Janīs, Yātus, are so numerous in the later parts of the Avesta that a pious Zoroastrian must have lived in continual dread of their assaults. He had even to conceal the parts of his body lest they should be used as darts to his injury by these his spiritual foes.

Fertility.—Ahura Mazda and his assistants promote life, fertility in man, beast and plant, agriculture, increase; while Ahrō Mainyus and his creatures cause destruction and death. Atar ("Fire"), also said Akūn Nāpāt ("Offspring of the Waters"), is the vital principle and the source of all energy in the world. Argvi, the male Anahīva, or Male spirit, is the male. Anahīva, or Female spirit, is the female. As a river the latter flows from Mt. Hukairya, a peak in the Elburz Range (Frānu XLI), into the Virdhak-sīr or Virdhak-sīr-sīr, a stream of which grows the tree Ḥūpsa ("well watered"), which bears seeds of all plants. Anahīva means "full filled," but it is applied to purity of soul (to purify any of the four "elements" was, for later Zoroastrians, a grievous sin). The root of each of his disciples should have said Anahīva (Anahīta). Though god of truth and righteousness Mithra is not associated with moral purity (chastity). On the contrary, he was said to fertilize the earth with his rays, as sun-god, and Anahīva as goddess of fruitfulness represented the female principle in conjunction with him. The virility which led to the identification of Anahīta with the Bab Mūlitta was doubtless of later date than Zoroaster's time, yet there was little or nothing in Zoroastrianism to check it. Something similar asserts itself in Armenia, as well as in Iran, and in fact in all Nature-worship everywhere. Associated with this was the form of incest known as next-of-kin marriage (Av. Geūs, Khūse skhas), which permitted and encouraged marriages between brothers and sisters.

According to later Zoroastrian belief, the contest between Ormazd (Ahura Mazda) and Ahriman (Ahrō Mainyūs), after continuing for 6. Contest 9,000 years, is to be decided in favor of the former only through his possessing foreknowledge and Ahriman's lacking it (Bānd). Both came into Ahriman existence independently in limitless time (Av. Zvāna Akarana; Vend., Farg. XIX, 13; Pahl. Dāmar-1 Akānderkhan-ān, Bānd, 1) which, personified in the Vendidad, is called "Self-created," and is the one by Ahura Mazda's command invoked by Zoroaster in conjunction with Vāyu, the Air, the Winds, "the bountiful, beauteous daughter of Ahura Mazda" (Armaiti), the Earth, and other objects of worship (loc. cit.). No creature of Ahriman is to be worshipped; hence Indra, though in later Vedic times rising in India to a leading position in the Pantheon, is in the Avesta accounted a fiend, the very impersonation of the lie which the Avesta so firmly decries and which Darius mentions as the cause of all the rebellions, which produced so much bloodshed in his time. No virtue was valued so highly as truth in ancient Iran, as Herodotus agrees with the Avesta in testifying.

Avestic morality encourages the destruction of all hurtful things, as being of Ahrō Mainyūs' creation, and the propagation of everything good. Hence agriculture is esp. commended, together with the rearing of cattle and sheep. Somewhat later the whole duty of man was said to consist in good thoughts, good words, good deeds. Fierce opposition to every other religion was enjoined as a religious duty, and, under the Sassanides esp., this led to fearful and repeated persecutions of Christians throughout the empire.

The Sacred Thread (Av. Aīvyaśūhka; Skt. Upanitam, etc., now by the Parsis styled the Kushti) plays as important a part in Zoroas
trianism as in Hinduism. So do the charms, māhtrās (Skt. mantras), con
cerning inv. of the languages of the ancient empire.

The first thing created by Ahura Mazda was a Bull, which may represent the earth, and reminds us of the Cow Audhuma in the Edga Sangavi (Vend. 6.7). The world was created by Ahrō Mainyūs (in a later version, by Mithra). His spirit (Gēūs Urean) went to heaven and became the guardian of cattle.
The first man was Gayā-maretan ("Mortal Life"); hence the phrase Haca Gayāt Mardehadat a Sooshgandt, from Gayā-maretan (Gayomard, Kayo-
march) to Sooshgandt (Yasa XXVI, 10; Yasa XIII, 145), means "from the beginning to the end of the world." From the Airyavem Vātējō ("Aryan germ"), the first home of the Iranians, men were com-
pelled to migrate because Ahrō Māmyōs so altered the climate that the winter became ten months long and the summer only two. Yima Rishagata ("Yima the Brilliant," Pers Jamsanhā, son of Vīvāhīt, though he twice refused Ahura Mazda's commission to guard his creatures, and though by three lies he lost the "Royal Light" (Harēnō Kāvāmēn) which he originally possessed, was yet directed to prepare a very extensive inclosure (Vāra), in which he pre-
erved "the seeds of sheep and cattle, of men, of dogs, of birds, and of red, glowing fires" from some terribly severe winters which came upon the earth (Vendōdīd 11; Yasa XIX). The Bānūdhi-bānōh tale of a flood differs from this, preserving an in-
dependent narrative. Ahura Mazda's law was preached to men within Yima's inclosure.

The earth consists of seven divisions, called Karshavas (Div. dirpes). One of these, Hvaniratha, is inhabited by men; the others are separated from it by im-
passable abysses. Sun, moon, and stars revolve round Mt. Šaēra, a peak in the Elburz mountains (Dennikin 7). A later legend says that the Elburz Range surrounds the earth.

Each god and man possesses a frivolsh, which has been compared to a guardian spirit and seems to differ from the soul (sūnvan). After

10. The
Earth

Cf. 11. Heaven

11. Heaven

Heaven and judgment by Mithra, Rashnu and and Hell

Sraoša, the souls of the dead must cross the Chinvat-bridge ("Bridge of the Judge"), which is guarded by two dogs and is narrow and difficult for the unwise, but wide and easy for the just. The righteous man then advances through three Paradises, those of Good Thoughts, Good Words and Good Works (Humata, Hukhtia, Hravātia: Yast XVI; Aria Yairf Namak, VII IX), until, led by Sraoša, Atar, and Vohu Mano, he finally reaches Ahura Mazda's abode of light and glory, Gurū-nāmana (in Gāthās, Gāro-dēnavān; Pahl. Garēnūmān), where Ahura Mazda himself receives him with the words: "Greeting to thee; well hast thou served; from now on eternal mortality is cut off; from this pure, bright place!" (A. V. Nāmāk, I X, 8, 9). But the soul of the wicked man, passing through regions of Evil Thoughts, Evil Words and Evil Deeds, finally reaches a dark and gloomy Hell (Duzkhūt). In later times it was believed that those not yet fit for heaven waited in Misānāt Gātūs, an intermediate place where the extra merits of the just were stored up for the benefit of the less fortunate (Vend., Farg. XIX). A later name was Khatūb-Dele Harēz; on opinion that this idea was borrowed from mediaeval Christianity.

In primeval times the Persians buried or burned their dead. Zoroastrianism may have introduced the dakhima (Vendōdīh, passim) or tower of silence, on which bodies are exposed to be eaten by vultures.

12. Intern-
ment

Those of which the ruins have been discovered at Al Hībah are very ancient. But in Herodotus' time it was usual, after permitting the flesh to be consumed by dogs and birds, to cover the bones with wax and bury them (Herod. i.140). This was done to prevent them from coming in contact with and so polluting the earth. The cus-
tom of burial is proved by the tombs of the Acha-
emenian kings near Persepolis, and that of Cyrus, stone of which raised high above the ground, at Pasargadē.

Zoroastrianism permits no idol-worship and no temples, fire-altars only being used. These were served by Ṭhārvanaks or fire-priests, who fed the fire with costly wood and poured into it libations of haoma-
juice, taking care to cover their mouths with a cloth

Fire Altars.

(patti-dōhāna) to keep the sacred fire from being poll-
buted by their breath. Sacrifices were often offered

on the tops of the highest mountains under the open

sky (Herod. i.132; Xen. Cyrop. viii).

The Magi or priests owed the monopoly of the ide of priestly functions to their being Zoroaster's own

tribe. They are not mentioned in the Pers canonic inscrip-
tions. Only once does the word 'Magus' occur in the Avesta, and then in composition (Māgū-ūkšīsh, a Magus-hater, Yasa LXV, 7). It is not necessary to trace to BaB influence the decay of Zoroastrianism and its degradation in late Achaemenian times. This was at least in large measure due to a sev eal of the ideas and practices forbidden by Zoroaster, which reassert themselves in some parts of the Avesta, and which afterward gave rise to Mithraism.

The Avesta states that, 1,000 years after Zoro-
aster's death, a prophet named Ukhişyār-creta will arise from his seed to restore his

religion. After another 1,000 years another, Ukhişyār-nemāhi, will appear for the same purpose. The end of the world will come 1,000 years after this third prophet, Saoshyant, will be born, and will usher in the Restoration (frashō-kerēti) of the world to its primitive happiness and freedom from the evil creatures of Ahrō Māmūs. This process will be completed in 28 years, during which 28 res-
ests will perform in the other 6 Karshavas the work which will here be accomplished by Saoshyant. But mention of this Restoration occurs only in very late parts of the Avesta (e.g. Vend., Farg. XVIII, 51). It does not mean Resurrection, as De Harlez has shown. Later still, something of the kind was believed, and in the Bānūdhi-bānōh (ch v) and the Patīt (§ 28) we have the word rīst-khīz (from Av. tilōn, "departed," and hōz, "to rise"), which does mean "rising of the dead." But it can hardly be doubted that the doctrine is due to Heb and Chris-
tian influence, esp. when we consider the late and uncertain date of the books in which the idea occurs. Israel-
ites settled in Media in large numbers in or about 730-728 BC under Sargus (2 K 17 6), long before Zoroaster's birth. It is possible that his reformation may have owed much therefore to Heb influence. See, further, Zoroastrianism.

The idea of virgin birth has been asserted to occur in Zoroastrianism, both with reference to Zoroaster him-
self and to the last three great prophets of whom mention has been made. This is no error. The Avesta and all

later Zoroastrian books speak of Zoroaster's birth as
quite natural, his father being Pērūshaṣpa. Nor is virgin birth referred to in the case of Sāoshyānti and the rest. (Mater cuique ex sē, sēne in locu quidam fratris, Zoroastres semina illic reposita grandia facta filium paravit: Vend., Par., XIX, 4, 5; Yast, XIII, 128, 142; Būza, XXXII, 8, 9.) Virginity is not highly esteemed in the Avesta, though forcible is condemned.
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PERSIANS, pūr’šanž, -zhanz (Cyr. Pors, also Pērīsa, Perīsī [q.v.]; adj. Pērīs, Pērīsī, Persī, Persī, Perīs, Perīs, Pérsāi, adj. only in Neh 12 22; Dnl 6 28); Achaem. Pers Pārsā, name of both country and people; does not occur in Avesta:

I. Affinity
1. Three Classes
2. Tribal and Clan Divisions
3. Achaemenian Dynasty

II. Civilisation
1. Writing
2. Institutions and Customs

III. History
1. Cyrus
2. Capture of Babylon
3. Cambyses
4. Pseudo-Smerdis
5. Darius I
6. Darius’ Sure Canal
7. Xerxes I
8. Artaxerxes II
9. Artaxerxes II
10. Later Persian Kings

IV. First Mention in Inscriptions

The Persians are not mentioned in the Bible until the exile books (2 Ch 36 20.22.23; Ezr 1 1.2.8; 3 7; Est 1 10, etc.; Dnl 5 28; 6 8.12.15.28), being previously included under the Medes (Gen 10 2), as were also by Thucydides, and even by Xenophon often.

Achaemenes (Hakhămānīsh)
Tēispēs (Chaispisch, Šispīs)

Cyrus
Cambyses
Cyrus the Great
Cambyses

Xerxes II
Sogdianus

Artaxerxes III (Ochos)
Arsēs

Artaxerxes II (Ochos)

Ariamnēs (Ariyārāmnē)
Arsamēs (Arshāma)

Hystaspēs (Vštāspa)
Darius I
Xerxes I (Ahashseres)
Artaxerxes I (Longimanus)

Darius II
(Nothos, Ōchos)

Artaxerxes II (Mēmēnōn)

(Sisygambis, a daughter)

Darius III (Codomannus)
(Noch 12 22; 1 Mac 1 1)

Artaxerxes III (Ochos)

(And even the words ἀγγαγα, ἀγγαρο, and ἀσάδα, astāndā, used to denote them, are almost certainly Babylonian). Of these men’s pace it was said, “No mortal thing is quicker.” The custom of showing special honor to the “Benefactors of the King” (Herod. viii.86: ἄρωτος γάμος = Av. ura saubh, “widely renowned”) is referred to in Est 6 1.2.3, and that of covering the head (and face) of a criminal condemned to death (with a large black cap) (Est 7 8.9) occurs in the Šākhatnāmeh also.)
(1) The king was an arbitrary ruler with unlimited power, the council of seven princes who stood nearest to the throne (Est. 1:14; cf. Herod. iii. 70-84) having no share in the government.

(2) The army.—As soldiers, the Persians were famous as archers and javelin-throwers; they were also skilled in the use of the sling, and above all in riding. Boys were taken from the women's into the men's part of the house at the age of 5, and were there trained in "riding, archery and speaking the truth" until 20 years old. In Darius' inscriptions, as well as in the Avesta, lyting is regarded as a great crime.

(3) Marriage.—The Persians practised polygamy, and marriages between those next of kin were approved. Pride and garrulity are mentioned as distinctive of this character.

III. History.—Persian history, as known to us, begins with Cyrus the Great. His ancestors, for at least some generations, seem to have been chiefs or "kings" of Anshah, a district in Persia or Elam. Cyrus himself (WAT. V, plate 35) gives his genealogy up to and including Téspés, entitling all his ancestors whom he mentions, kings of Anshah. Phraortés, king of the Medes, is said to have first subdued the Persians to that kingdom about 97 years before Cyrus (Herod. i.102). Cyrus himself headed his countrymen's revolt against Astyages, who advanced to attack Persis and Elam (549 BC). His army mutinied and surrendered him to Cyrus, whom the Greeks had invited to be his grandson on the mother's side. Cyrus, becoming supreme ruler of both Medes and Persians, advanced to the conquest of Lydia. He defeated and captured Croesus, overran Lydia, and compelled the Greek colonies in Asia Minor to pay tribute (547 BC). He overthrew the Sute (Bedawin) across the Tigris the following year, and was then invited by a large party in Babylonia to come to their help against the usurper Nabu-níph, whose religious zeal had led him to collect as many as possible of the idols from other parts of Babylonia and remove them to Babylon, thereby increasing the sacredness and magnificence of that city but inflicting injury on neighboring and more ancient sanctuaries. Defeating Nabunád's army and capturing the king, Cyrus sent his own forces under Gúryyas (Gubaru, Gauharua) to take possession of Babylon. This he did in June, 538, "without opposition and without a battle." The citadel, however, where Belshazzar "the king's son" was in command, held out for some months, and was then taken in a night attack in which "the king's son" was slain. Cyrus made Gúryyas viceroy of Chaldaea, and he "appointed governors in Babylonia" (Cyrus' "Annaletic Tablet"). When Gúryyas died within the year, Cyrus' son Cambyses was made viceroy of the country, now become a province of the Persian empire. Cyrus restored the gods to their sanctuaries, and this doubtless led to permission being given to the Jews to return to Jerusalem, taking with them, their sacred vessels, and to rebuild their temple. Cyrus was killed in battle against some frontier tribe (accounts differ where) in 529 BC. His tomb at Murgháb, near the ruins of Pasargadae, is still standing.

Cyrus' son and successor, Cambyses, invaded Egypt and conquered it after a great battle near Pelusium (525 BC). During his absence, a Magian, Gaumátá, who pretended to be Smerdis (Bardiya), Cambyses' murdered brother, seized the throne. Marching against him, Cambyses committed suicide. After a reign of 7 months, the usurper was overthrown and slain by Darius and his 6 brother-nobles, (their names in Herod. iii. 70 are confirmed with one exception in Darius' Besítin Inscript. col. iv. 80-86). Darius became king as the heir of Cambyses (521 BC). But in nearly every part of the empire, at least, as the result of rebellions or uprisings of various kinds. He then divided the empire into satrapies, or provinces (dahyava), of which there were at first 25 (Beh. Inscription, col. i. 13-17), and ultimately at least 29 (Naqsh i Rustam Inscription, 22-30). Over these he placed satraps of noble Pers or Median descent, instead of representatives of their ancient kings. His empire extended from the Indus to the Black Sea, from the Jaxartes to beyond the Nile.

Darius united the latter river with the Red Sea by a canal, the partly obliterated inscription commemorating which may perhaps be thus interpreted and rendered: "I am a Persian; with Persia Suez I united Egypt. I commanded to dig this canal from the river named the Nile (Práva), which flows through Egypt, to this sea which comes from Persia. This canal was dug, according as I commanded. And I said: 'Come ye from the Nile through this canal to Persia.'"

Darius' expedition into Scythia, his success in subduing the rebellion among the Asiatic Greeks, his attempt to conquer Greece itself and his overthrow at Marathon (499-490 BC) are part of the history of Greece. A rebellion in Egypt had not been repressed when Darius died in 483 BC.

Xerxes I, who succeeded his father, regained Egypt, but his failure in his attempts to conquer Greece largely exhausted his empire.

7. Xerxes I In 464 BC he was murdered. His son Artaxerxes I, summoned "the long-armed," succeeded him, being himself succeeded in 421 BC by his son Xerxes II, who was murdered.
the following year. This ended the legitimate Achaemenid line, the next king, Darius II (styled Nothos, or 'bastard'), as well as his brothers, Ilshans and Azeres, by his Egyptian eunuch Bagôs, probably in revenge for Artaxerxes' conduct in Egypt (333 BC). Arsês was murdered by Bagôs 3 years later, when Darius III, Codomanus, the son of Sisygambis, daughter of Artaxerxes II, and her husband, a Pers noble, ascended the throne. Darius was completely overthrown by Alexander the Great in the battle of Gaugamela or Arbela, 331 BC, and shortly after fell by an assassin's hand. This ended the P ersian empire of the Achaemenides, the whole of the lands composing it becoming part of the empire of Macedon.

IV. First Mention in Inscriptions.—Persis (Par-
sia) is the first mention of Persia in an inscription of Ramman in Nisîrî III (WAF I, 1, 18), who boasts of having conquered it and other lands (he reigned from 812 to 783 or from 810 to 781 BC).

LITERATURE.—Besides the main authorities mentioned in the text, we learn much from Spicq, Die Altper-
sischen Keilschrifttexte, Arrian, Tacitcides, Polybius, Strabo, Curtius.

W. ST. CLAIR TIBBULL

PERSIS, pûr'sîs (Isapôs, Persis): The name of a female member of the Christian community at Rome, to whom Paul sent greetings (Rom 16 12). The name is also derived from "the beloved, who labored much in the Lord." The name is not found in inscriptions of the imperial household, but it occurs as that of a freedwoman (CIL VI, 23, 959).

PERSON, pûr'sûn, pûr's'h, PERSONALITY, pûr-
sun-al't-i (sî, nephesh, 'îsh, 'îshîn, 'â'nîm, 'âvî- nîm; pûr'sûn, pûr's'hon, pûr's'hon, hû-pû-
ê'sàtn): The most frequent word for "person" in the OT is nephesh, "soul" (Gen 14 21, "Give me the persons, and take the goods"); 36 6, AV "all the persons"; Nu 5 6, AV "that person," etc; 'îsh, "a man," and his designations (Ps 23 1, "sheep and ten persons"); 1 S 16 18, "a comely person" etc; 'â'nîm, "a man," and his designations (Ps 31 28, "of the persons, and of the oxen"); Prov 6 12, "a worthless person," etc; 'înâsh, "a man," "a weak, mortal man," occurs twice (Jgs 9 4, AV "vain and light persons"); Zeph 3 4); ba'al, "owner," "lord," is once tr'c "person" (Prov 4 8, AV "a miscellaneous person"); and mî'thîm, "men," once (Ps 26 4, AV "vain persons"); pûr's'h, "face," is frequently tr'c "person," especially in the external appearance, as of persons in high places, rich persons who could favor or bribe, etc, chiefly in the phrases regarding the person, "accepting the person" (Dt 10 17; Mal 1 8).

In the NT pro'sôph, "face," "countenance," stands in the same connection (Mt 22 16, "Thou regardest not the person of men"); Gal 2 6, "God accepteth not man's person"; Acts 10 34, "God is no respecter of persons"; Rom 2 11, "there is no respect of persons with God"); Eph 6 9; Col 3 24). In Col 4:11 we have "persons" (pro'sôph), also, as in the later Gr, "the gift bestowed . . . by many persons," the only occurrence in the NT; in 2 10 pro'sôph may stand for "presence," as RV "in the presence of Christ," but it might mean "as representing Christ"; not H 1 3, AV "hypostasis," "that which lies under." Sub-

stratum, is rendered "person," "the express image of his person," i.e. of God, which RV renders "the very image of his substance," in "the impress of his substance," in "the most visible image of the invisible God and Father." Person is also frequently supplanted as the substantive implied in various adjts, etc, e.g. profane, perjured, vile.

In the Apoc we have prosôph tr'c "person" (Jth 7 15, AV "face"); Ecclus 10 13, "the accepting of persons" is condemned (Wis 6 7; Ecclus 4 22 27; 7 6; 20 22, RV "by a foolish countenance"); 36 13; 42 1; "With him [God] is no respect of persons," Ecclus 35 12).

RV has "soul" for "person" (Nu 5 6). "face" (Jer 52 26, "man") (Ps 104 14) "reprochrome" for " vile person" (Ps 15 4), AV "BYM, "tool" (Isa 32 5 6); AV "man of falsehood," AV "vain persons" (Ps 36 5). The thing has an evil thing (Ps 10 14), "back to thee in his own person" (author, different text) for "again that therefore receive him" (Philon versa); "take away life" for "respect any person" (2 S 14 14), with seven others for "the eighth person" (G 2 Pot 2 5); "false witnesses" for "seven thousand persons" for "of men seven thousand" (Rev 11 14).

Personality is that which constitutes and characterizes a person. The word "person" (Lat persona) is derived from the mask through which an actor spoke his part (per sona). From being applied to the mask, it came next to be applied to the actor, then to the character act, then to any assumed character, taken by anyone having a certain "station"; lastly, it came to mean an individual, a feeling, thinking and acting being. For full personality there must be self-consciousness, with the capability of free thought and action—self-deter-
mination—hence we speak of personal character, personal action, etc. A person is thus a responsible being, while an animal is not. Personality is distinctive of man. The personality is the unit of the entire rational being, perhaps most clearly represented by "the will"; it is that which is deepest in man, belonging, of course, not to the realm of space or the region of the visible, but existing as a spiritual reality in time, with a destiny beyond it. It is the substance (hypostasis) of the being, that which underlies all its manifestations; hence the rendering "the express image of his person" in He 1 3 AV. Hypostasis was employed by the early Gr Fathers to express what the Latins intended by per-
sona; afterward prosôph was introduced.

Recent psychologists have isolated the prominent elements in the subconscious realm, the relation of which to the personality is obscure. There seems to be more in each individual than is normally expres-
sed in the personal consciousness and action. The real, responsible personality, however, is something which is always being formed. The phe-
nomenon of double personality is pathological, as truly the result of brain disease as insanity.

In the Bible man is throughout regarded as per-
sional, although in so many instances that the full importance of the individual as distinct from the nation was realized. The use of pro'sôph for "per-
sion" indicates also a more external conception of personality than the modern. With the Hebrews the nephesh, "the seat of the person," et al. "You will not leave my soul nephesh to Sheol" (Ps 16 10); "Thou hast brought up my soul from Sheol" (Ps 30 3). God is also always regarded as personal (who has created man in His own image), and although the representations so often show an anthropomorphic re-creation of man, the Divine personality could only be conceived after the analogy of the human, as far as it could be definitely conceived at all; but God was regarded as transcending, not only the whole of Nature, but all that is human, e.g. "the Lord who can sift as a sieve" (Nu 13 19; 1 S 15 29); "Canst thou by searching
find out God?" (Job 11:7; Isa 40:28; cf. Ecc 3:11, 18, etc.). In the NT the personality of God is, on the warrant of Jesus Himself, conceived after the analogy of the fatherhood yes yet as transcending all our human conceptions: "How much more?" (Mt 7:11); "Who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor?" (Rom 11:34). Man is body, soul and spirit, but God in Himself is Spirit, infinite, perfect, ethereal Spirit (Mt 5:48; 1 Cor 15:44). He is forever more than all that is created, "For of him, and through him, and unto him, are all things" (Rom 11:36). The human personality, being spiritual, survives bodily dissolution and in Christ becomes clothed again with a spiritual body (Phil 3:21; 1 Cor 15:44).

PERSON OF CHRIST:
Method of the Article
1. Teaching of Paul
   1. Phil 2:5–9
      (1) General Drift of Passage
      (2) Our Lord's Intrinsic Deity
      (3) No Exaltation
      (4) Our Lord's Humanity
   2. Other Passages

II. Teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews
Hebrews
   1. Background of Express Deity
      (1) Completeness of Humanity
      (2) Continued Possession of Deity

III. Teaching of Other Epistles

IV. Teaching of John
   1. The Epistles
      2. Prologue to the Gospel
      (1) The Being Who Was Incarnated
      (2) The Incarnation
      (3) The Incarnated Person
   2. The Lord

V. Teaching of the Synoptic Gospels
   (1) The Johannine Jesus
      (1) His Higher Nature
      (2) Multiplication
   2. The Synoptic Jesus
      (1) His Deity
      (2) Mk 15:32
      (5) Other Passages: Son of Man and Son of God
      (c) Mt 11:27; 28:19
   (2) His Humanity
   (3) Unity of the Person

VII. The Two Natures Everywhere Presupposed

VIII. Formulation of the Doctrine Literature

It is the purpose of this article to make as clear as possible the conception of the Person of Christ, in the technical sense of that term, as it lies on the pages of the NT. The Article so, beneath—the pages of the NT. Were it its purpose to trace out the process by which this great mystery has been revealed to men, a beginning would need to be taken from the intimations as to the nature of the person of the Messiah in OT prophecy, and an attempt would require to be made to discriminate the exact contribution of each organ of revelation to our knowledge. And were there added to this a desire to ascertain the progress of the apprehension of this mystery by men, there would be demanded a further inquiry into the exact degree of understanding which was brought to the truth revealed at each stage of its revelation. The magnitudes with which such investigations deal, however, are very minute; and it is profit to be derived from them is not, in a case like the present, very great. It is, of course, of importance to know how the person of the Messiah was represented in the predictions of the OT; and it is a matter at least of interest to note, for example, the difficulty experienced by our Lord's immediate disciples in comprehending all that was involved in His manifestation. But, after all, the constitution of Our Lord's person is a matter of revelation, not of human thought; and it is preeminently a revelation of the NT, not of the OT. And the NT is all the product of a single movement, at a single stage of its development, and therefore presents in its fundamental teaching a common character. The whole of the NT was written within the life of about a half a century; or, if we except the writings of John, within the narrow bounds of a couple of decades; and the entire body of writings which enter into it are so much of a piece that it may be plausibly represented that they all bear the stamp of a single fundmental teaching. The NT lends itself, therefore, more readily to what is called dogmatic than to what is called genetic treatment; and we shall penetrate most surely into its essential meaning if we take our start from its clearest and fullest statements, and permit their light to be thrown upon its more incidental allusions. This is peculiarly the case with such a matter as the person of Christ, which is dealt with chiefly incidentally, as a thing already understood to all, and needing only to be alluded to rather than formally expounded. That we may interpret these allusions aright, it is requisite that we should recover from the first the common conception which underlies them all.

1. The Teaching of Paul.
   (1) General drift of passage.
   (2) Phil 2:5–9.
   (3) Our Lord's intrinsic Deity.
   (4) Our Lord's Humanity.

2. Other Passages.

3. Hebrews.


5. Synoptic Gospels.


7. Multiplication.

8. Synoptic Jesus.


11. Unity.

12. NT.


15. Synoptic Jesus: Deity.


17. Other Passages: Son of Man and Son of God.


19. Unity.

20. NT.


22. Multiplication.


24. Kirk.

25. Other Passages: Son of Man and Son of God.


27. Unity.

28. NT.


30. Multiplication.

31. Synoptic Jesus: Deity.

32. Kirk.

33. Other Passages: Son of Man and Son of God.

34. Humanity.

35. Unity.

36. NT.


38. Multiplication.


40. Kirk.

41. Other Passages: Son of Man and Son of God.

42. Humanity.

43. Unity.

44. NT.


46. Multiplication.

47. Synoptic Jesus: Deity.


49. Other Passages: Son of Man and Son of God.

50. Humanity.

51. Unity.

52. NT.


54. Multiplication.

55. Synoptic Jesus: Deity.

56. Kirk.

57. Other Passages: Son of Man and Son of God.

58. Humanity.

59. Unity.

60. NT.
acting qualities which make a thing the precise thing that it is. Thus, the "form" of a sword (in this case mostly matters of external configuration) is all that makes a given piece of metal specifically a sword, rather than, say, a spade. And "the form of God" is the sum of the characteristics which make the being very God," specifically God, rather than some other being an angel, say, or a man. When Our Lord is said to be in "the form of God," therefore, He is declared, in the most express manner possible, to be all that God is, to possess the whole fulness of attributes which make God God. Paul chooses the manner of the expression instinctively, because, in adding Our Lord as our example of self-abnegation, his mind is naturally resting, not on the bare fact that He is God, but on the richness and fulness of His being as God. He was all this, yet He did not look on His own things but on those of others.

It should be carefully observed also that in making this great affirmation concerning Our Lord, Paul does not throw it distinctively into the past, as if he was saying, "This is a mere mode of Our Lord's, indeed, but no longer His because of the action by which He became our example of unselfishness. Our Lord, he says, "being," "existing," "subsisting" in the form of God"—as it is variously rendered in the revised versions. "being originally," while right in substance, is somewhat misleading. The vb. employed means "strictly to be beforehand," "to be already" so and so" (Blass, Grammar of NT Greek, ET, 244), "to be, exist," and intimates the existing circumstances, disposition of mind, or, as here, mode of subsistence in which the action to be described takes place. It contains no intimation, however, of the cessation of these circumstances or disposition, or mode of subsistence; and that, the less in a case like the present, where it is cast in the tense (the imperfect) which in no way suggests that the mode of subsistence intimated came to an end in the action described by the succeeding vb. (cf. the 1's, 1K 16 14 23; 2S 50; Acts 2 30; 3 2; 2 Cor 8 17; 12 16; Gal 1 14). Paul is not telling us here, then, what Our Lord was once, but rather what He already was, or, better, what in His intrinsic nature He is; he is not describing a past mode of existence of Our Lord, before the action by which He became our example—although that mode of existence he describes was Our Lord's mode of existence before this action—so much as painting the background upon which the action adduced may be thrown up into prominence. He is telling us who and what He is who did these things for us, that we may appreciate how great the things He did for us are.

(3) No exinanition.—And here it is important to observe that the whole of the action adduced is thrown up thus against this background—not only its negative description to the effect that Our Lord (although all that God is) did not look greedily on His (consequent) being on an equality with God; but its positive description as well, introduced by the "but..." and that in both of its elements, not merely in the effect (ver 7) that 'he took no account of himself' (rendered not badly by AV, He "made himself of no reputation"; but quite misleading by RV, He "emptied himself"), but equally that to the effect (ver 8) that "he humbled himself." It is the whole of what the clause (vs 6-8) that "he humbled himself" as doing despite His "subsistence in the form of God." So far is Paul from intimating, therefore, that Our Lord laid aside His Deity in entering upon His life on earth, that he rather asserts that He retained His Deity throughout His life on earth, and in the whole course of His humiliation, up to death itself, was consciously ever exercising self-abnegation, living a life which did not by nature belong to Him, which stood in fact in direct contradiction to the life which was naturally His. It is this underlying implication which determines the whole choice of the language in which Our Lord's earthly life is described. It is because it is kept in mind that He still was "in the form of God," that is, that He still had in possession all that body of characterising qualities by which God is made God, for example, that He is said to have been made, not man, but "in the likeness of man," to have been found, not man, but in fashion as a servant. It is true that our emphasis, and obedience, the mark of servanthood, is thought of as so great. Though He was truly man, He was much more than man; and Paul would not have his readers imagine that He had become merely man. In other words, Paul does not teach that Our Lord was once God but had become instead man; he teaches that though He was God, He had become also man.

An impression that Paul means to imply, that in entering upon His earthly life Our Lord had laid aside His Deity, may be created by a very prevalent misinterpretation of the central clause of His statement—a misinterpretation unfortunately given currency by the rendering of RV: "counted it not a prize to be made equal with God," varied without improvement in ARV to: "counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself." The former (negative) member of this clause means just: He did not look greedily on His being on an equality with God; did not "set supreme more" by it (see Lightfoot on the clause). The latter (positive) member of it, however, cannot mean in antithesis to this, that He therefore "emptied himself," divested Himself of this, His being on an equality with God, much less that He "emptied himself," divested Himself of His Deity ("form of God") itself, of which His being on an equality with God is the manifested consequence. The vb. here rendered "emptied" is in constant use in a metaphorical sense (so only in the NT: Rom 4 14; 1 Cor 1 17; 9 15; 2 Cor 9 3) and cannot here be taken literally. This is already apparent from the definition of the manner in which the "emptying" is said to have been accomplished, supplied by the modal clause added: "having made Himself to be a servant." You cannot "empty" by "taking"—adding. It is equally apparent, however, from the strength of the emphasis which, by its position, is thrown upon the "Himself." We may speak of Our Lord as "emptied" Himself with the utmost emphasis, scarcely, with this strength of emphasis, of His "emptying Himself" of something else. This emphatic "Himself," interposed between the preceding clause and the vb. rendered "emptied," builds a barrier over which we cannot go back in search of that of which Our Lord emptied Himself. The whole thought is necessarily contained in the two words, "emptied Himself," in which the word "emptied" must therefore be taken in a sense analogous to that which it bears in the other parts of the clause in the NT where it occurs. Paul, in a word, says here nothing more than that Our Lord, who did not look with greedy eyes upon His estate of equality with God, emptied Himself, if the language may be pardoned, of Himself; that is to say, Our Lord is divested, in the exhortation for the enhancement of which His example is adduced, that He did not look on His own things. "He made no account of Himself," we may fairly paraphrase the clause; and thus all question of what He emptied Himself of is removed. What Our Lord actually did, according to Paul, is expressed in the following clauses; those now before
us express more the moral character of His act. He took "the form of a servant," and so was "made in the likeness of men." But His doing this showed that He did not set overwheining store by His state of being, merely its outward display. Here the change in Our Lord's condition at a point of time perfectly understood between the writer and his readers is adverted to and assigned to its motive, but no further definition is given of the nature of either condition referred to. We are brought closer to the precise nature of the act by which the change was wrought by such a passage as Gal 4 4. We read that "When the fulness of the time came, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the law, that He might redeem those that were under the law; which were referred to the Father in fulfillment of His eternal plan of redemption, and it is described specifically as an incarnation: the Son of God is born of a woman—He who is in His own nature the Son of God, abiding with God, is sent forth from God in such a manner as to be born a human being, subject to law. The primary implications are that this was not the beginning of His being; but that before this He was neither a man nor subject to law. But above all, that on the genuine and subject to law, He ceased to be the Son of God or lost anything intimated by that high designation. The uniqueness of His relation to God as His Son is emphasized in a kindred passage (Rom 8 3) by His heightening the elevation of "the Son" of His "own Son," and His distinction from other men is intimated in the same passage by the declaration that God sent Him, not in sinful flesh, but only "in the likeness of sinful flesh. The reality of Our Lord's flesh is not in the imagination of this turn of speech, but His freedom from the sin which is associated with flesh as it exists in lost humanity is asserted (cf 2 Cor 6 21). Though true man, therefore (1 Cor 15 21; Rom 8 17; Acts 15 31) He is not without differences from other men; and these differences do not concern merely the condition (as sinful) in which men presently find themselves; but also their very origin: they are from below, He from above—"the first man is from the earth, earthy; the second man is from heaven' (1 Cor 15 47). This is His peculiarity: He was born of a woman like other men; yet He descended from heaven (cf Eph 4 9; Jn 3 13). It is not meant, of course, that already in heaven He was a man; what is meant is that the human nature of the Son was of origin in an exceptional sense from heaven. Paul describes what He was in heaven (but not alone in heaven)—that is to say before He was sent in the likeness of sinful flesh (though not alone before this)—in the great terms of "God's Son," "God's own Son," "the form of God," or yet again in words whose import cannot be mistaken, 'God over all' (Rom 9 5). In the last cited passage, together with its parallel earlier in the same ep. (Rom 1 3), the two sides of the nature of Our Lord's person are brought into collocation after a fashion that can leave no doubt of Paul's conception of His twofold nature. In the earlier of these passages he tells us that Jesus Christ was born, indeed, of the seed of David according to the flesh, that is, so far as the human side of His being is concerned, but was powerfully marked out as the Son of God according to the Spirit of Holiness, that is, with respect to His higher nature, by the resurrection of the dead, which in a true sense began in His own rising from the dead. In the later of them, he tells us with deep feeling, indeed, as concerns the flesh, that is on the human side of His being, from Israel, but that, despite this earthly origin of His human nature, He yet is and abides (present participle) nothing less than the Supreme God, "God over all [emphatic], blessed forever." The Paul teaches us that by His coming
forth from God to be born of woman, Our Lord, assuming a human nature to Himself, has, while remaining the Supreme God, become also true and perfect man. The whole of the resources of language are strained to the utmost to make the exaltation of Our Lord's being clear— in which He is described as the image of the invisible God, whose being antedates all that is created, in whom, through whom and to whom all things have been created, and in whom they all subsist—we are told not only that (naturally) in Him all the fulness dwells (Col 1 19), but, with complete explanation, that "all the fulness of the Godhead dwells in him bodily" (Col 2 9); that is to say, the very Deity of God, of which Our Lord is the human form of the Son of God in becoming man: He descended an infinite distance to reach man's highest conceivable exaltation. As, however, the primary purpose of the adoption of the language is merely to declare that the Son of God became man, so it is shortly afterward explained (2 14) as an entering into participation in the blood and flesh which are common to men: "Since then the children are sharers in flesh and blood, he also himself in like manner partook of the same" (2 14). In the reality, the completeness of the assumption of humanity by the Son of God, are all here emphasized.

The proximate end of Our Lord's assumption of humanity is declared to be that He might die; He was "made a little lower than the angels . . . because of the suffering of death" (2 9); He took part in blood and flesh in order "that through death . . . " (2 14). The Son of God as such could not die; to Him belongs "the name which is above every name" (Phil 2 9). If He was to die, therefore, He must take to Himself another nature to which the experience of death was not impossible (2 17). Of course it is not meant that death was desired by Him for its own sake. The purpose of the passage is to save its Jewish readers from the offence of the death of Christ. What they are bidden to observe is, therefore, Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels because of the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor, that by the grace of God the bitterness of death which He tasted might redound to the benefit of every man" (2 9), and the argument is immediately pressed home that it was eminently suitable for God Almighty, in bringing many sons unto glory, "that He should be exalted in the highest sovereignty of His salvation perfect (as a Saviour) by means of suffering. The meaning is that it was only through suffering that these men, being sinners, could be brought into glory. And therefore in the plainer statement of ver 14 we read that Our Lord took part in flesh and blood in order "that through death he might bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and might deliver all them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For ver 17 that the ultimate object of His assumption to man was that He might "make propitiation for the sins of the people." It is for the salvation of sinners that Our Lord has come into the world; but, as that salvation can be wrought only by suffering and death, the proximate end of His assumption of humanity remains that He might die; whatever is more than this gathers around this.

The completeness of Our Lord's assumption of humanity and of His glorification is thus stated with strong emphasis in this passage. He took part in the flesh and blood which is the common heritage of men, after the same fashion that other men die (2 14); and, having thus become a man among men, He shared with other men that most solemn exhalation and fortunes of life, "in all things" (2 17). The stress is laid on trials, sufferings, death; but this is due to the actual course in which His life ran and that it might
run in which He became man—and is not exclusive of other representations of the Divine Son. What is asserted is that He became truly a man, and lived a truly human life, subject to all the experiences of man in the particular circumstances in which He lived.

(3) Continued possession of Deity.—It is not implied, however, that during this human life—"the days of his flesh" (6 7)—He had ceased to be God, or to have at His disposal the attributes which belonged to Him as God. That is already excluded by the representations of ch. 1. The glory of this dispensation consists precisely in the bringing of its revelations directly by the Divine Son rather than by mere prophets (1 1), and it was as the effulgence of God's glory and the express image of His substance, upholding the universe by the word of His power, that this Son made purification of sins (1 3). Indeed, we are expressly told that even in the days of the flesh, He continued still a Son (5 8), and that it was precisely in this that the wonder lay: that the Son of God, in a real sense, became a man, a perfectly human and separate individual, in contrast with the shadows of the Old Covenant (9 14). Though a man, therefore, and truly man, sprung out of Judah (7 14), touched with the feeling of human infirmities (4 15), and tempted like as we are tempted (4 17), yet altogether distinct from ordinary men, one thing, He was "without sin" (4 15; 7 26), and, by this characteristic, He was, in every sense of the words, separated from sinners. Despite the completeness of His identification with men, He remained, therefore, even in the days of His flesh different from them and above them.

III. Teaching of Other Epistles.—It is only as we carry this conception of the person of our Lord with us—the conception of Him as united to us—so far as He is God our Saviour, to whom our adoration is due, and our fellow in the experiences of a human life—that unity is induced in the multiform allusions to Him throughout, whether to the Ep. of Paul or the Ep. to the H. or, indeed, the other epistles of the New Testament. In this measure there is no difference between those and these. There are no doubt a few passages in these other letters in which elements of the person of Christ are brought together and given detailed mention. In 1 Cor. 15, 20, the two constitutive elements of His person are spoken of in the contrast, familiar from Paul, of the "flesh" and the "spirit." But ordinarily we may speak of the person of Christ as being more or less divided. Everywhere our Lord is spoken of as having lived out His life as a man; but everywhere also He is spoken of with the supreme reverence which is due to God alone, and the very name of God is not withheld from Him. In 1 Pet. 1 11 His preexistence is taken for granted; in Jas. 2 1 He is identified with the Shekinah, the manifested Jehovah—our Lord Jesus Christ, the Glory; in Jude ver. 4 He is "our only Master [Deipontos] and Lord"; over and over again He is the Divine Lord who is Jesus (e.g. 1 Pet. 2 13; 2 Pet. 3 2 18); in 2 Pet. 1 1, He is roundly called "our God and Saviour"—perhaps nowhere more formal articulation of the entire doctrine of the person of Christ. But everywhere its elements, now one and now another, are presupposed as the common property of writer and readers. It is only in the Ep. of John that this easy and unstudied presupposition of them gives way to pointed insistence upon them.

IV. Teaching of John.—In the circumstances in which he wrote, John found it necessary to insist upon the elements of the person of 1. The Our Lord—His true Deity, His true Epistles humanity and the unity of His person with the Godhead which is more directly in form than anything we find in the other writings of the NT. The great depository of his teaching on the subject is, of course, the prologue to his Gospel.

But it is not merely in this prologue, nor in the Gospel to which it forms a fitting introduction, that these didactic statements are made. The prologue of John's witness to the twofold nature of the Lord is brought out, indeed, only by combining what he says in the Gospel and in the Epp. In the Gospel, remarks Westcott (on Jn. 20 31), "the evangelist seems to have taken step by step through historical Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God (opposed to mere 'flesh'); in the Ep. he reaffirms that the Christ, the Son of God, was true man (opposed to mere 'spirit'; 1 Jn. 4 2). What John is concerned to show is that in Jesus both (1 Jn. 5 20) He was "made flesh" (Jn. 1 14); and that this 'only God' (Jn. 1 18, R.V. 'God only begotten') has truly come in . . . flesh" (1 Jn. 4 2). In all the universe there is no other being of whom it can be said that He is God come in flesh (2 Jn. 1 7, that "cometh in the flesh," whose characteristic this is). And of all the marvels which have ever occurred in the marvelous history of the universe, this is the greatest—that what was from the beginning (1 Jn. 3 14) has been heard and gazed upon, seen and handled by men (1 Jn. 1 1).

From the point of view from which we now approach it, the prologue to the Gospel of John may be said to fall into three parts. In the first of these, the prologue of the Being who became incarnate in the person we know as Jesus Christ is described; in the second, the general nature of the act we call the incarnation; and in the third, the nature of the incarnated person. See JOHN, THEOLOGY, III; JOHN, GOSPEL OF, IV, 1, (3), 2.

(1) The Being who was incarnated.—John here calls the person who became incarnate by a name peculiar to himself in the NT—the Logos or 'Word.' According to the predicates which he here applies to Him, he can mean by the "Word" nothing else but God Himself, "considered in His creative, operative, self-revealing, and communicating character," the sum total of what is Divine (C. F. Schmid). In three crisp sentences he declares at the outset His eternal subsistence, His eternal intercommunion with God, His eternal identity with God: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God' (Jn. 1 1). "In the beginning," at that point of time when things first began to be (Gen 1 1), the Word already "was." He antedates the beginning of all things. And He not merely antedates them, but it is immediately added that He is in the bosom of the Father. "And the Word was with God" (Jn. 1 1). "In the beginning," at that point of time when things first began to be (Gen 1 1), the Word already "was." He antedates the beginning of all things. And He not merely antedates them, but it is immediately added that He is in the bosom of the Father. "And the Word was with God" (Jn. 1 1). In 1 Cor. 15, 20, the two constitutive elements of His person are spoken of in the contrast, familiar from Paul, of the 'flesh' and the 'spirit.' But ordinarily we may speak of the person of Christ as being more or less divided. Everywhere our Lord is spoken of as having lived out His life as a man; but everywhere also He is spoken of with the supreme reverence which is due to God alone, and the very name of God is not withheld from Him. In 1 Pet. 1 11 His preexistence is taken for granted; in Jas. 2 1 He is identified with the Shekinah, the manifested Jehovah—our Lord Jesus Christ, the Glory; in Jude ver. 4 He is "our only Master [Deipontos] and Lord"; over and over again He is the Divine Lord who is Jesus (e.g. 1 Pet. 2 13; 2 Pet. 3 2 18); in 2 Pet. 1 1, He is roundly called "our God and Saviour"—perhaps nowhere more formal articulation of the entire doctrine of the person of Christ. But everywhere its elements, now one and now another, are presupposed as the common property of writer and readers. It is only in the Ep. of John that this easy and unstudied presupposition of them gives way to pointed insistence upon them.
was thus in some sense a second along with God. He was no nekkel, not a separate being from God: "And the Word was God" (John 1:1). In some sense distinguishable from God, He was in an equally true sense identical with God. There is but one eternal God; this eternal God, the Word is; in whatever sense we may distinguish Him from the God whom He is with." He is yet not another than this God, but Himself is this God. The predicate "God" occupies the position of emphasis in this great declaration, and is so placed in the sentence as to be thrown up in sharp contrast with the phrase: "with God"; which incidentally enforces inferences as to the nature of the Word being drawn even momentarily from that phrase. John would have us realize that what the Word was in eternity was not merely God's coeternal fellow, but the eternal God's self.

(2) The incarnation.—Now, John tells us that it was this Word, eternal in His subsistence, God's eternal fellow, the eternal God's self, that, as "come in the flesh," was Jesus Christ (1 John 4.2). And the Word because flesh " (John 1:14), he says, the terms he employs here are not terms of substance, but of personality. The meaning is not that the substance of God was transmuted into that substance which we call "flesh." The Word is a personal name, which the Father gave an appropriate designation of humanity in its entirety, with the implications of dependence and weakness. The meaning, then, is simply that He who had just been described as the eternal God, became, by a voluntary act in time and space. The exact nature of the act by which He "became" man lies outside the statement; it was matter of common knowledge between the writer and the reader. The language employed intimates merely that it was a definite act, and that it involved a change in the identity of the eternal God, here designated "the Word." The whole emphasis falls on the nature of this change in His life-history. He became flesh. That is to say, He entered upon a mode of existence in which the experiences that belong to human beings would also be His. The dependence, the weakness, which constitute the very idea of flesh, in contrast with God, would now enter into His personal experience. And it is precisely because these are the connotations of the term "flesh" that the term here has not the more simply denotive term "man." What he means is merely that the eternal God became man. But he elects to say this in the language which throws best up to view what it is to become man. The contrary be the Word and the human nature which He assumed as flesh, is the hinge of the statement. Had the evangelist said (as he does in 1 John 4:2) that the Word "came in flesh," it would have been the continuity through the change which would have been most emphasized. When he says rather that the Word became flesh, while the continuity of the personal subject is, of course, intimated, it is the reality and the completeness of the humanity assumed which is made most prominent.

(3) The incarnated person.—That in becoming flesh the Word did not cease to be what He was before entering upon this new sphere of experiences, the evangelist does not leave, however, to mere suggestion. The glory of the Word was so far from diminishing, when by His becoming flesh, that he gives us at once to understand that it was rather as "trailing clouds of glory" that He came. "And the Word became flesh," he says, and immediately adds: "and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth)" (1:14). The language is colored by reminiscences from the Tabernacle, in which the Glory of God, the Shekinah, dwelt. The flesh of Our Lord became, on its assumption by the Word, the Temple of God on earth (cf. v. 19), and the glory of the Lord filled the house of the Lord. John tells us expressly that this glory was visible, that it was precisely what was appropriate to the Son of God as such. "And we beheld his glory," he says; not divined, nor inferred, but perceived it. It was open to sight, and the actual object of observation. Jesus Christ was obviously more than man; He was obviously God. His actually observed glory, John tells us further, was a "glory of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth" unique; nothing like it was ever seen in another. And its uniqueness consisted precisely in its consonance with what the unique Son of God, sent forth from the Father, who was full of grace and truth, would naturally manifest. That nothing is more characteristic of the incarnation of the continuity of all that belongs to the Word as such into this new sphere of existence, and its full manifestation through the veil of His flesh, John adds at the close of his exposition the remarkable sentence: "As God, no one has ever yet seen him; God only begotten, who is in the bosom of the Father—he hath declared him" (1:18 m). It is the incarnate Word which is here called 'only begotten God.' The absence of the article with this designation is doubtless due to its parallelism with the word "God" which stands at the head of the corresponding clause. The effect of its absence is to throw up into emphasis the quality rather than the mere individuality of the person so designated. The adj. "only begotten" conveys the idea, not of derivation and subordination, but of uniqueness and consubstantiality: Jesus is all that God is, and He alone is this. Of this "only begotten God" it is now declared that He "is"—not "was," the state is not an incomplete one, but one which continues uninterupted and unmodified—"into"—not merely "in"—"the bosom of the Father"—that is to say, He continues in the most intimate and complete communion with the Father. The unity which the "Word of God" in the full sense of the external relation intimated in 1:1. This being true, He has much more than seen God, and is fully able to "interpret" God to men. Though no one has ever yet seen God, yet he who has seen Jesus Christ, "God only begotten," has seen the Father (cf. 14:9; 12:45). In this remarkable sentence there is asserted in the most direct manner the full Deity of the incarnate Word, and the continuity of His life as such in His incarnate life; thus He is fitted to be the absolute revelation of God to man.

This condensed statement of the whole doctrine of the incarnation is only the prologue to a historical treatise. The historical treatise which it introduces, naturally, is (cf. 2:11) written from the point of view of its prologue. Its object is to present Jesus Christ in His historical manifestation, as obviously the Son of God in flesh. "These are written," the Gospel testifies, "that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that Jesus whom God has raised from the dead is the Son of God: a partial answer to the question of grace and truth" (1:14). The language is colored by reminiscences from the Tabernacle, in which the

Person of Christ
V. Teaching of the Synoptic Gospels.—The same may be said of the other Gospels. They are all dramatizations of the God-man set forth in the expositions in the prologue to John’s Gospel. The Gospel of Luke, written by a known companion of Paul, gives us in a living narrative the same Jesus who is presupposed in all Paul’s allusions to Him. That of Mark, who was also a companion of Paul, as also of Peter, is, as truly as the Gospel of John itself, a prologue to the life of Jesus, with a view to making it plain that this was the life of no mere man, human as it was, but of the Son of God Himself. Matthew’s Gospel differs from its fellows mainly in the greater richness of Jesus’ own testimony to His Deity which it records. What is characteristic of all three is the inextricable interlacing in their narratives of the human and Divine traits which alike marked the life they are depicting. It is possible, by neglecting one series of their representations, to arrive at an estimate of the other. It is possible to sift out from them at will the portrait of either a purely Divine or a purely human Jesus. It is impossible to derive from them the portrait of any other than a Divine-human Jesus. If we surrender ourselves to their guidance and take off of their pages the portrait they have endeavored to draw. As in their narratives they cursorily suggest now the fulness of His Deity and now the completeness of His humanity and everywhere the unity of His person, they present as real and as forcible a testimony to the constitution of Our Lord’s person as uniting in one personal life a truly Divine and a truly human nature, as if they announced this fact in analytical statement. Only on the assumption of this conception of Our Lord’s person as underlying all the description can the supposition, all their representations fall into their places as elements in one consistent whole. Within the limits of their common presupposition, each Gospel has no doubt its own peculiar emphasis. Mark lays particular stress on the Divine power of the man Jesus, as evidence of His supernatural being; and on the irresistible impression of a veritable Son of God, a Divine being walking the earth as a man, which He made upon all with whom He came into contact. Luke places His Gospel by the side of the Ep. to the He in the prominence it gives to the human development of the Divine being whose life on earth it is depicting and to the range of temptation to which He was subjected. It is therefore chiefly for the heights of the Divine self-consciousness which it uncovers in its report of the words of Him whom it represents as nevertheless the Son of David, the Son of Abraham; heights of Divine self-consciousness which fall in nothing short of those attained in the great utterances preserved for us by John. But amid whatever variety there may exist in the aspects on which each lays his particular emphasis, it is the same Jesus Christ which all three describe, the Son of God in man and man and one individual person. If that be not recognized, the whole narrative of the Synoptic Gospels is thrown into confusion; their portrait of Christ becomes an insoluble puzzle; and the mass of each witness’ life-experiences is transmuted into a mere set of cruel contradictions. See also GOSPELS, THE SYNOPTIC.

VI. Teaching of Jesus.—The Gospel narratives not only present us, however, with dramatizations of His person, according to their authors’ conception of His composite 1. The Johannine person. They preserve for us also a Jesus considerable body of the utterances of Jesus Himself, and this enables us to observe the conception of His person which underlay and found expression in Our Lord’s own teaching. The discourses of Our Lord which have been selected for record by John have been chosen (among other reasons) expressly for the reason that they bear witness to His essential Deity. They are accordingly peculiarly rich in material for forming a judgment of Our Lord’s conception of His higher nature. This conception, it is needless to say, is precisely that which John, taught by it, has announced in the prologue, and has been compacted by Our Lord himself as it is of these discourses. It will not be necessary to present the evidence for this in its fulness. It will be enough to point to a few characteristic passages, in which Our Lord’s conception of His higher nature finds esp. clear expression.

(1) His higher nature.—That He was of higher nature than earthly origin and nature, He repeatedly asserts: “Ye are from beneath,&quot; He says to the Jews (8 22), “And of thine own seed ye are of this world! I am not of this world!” (cf 17 10). Therefore, He taught that He, the Son of Man, had “descended out of heaven” (8 13), where was His true abode. This carried with it, of course, an assertion of preexistence; and this preexistence is explicitly affirmed: “What then,” He asks, “if ye should behold the Son of man ascending where he was before?” (6 62). It is not merely preexistence, however, but eternal preexistence which He claims for Himself: “And now, Father,” He prays (17 5), “glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was” (cf ver 24); and again, as the most impressive language possible, He declares (8 58 AV): “Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am,” where He claims for Himself the timeless present of eternity as His mode of existence. In the former of these two last-
cited passages, the character of His preexistent life is intimated; in it He shared the Father's glory from all eternity ("before the world was"); He stood by the Father's side as a companion in His glory, for He descended to earth, therefore, not from heaven only, but from the very side of God (8 42; 17 8). Even this, however, does not express the whole truth; He came forth not only from the Father's side where He had shared in the Father's glory; He came forth out of the Father's very being—"I came out from the Father, and am come into the world" (16 28; cf 8 42). "The connection described is inherent and essential, and not that of presence or external fellowship" (Westcott). This prepares us for the great assertion: "I and the Father are one" (10 30), from which it is a mere corollary that "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (14 9; cf 8 19; 12 45).

(2) His humiliation.—In all these declarations the subject of the affirmation is the actual person speaking: it is of Himself who stood before men and spoke to them that Our Lord makes these immense assertions. Accordingly, when He majestically declared, "I and the Father are" (plurality of persons) "one" (neuter singular, and accordingly singleness of being) (10 30), God, the "Thee" (Mk 8 37; Lk 18 17; Rom 8 33; Col 3 12; Tit 1 1) as His elect. He is obviously speaking in Mk 13 32 after a Divine self-consciousness: "Only a Divine being can be exalted above angels" (B. Weiss). He therefore designates Himself by His Divine name, "the Son," that is to say, the unique Son of God (9 7; 11 1), to claim to be whom would for a man be blasphemy (Mk 14 61 64). But though He designates Himself by this Divine name, He is not speaking of what is given at the baptism. He is: the action of the vb. is present, "knoweth." He is claiming, in other words, the supreme designation of "the Son," with all that is involved in it, for His present self, as He moved among men: He is, not merely was, "the Son." Nevertheless, what He affirms of Himself cannot be affirmed of Himself distinctively as "the Son." For what He affirms of Himself is ignorance—"not even the Son" knows it; and ignorance does not belong to the Divine nature, for which the term "the Son" is used (21 21). An extreme appearance of contradiction accordingly arises from the use of this terminology, just as it arises when Paul says that the Jews "crucified the Lord of glory" (1 Cor 2 8). Such an expression could only signify to "feed the imagination of God which he purchased with his own blood" (Acts 20 28m); or John Keble praises Our Lord for "the blood of souls by Thee redeemed." It was not the Lord of Glory as such who was nailed to the tree, nor have either "God" or "soul" blood to shed.

We know how this apparently contradictory mode of speech has arisen in Keble's case. He is speaking of men who are composite beings, consisting of souls and bodies, and these men come to be designated from the element of their composite personalities, though what is affirmed by them belongs rather to the other: we may speak, therefore, of the "blood of souls" meaning that these "souls," while not having blood as such, yet designate persons who have bodies, therefore dead. We know equally how to account for Paul's apparent contradiction. We know that the Old Testament Lord, as a composite person, uniting in Himself a Divine and a human nature. In Paul's view, therefore, though God as such has no blood, yet Jesus Christ, who has God's blood because He is also man. He can justly speak, therefore, when speaking of Jesus Christ, as of "the blood of God." When precisely the same phenomenon meets us in Our Lord's speech of Himself, we cannot presume that character either within the same state of things. When He speaks of the "Son" (who is God) as ignorant, we cannot designate Himself as the "Son" because of His other nature, and yet has in mind the ignorance of His lower nature. He means that the designated "the Son" is ignorant, that is to say with respect to the human nature which is as intimate an element of His person as is His Deity.
When Our Lord says, then, that "the Son knows not," He becomes as express a witness to the two natures which constitute His person as Paul is when he speaks of Jesus Christos Ktistes as a parenthesis to the threefold constitution of a human being when he speaks of such as the Lord of the Synoptics. There is no need to insist here on the elevation of Himself above the kings and prophets of the Old Covenant (Mt 12 41 ff), above the temple itself (Mt 12 6), and the ordinances of the Divine Law (Mt 12 8); or on His accent of authority in both His teaching and action, His great "I say unto you" (Mt 5 21 22), "I will; be cleansed" (Mk 1 41; Lk 7 14); or on His separation of Himself from men in His relation to God, never including them with Himself in an "Our Father," but consistently speaking distinctively of "my Father," His Father (e.g. Mt 5 16); or on His intimation that He is not merely David's Son but David's Lord, and that a Lord sitting on the right hand of God (Mt 22 44); or on His parable discrimination of Himself a Son (Mt 21 37 ff); and the Son of God (Mt 21 9) even on His ascription to Himself of the purely Divine functions of the forgiveness of sins (Mt 2 8) and judgment of the world (Mt 25 31), or of the purely Divine powers of reading the heart (Mt 9 4; Lk 8 15); or of foreshadowing (Mt 16 14 ff) and omnipresence (Mt 18 20; 28 10). These things illustrate His constant assumption of the possession of Divine dignity and attributes; the claim itself is more directly made in the two great designations with the two names of God, the first being Son, the second God. It is a designation, thus, which implies at once a heavenly preexistence, a present humiliation, and a future glory; and He proclaims Himself in this future glory no less than the universal King seated on the throne of glory, and to His Father and to the earth's multitude (Mt 8 31; Mt 25 31). The implication of Deity imbedded in the designation, Son of Man, is perhaps more plainly spoken out in the companion designation, Son of God, which Our Lord not only accepts at the hands of others, accepting with it the implication of blasphemy in permitting its application to Himself (Mt 26 63 65; Mk 14 61 64; Lk 22 28 30), but persistently claims for Himself both, in His constant designation of God as His Father in a distinctive sense, and in His less frequent but more pregnant designation of Himself as, by way of eminence, "the Son." That His consciousness of the peculiar relation to God expressed by this designation was not an attainment of His mature spiritual development, but was part of His most intimate consciousness from the beginning, is suggested by the sole glimpse which is given us into His mind as a child (Lk 2 49). The high significance which the designation bore to Him is further emphasized in two respects preserved, the one by both Matthew (11 27 ff) and Luke (10 22 ff), and the other by Matthew (28 19).

(1) Mt 11 27; 28 19: In the former of these utterances, Our Lord, speaking in the most solemn manner, not only presents Himself, as the Son, as the sole source of knowledge of God and of blessedness for men, but places Himself in a position, not of equality merely, but of absolute reciprocity and interpenetration of knowledge with the Father. "No one knows . . ." He says, "no one knows the Father, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son . . ." varied in Luke so as to read: "No one knoweth who the Son is, save the Father; and who the Father is, save the Son . . ." as if the being of the Son of God were so delimited as to know it thoroughly: and the knowledge of the Son was so unlimited that He could know God to perfection. The peculiarly pregnant employment here of the terms "Son" and "Father" over against one another is explained to us in the other utterance (Mt 28 19). It is the resurrected Lord's commission to His disciples. Claiming for Himself all authority in heaven and on earth—which implies the possession of omnipotence—and promising to be with His followers 'alway, even to the end of the world'—He commands them to baptize their converts 'in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.' The precise form of the formula must be carefully observed. There were three persons numbered, each with its distinguishing name. Nor yet: 'In the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost,' as if there were one person, going by a threefold name. It reads: 'In the name [singular] of the Father, and of the [article repeated] Son, and of the [article repeated] Holy Ghost,' carefully distinguishing three persons, though uniting them all under one name. The name of God was to the Jews Jehovah, and to name the Son of God, this Son of God, Jesus, thus: 'The name of Jesus.' What Jesus did in this great injunction was to command His followers to name the name of God upon their converts, and to announce the name of God which is to be named on their converts in the threefold enumeration of "the Father" and "the Son" and 'the Holy Ghost.' As it is unquestionable that He intended Himself by "the Son," He here places Himself by the side of the Father and the Spirit, as together with them constituting the one God. It is, no doubt, possible to argue, as some would, that this is an attempt at describing; and that is as much as to say that He announces Himself as one of the persons of the Trinity. This is what Jesus, as reported by the Synoptics, undertook Himself to be. See Trinitv. (2) His Human Body: He is God, however, Jesus does not deny that He is man also. If all His speech of Himself rests on His consciousness of a Divine nature, no less does all His speech manifest His consciousness of a human nature. He easily identifies Himself with men (Mt 4 4; Lk 4 4), and receives without protest the imputation of humanity (Mt 11 19; Lk 7 34). He speaks familiarly of His body (Mt 26 12 26; Mk 14 8; 14 22; Lk 22 19), and of His bodily parts—His feet and hands (Lk 24 30), His head and feet (Lk 7 44 46), His flesh and bones (Lk 24 39), His blood (Mt 26 28; Mk 14 24; Lk 22 20). We chance to be given indeed a very express affirmation on His part of the reality of His bodily nature; when His disciples were terrified at His appearing before them after His resurrection, supposing Him to be a spirit, He reassures them with the direct declaration: "See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as thou seest me having." (Lk 24 39). His testimony to His human nature is just as express: "My soul," says He, "is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death" (Mt 26 38; Mk 14 34). He speaks of the human dread with which
He looked forward to His approaching death (Lk 12:50), and expresses in a poignant cry His sense of desolation on the cross (Mt 27:46; Mk 15:34). He speaks aloud of His pity for the weary and hungering (Mt 28:17; Lk 12:22). He displays human desire which He felt (Lk 22:15). Nothing that is human is alien to Him except sin. He never ascribes imperfection to Himself and never betrays consciousness of sin. He recognizes the evil of those about Him (Lk 11:13; Mt 7:11; Lk 11:34; Lk 11:29), but never identifies Himself with it. It is those who do the will of God with whom He feels kinship (Mt 12:50), and He offers Himself to the morally sick as a physician (Mt 9:12). He prefers the human example of John the Baptist (Mt 11:28 ff) and pronounces him blessed who shall find no occasion of stumbling in Him (Mt 11:6).

(5) Unity of the Person.—These manifestations of a human and Divine consciousness simply stand side by side in the records of Our Lord's self-expression. Neither is suppressed or even qualified by the other. If we attend only to the one class we might suppose Him to proclaim Himself wholly Divine; if only to the other we might equally easily imagine Him to be by Himself wholly human. With both together before us we perceive Him alternately speaking out of a Divine and out of a human consciousness; manifesting Himself as all that God is and as all that man is; yet making the natures so distinct one from another that He, the one Jesus Christ, was to His own apprehension true God and complete man in a unitary personal life.

VII. The Two Natures Everywhere Presupposed.

There do not, however, the native literature of the NT a single, unvarying conception of the constitution of Our Lord's person. From Mt where He is presented as one of the persons of the Holy Trinity (28:19)—or if we prefer the chronological order of books, from the Ep. of Jas where He is spoken of as the Glory of God, the Shekinah (2:1)—to the Apocalypse where He is represented as declaring that He is the Alpha and the Omega, the First and the Last, the Beginning and the End (1:8; 1:13). He is consistently thought of as in His fundamental being just God. At the same time from the Synoptic Gospels, in which He is dramatized as a man walking among men, His human descent carefully recorded, and His sense of dependence on God so emphasized that preoccupation of the characteristic characteristic construction, to the Ep. of John in which it is made the note of a Christian that He confesses that Jesus Christ has come in flesh (1 Jn 4:2) and the Apocalypse in which His birth in the tribe of Judah and the house of David (5:5; 22:16), His exemplary life of conflict and victory (3:21), His death on the cross (11:8) are noted, He is equally death-sentimentally thought of as true man. Nevertheless, from the beginning to the end of the whole series of books, while first with Him but then saying the other, there is no question of conflict between the two, never any confusion in their relations, never any schism in His human personal action; but He is obviously considered and presented as one, composite indeed, but undivided personality. In this state of the case not only may evidence of the constitution of Our Lord's person properly be drawn indiscriminately from every part of the NT, and passage justly be cited to support and explain passage without reference to the portion of the NT in which it is found, but we should be without justification if we did not employ this common presupposition of the whole body of this literature to illustrate and explain the varied representations which meet us curiously in its pages, representations which might easily be made to appear mutually contradictory were they not brought into harmony by their relation as natural component parts of this one unitary conception which underlies and gives consistency to all of them. There can scarcely be imagined a better proof of the nature of Our Person that His power completely to harmonize a multitude of statements which without it would present to our view only a mass of confused inconsistencies. A key which perfectly fits a lock of very complicated wards can scarcely fail to be the true key, can prove how the single personality remain an unplumbed mystery, and give rise to paradoxical modes of speech which would be misleading, were not their source in our duplex nature well understood. We may read, in careful writers, of souls being left dead on battlefields, and of everybody's immortality. The mysteries of the relations in which the constituent elements in the more complex personality of Our Lord stand to one another are immeasurably greater than in our simpler case. We can comprehend how the infinite God and a finite humanity can be united in a single person; and it is very easy to go fatally astray in attempting to explain the interactions in the unitary person of God and man. But the entire life of the Church, therefore, that so soon as serious efforts began to be made to give systematic explanations of the Bib. facts as to Our Lord's person, many one-sided and incomplete statements were formulated which required不断完善ing and a larger, in the case at least a mode of statement was devised which did full justice to the Bib. data. It was accordingly only after more than a century of controversy, during which nearly every conceivable method of construing and misconstruing the Bib. facts had been proposed and tested, that a formula was framed which successfully guarded the essential data supplied by the Scriptures from destructive misconception. This formula, put together by the Council of Chalcedon, 451 AD, declares it to have been the doctrine of the church, derived from the Scriptures and Our Lord Himself, that Our Lord Jesus Christ is "truly God and truly man, of a reasonable soul and body;" that the Father is Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to the manhood; in all things like unto us, without sin; begotten before all ages of the Father according to the Godhead, and in these latter days, for us and for our salvation, born of the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, according to the manhood; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, to be acknowledged in two natures inconfusively, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably; the distinction of natures being by no means that we saw the other, but the property of each nature being preserved, and concurred in one Person and one subsistence, not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son, and Only-begotten, God, the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ." There is nothing here but a careful statement in systematic form of the pure teaching of the Scriptures; and therefore this statement has stood ever since as the norm of thought and teaching as to the person of the Lord. As such, it has been incorporated, in one form or another, into the creed of all the great branches of the church; it underlies and gives their form to all the usages to Christ in the great mass of preaching and song which has accumulated during the centuries; and it has supplied the background of all the devotions of the untold multitudes who through the Christian ages have been worshippers of Christ.
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3. Life-Story

(1) The first period again may be conveniently divided into the events prior to the Passion of Christ and those following. There are about ten of the former: the healing of his wife's mother Capernaum (Mt 8 14 ff); the great draught of fishes, and its effect in his self-abasement and surrender of his all to Jesus (Lk 5 1-11); his call to the apostolic office and his spiritual equipment therefor (Mt 10 2); his attachment to the waves (Mt 14 28); the same attachment as shown at a certain crisis, in his inquiry "Lord, to whom shall we go?" (Jn 6 68); his noble confession of Jesus as the Christ, the Son of the living God, and, alas, the rebuke that followed it (Mt 16 15-23); the exalted privileges he enjoyed with James and John as witness of the raising of Jairus' daughter (Mk 5 37) and the transfiguration of his Lord (Mt 17 1-5); and finally, the incident of the tribute money (Mt 17 24).

The events beginning at the Passion are more easily recalled, because so large an extent are they found in all the Gospels and about in the same order. They commence with the washing of his feet by the Master at the time of the last Passover, and the two mistakes he made to the two steps of the former event: the act (Jn 13 1-10); the first of his presumptuous boastings as to the strength of his devotion to his Master, and the warning of the latter as to Satan's prospective assault upon him (Lk 22 31-34), twice repeated before the betrayal in Gethsemane (Mt 26 31-35); the admission to the garden to behold the Saviour's deepest distress, the charge to watch and pray, and the failure to do so through sleepiness (Mt 26 36-46); the mistaken courage in severing the ear of Malchus (Jn 18 10-12); the forswearing of his Lord while the latter was being led away as a prisoner, his following Him afar off, his admission into the high priest's palace, his denial "before them all," his confirmation of it by an oath, his remembrance of the warning when "the Lord turned and looked upon Peter," and his tears of bitterness as he went out (Mt 26 56-58; Mk 14 66-72; Lk 22 54-62; Jn 18 15-27).

It will be seen that the story of Peter's fall is thus recounted as at least in greater detail than that of the other Disciple. "None have described it in so heinous a light than Mark; and if, as is generally supposed, that Gospel was reviewed by Peter himself and even written under his direction, this circumstance may be considered as an evidence of his integrity and sincere contrition."

Nothing more is heard of Peter until the morning of the resurrection, when, on the first tidings of the event, he runs with John to see the tomb (Jn 20 1-10); his name is next mentioned by the angel (Mk 16 7); and on the same day he sees Jesus alive before any of the rest of the Twelve (Lk 24 34; 1 Cor 16 5). Subsequently, at the Sea of Tiberias, Peter is given an opportunity for a threshold confession of Jesus whom he had three times denied, and is made more assigned to the apostolic office; a prediction follows as to the kind of death he should die, and also a command to follow his Lord (Jn 21).

(2) The second period, from the ascension of Christ to the conversion of Paul, is more briefly sketched. After the ascension, of which Peter was doubtless a witness, he "stood up in the midst of the brethren" in the upper room in Jerusalem to counsel the choice of a successor to Judas (Acts 1 15-26). On the day of Pentecost he preaches the first gospel sermon (Acts 2), and later, in company with John, instrumentally heals the lame man, addresses the people in the Temple, is arrested, defends himself before the Sanhedrin and returns to his own "company" (Acts 3, 4). He is in 42 arrested and beaten (ch 6); after a time he is sent by the church to Jerusalem to communicate the Holy Ghost to the disciples at Samaria (ch 8). Returning to Jerusalem (where presumably Paul visits him, Gal 1 18), he afterward journeys "throughout all parts," heals Aeneas at Lydda, raises Dorcas from the dead at Joppa, sees a vision upon the housetop which influences him to preach the gospel to the gentle centurion at Caesarea, and explains this action before "the apostles and the brethren that were in Judea" (9 32-41; ch 11).

After a while another persecution arose against the church, and Herod Agrippa, having put James to death, imprisons Peter with the thought of executing him also. Prayer is made by the church on his behalf, however, and miraculous deliverance is given him (ch 12). Retiring for a while from public attention, he once more comes before us in the church council at Jerusalem, when the question is to be settled as to whether works are needful to salvation, adding his testimony to that of James and Barnabas in favor of justification by faith only (ch 15).

Subsequently he is found at Antioch, and having fellowship with gentle Christians until "that certain came from James," when he "drew back and separated himself from the assembly of the brethren" (ch 16). "Rebellion and division" were used as reason for his absence (Acts 15 19-21; ch 16), for which dissembling Paul "resisted him to the face, because he stood condemned" (Gal 2 11-14).

Little more is authentically known of Peter, except that he traveled more or less extensively, being accompanied by his wife (1 Cor 9 5), and that he wrote two epistles, the second of which was penned as he approached the end of his life (2 Pet 1 12-15).

The tradition is that he died a martyr at Rome about 67 AD, when about 75 years old. His Lord and Master had predicted a violent death for him (Jn 21 18,19), which it is thought came to pass by crucifixion under Nero. It is said that at his own desire he was crucified head downward, feeling himself unworthy to resemble his Master in his death.

It should be observed, however, that the tradition that he visited Rome is only tradition and nothing more, resting as it does partly upon a miscalculation of some of the early Fathers, "who assume that Peter went to Rome only a short time after his deliverance from prison" (cf Acts 12 17). Schaff says this "is irreconcilable with the silence of Scripture, and even with the mere fact of Paul's Ep. to the Rom, written in 68, since the latter says not a word of Peter's previous labors in that city, and he himself never built on other men's foundations" (Rom 16 20; 2 Cor 10 15.16).

The character of Peter is transparent and easily analyzed, and it is doubtless true that no other "in his story of the history of the world "clearly or strongly." He has been

4. His Character

The character of Peter is transparent and easily analyzed, and it is doubtless true that no other "in his story of the history of the world "clearly or strongly." He has been
The leadership referred to, however, should not lead to the supposition that he possessed any supremacy over the other apostles, of which there is no proof. Such supremacy was never conferred upon him by his Master, it was never claimed by him, nor ever computed to his credit. See in this connection Mt 23 8-12; Acts 15 13-14; 2 Cor 12 11; Gal 2 11.

It is true that when Christ referred to the meaning of his name (Mt 16 18), he said, "Upon this rock I will build my church," but he did not intend to teach that his church would be built upon Peter, but upon Himself as confessed by Peter in ver 16 of the same chapter. Peter is careful to affirm this in the first of his two Epp. (2 4-9). Moreover, when Christ said, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," etc (Mt 16 19), he invested him with no power not possessed in common with his brethren, since they also afterward received the same commission (Mt 18 18; Jn 20 23). A key is a badge of power or authority, and, as many Protestant commentators have pointed out, to quote the language of one of them, "the apostolic history explains and limits this trust, for it was Peter who opened the door of the gospel to Israel on his mission of salvation (1 John), and to the Gentiles in the house of Cornelius (Acts 10 34-46)."

Some, however, regard this authority as identical with the great commission (Mt 28 19). See Keys, Power of the.

The first Epp of Peter were written presumably late in life, as appears esp. of the Second (1 12-15). Both were addressed to the same class of persons, chiefly Jewish Christians scattered abroad in the different provinces of Asia Minor, among whom Paul and his associates had planted the gospel (1 Pet 1 1-2; 2 Pet 3 1). The First was written at Babylon (1 Pet 5 13), doubtless the famous Babylon on the Euphrates, which, though destroyed as a great capital, was still inhabited by a small colony of people, principally Jews (see Weiss, INT, II, 150; but see also Peter, First Epistle of).

(1) First Epistle.—The theme of the First Ep. seems to be the living hope to which the Christian has been begotten and promised by the prophets of old. The living hope is espoused in the earlier part of the first chapter down to ver 13, where the obligations begin to be stated, the first group including: hope, godly fear, love to the brethren, and praise 1 3-12.

The writer drops his pen at this point, to take it up again to address those who were suffering persecution for righteousness' sake, upon whom two more obligations are impressed, submission to authority, and testimony to Christ (2 11-4 6). The third group which concludes the book begins here, dealing with such themes as spiritual hospitality in the use of heavenly gifts, patience in suffering, fidelity in service, and humility in ministry in opposition to one another. The letter was sent to the churches "by Silvanus, our faithful brother," the author affirming that his object in writing was to exhort and testify concerning the "true grace of God" (5 12).

The genuineness of this First Ep. has never been doubted, except out of course by those who in these latter days have doubted everything, but the same cannot be said of the Second. It is not known to whom the latter was intrusted; as a matter of fact it is two different persons, one Pontecoptes (Acts 2 38-42) and to the other the emblems of the 2d and 3d cents. The first church employing it was at Alexandria, but subsequently the church at large became satisfied from internal evidence of its genuineness and inspiration, and when the Canon was pronounced complete in the 4th cent., it was without hesitancy received.

(2) Second Epistle.—The Second Ep. claims to have been written by Peter (1 1; 3 1.2), to doubt which would start more serious difficulties than can be alleged against its genuineness as relieved on the account of its late admission, rather because of the Canon or its supposed diversity of style from Peter's early writing. See Peter, Second Epistle of.

His object is the same in both Epps., to "stir up your sincere mind by putting you in remembrance" (3 1). Like Paul in his Second Ep. to Titus, he foresees the apostasy in which the professing church will end, the difference being that Paul speaks of it in its last stage when the laity have become infected (2 Tim 3 1-5; 4 3-4), while Peter sees it in its origin as accessible to false teachers (2 Pet 2 1-3; 15-19). As in the First Ep. he wrote to exhort and to testify, so here it is rather to caution and warn. This warning was, as a whole, against falling from grace (3 17,18), the enforcement of which warning is contained in ch 1-2, the ground of it in ch 3, and the occasion of it in the last two chapters. To speak only of the occasion: This, as was stated, was the presence of false teachers (2 1), whose eminent success is predicted (2 2), whose punishment is certain and dreadful (2 3-9), and who are described (2 10-20) as those who have "an evil conscience," etc. The nature of their false teaching (ch 3) forms one of the most interesting and important features of the Ep., focusing as it does on the Second Coming of Christ.

The theology of Peter offers an interesting field of study because of what may be styled its freshness and variety in comparison with 6. Theology that of Paul and John, who are the great theologians of the NT.

(1) Messianic teaching.—In the first place, Peter is unique in his Messianic teaching as indicated in the first part of the Acts, where he is the chief personage, and where for the most part his ministry is confined to Jews and the Jews. The latter, already in covenant relations with Jeh, had sinned in rejecting Jesus as the Messiah, and Peter's preaching was directed to that point, demanding repentance or a change of mind about Him. The apparent failure of the OT promises concerning the Davidic kingdom (Isa 11 10-12; Jer 25 5-8; Ezek 37 21-28) was explained by the prophet as that which would be set up at the return of Christ (Acts 2 25-31; 15 14-16); which return, personal and corporeal, and for that purpose, is presented as only awaiting their national repentance (Acts 3 19-26).

See Schofield, Christian History Bible SE for more.

(2) Justification.—But Peter's special ministry to the circumcision is by no means in conflict with that of Paul to the Gentiles, as demonstrated at the point of transition in Acts 10. Up until this time the gospel had been offered to the Jews only, but now they have rejected it in the national sense, and "the normal order for the present Christian age" is reached (Acts 13 44-48). Accordingly, we find Peter, side by side with Paul, affirming the great doctrine of justification by faith only, in the words, "We believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we [Jews] shall be saved, even as they [Gentiles]" (Acts 15 11 AV). Moreover, it is clear from Peter's Second Ep. (1 1) that his conception of justification from the Divine as well as the human side is identical with that of Paul, since he speaks of justification as terminating on the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ. As we understand it, this is not the righteousness which God requires, but the righteousness which God has given (cf Rom 1 16.17; 3 21-25; 2 Cor 5 20.21).

(3) Redemption.—Passing from his oral to his written utterances, Peter is particularly rich in his allusions to the redemptive work of Christ. Limiting ourselves to his First Ep., the election of the individual believer is seen to be the result of the
sprinkling of Christ’s blood (1 1); his obedience and godly fear are inspired by the sacrifice of the “lamb without blemish and without spot: Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world (1 17—20 AV). But most interesting are the manner and the connection in which these sublime truths are sometimes set before the reader. For example, an exhortation to submission on the part of household slaves is the occasion for perhaps the most concise yet comprehensive interpretation of Christ’s vicarious sufferings anywhere in the NT (2 18—25, esp. the last two verses; cf also in its context 3 18—22).

(4) Future Life.—Next to the redemptive work of Christ, thePetrine teaching about the future life claims attention. The believer has been begotten again unto “a lively [or living] hope” (1 Pet 1 3); which is an “inheritance” “reserved in heaven” (1 4); and associated with “praise, and glory and honor at the revelation [Second Coming] of Jesus Christ” (1 7 13; 4 13; 5 4 10; 2 Pet 1 11; 12; 3 13, etc). This “hope” or “inheritance” is so real and so precious as to cause rejoicing even in times of heaviness and trial (1 Pet 1 6); to stimulate to holy living (1 13); to sustain patience in persecution (4 12 13); fidelity in service (5 1 4—5); steadfastness against temptation (5 8—10); and growth in grace (2 Pet 1 10;11). It is a further peculiarity that the apostle always throws the thought of the future toward into the light of the future glory. It is not as though there were merely an allotment of suffering here, and an allotment of glory by and by, with no relation or connection between the two, but the one is seen to be incident to the other (1 Pet 1 7 11; 11 12; 2 Pet 3 12 13). It is this circumstance, added to others, that gives Peter the title of the apostle of hope, as Paul has been called the apostle of faith, and John the apostle of love.

(5) Holy Scripture.—Considering their limitations as to space, Peter’s Epp, are notable for the emphasis they lay upon the character and authority of the Holy Scriptures. 1 Pet 1 10—12 teaches a threefold relation of the Holy Spirit to the Holy Word as its Author, its Revealer, and its Teacher or Preacher. The same chapter (vs 22—25) speaks of its life-giving and purifying power as well as its eternal duration. Ch 2 opens with a declaration of its vital relation to the Christian’s spiritual growth. In 4 11, it is fond of being the staple of the Christian’s’s teaching. Practically the whole of the Second Ep. is taken up with the subject. Through the “exceeding great and precious promises” of that Word, Christians become “partakers of the divine nature” (1 4 AV); that they may be kept “always in remembrance” is Peter’s object in writing (vs 12—15 AV); the facts of that Word rest on the testimony of eyewitnesses (vs 16—18); its origin is altogether Divine (vs 20 21); which is as true of the NT as of the OT (3 2); including the Epp. of Paul (vs 15 16).

(6) Apostasy and judgment.—This appreciation of the living Word of God finds an antithesis in the solemn warning against apostate teachers and teaching forming the substance of 2 Pet 2 and 3. The theology here is of judgment. It is swift and “iniqueth not” (2 1—3); the Judge is He who “spared not” in olden time (vs 4—7); His delay expresses mercy, but He “will come as a thief” (3 9-10); the heavens “shall pass away,” the earth and its works shall be burned up (ver 10); “What manner of men ye be that refrain all holy living and godliness” (ver 11).

(7) Second Coming of Christ.—Peter’s theology concerning judgment is a further illustration of the Messianic character of his instruction. For example, the Second Coming of Christ of which he speaks in the closing chapter of the Second Ep. is not that of aspect it is associated with the translation of His church, and of which Paul treats (1 Thess 4 13—18), but that pertaining to Israel and the day of Jeh spoken of by the OT prophets (Isa 2 12—22; Rev 19 11—21, etc).


On the theology of Peter, consult the subject in works on Systematic or Bib. Theology, and see also R. W. Dale, The Apostles, London, 1875; C. A. Briggs, Messiah of the Apostles, 21—41, New York, 1885; Scofield, Reference Bible, where pertinent.
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VI. ANALYSIS

LITERATURE

1. Simon Peter was a native of Galilee. He was brought to Jerusalem early in His ministry by his brother Andrew (Jn 1 40 41). His call to the office of apostle is recorded in Mt 10 1—4; Mk 3 13—16.

He occupied a distinguished place among the Lord’s disciples. In the four lists of the apostles found in the NT his name stands first (Mt 10 2—4; Mk 3 16—19; Lk 6 14—16; Acts 1 13). He is the chief figure in the first twelve chapters of the Acts. It is Peter that preaches the Christian sermon (Acts 2), he that opens the door of the gospel to the gentile world in the house of the centurion, Cornelius, and has the exquisite delight of witnessing scenes closely akin to those of Pentecost at Jerusalem (Acts 10 44—47). It was given him to pronounce the same sentence on the guilty pair, Ananias and Sapphira, and to rebuke in the power of the Spirit the profane Simon Magus (Acts 8 13—24). In these and the like instances Peter exhibited the authority with which Christ had invested him (Mt 10 19)—an authority bestowed upon all the twelve (Mk 20 22—23)—the power to bind and to loose.

Two Epps are ascribed to Peter. Of the Second
Peter, First Ep. of THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

I. Canonicky of 1 Peter.—The certainty of its integrity and trustworthiness is ample and altogether satisfactory. It falls into parts: external and internal. The historical attestation to its authority as an apostolic document is abundant. Polycarp, the disciple of the apostle John, martyred in 156 AD at 86 or more years of age, refers to the Ep. in unmistakable terms. Irenæus, a man who may well be said to represent both the East and the West, who was the first to quote Peter and Polycarp, quotes it copiously, we are assured. Clement of Alexandria, born c. 150 AD, died c. 216 AD, cites it many times in his Stromata, one passage (4.8) being quoted five times by actual count. "The testimony of the early church is summed up by Eusebius (HE II, xxiii, 3). He places it among those writings about which no question was ever raised, no doubt ever entertained by any portion of the church." (Professor Lumby in Bible Comm.)

The internal evidence in favor of the Ep. is as conclusive as the external. The writer is well acquainted with Our Lord's teaching, and he makes use of it to illustrate and enforce his own. The references he makes to the OT are to the point; and they include the four Gospels. He is familiar likewise with the Epp., particularly Jas, Rom, and Eph. But what is esp. noteworthy is the fact that 1 Pet in thought and language stands in close relation with the other apostolic discourses as recorded in Acts. By comparing 1 Pet 1:17 with Acts 10:34; 1:21 with 2:32-36 and 10:40-41; 7:8 with 4:10-11; 2:17 with 10:28; and 3:18 with 3:14, one will perceive how close the parallel between the two is. The inference from these facts appears legitimate, viz. 1 Pet in diction and thought belongs to the same period of time and moves in the same circle of truth as do the other writings of the NT. The writer was an apostle, and he was Simon Peter.

II. The Address.—Peter writes to the "elect who are sojourners of the Dispersion," James employs the term "Dispersion" to designate believing Hebrews of the Twelve Tribes who lived outside the land (1:1). The Jews included in it the whole branch of the once-dispersed Israelites as recorded in Acts. By comparing 1 Pet 1:17 with Acts 10:34; 1:21 with 2:32-36 and 10:40-41; 7:8 with 4:10-11; 2:17 with 10:28; and 3:18 with 3:14, one will perceive how close the parallel between the two is. The inference from these facts appears legitimate. viz. 1 Pet in diction and thought belongs to the same period of time and moves in the same circle of truth as do the other writings of the NT. The writer was an apostle, and he was Simon Peter.

The three of the four epistles Peter mentions, viz. Pontus, Cappadocia, and Asia, had representatives at the memorable Pentecost in Jerusalem (Acts 2:9; 1 Pet 1:1). Many of these "sojourners of the Dispersion" may have believed the message of the apostle and accepted salvation through Jesus Christ, and returned home to tell the good news to their nearest and dearest. This would form a new and special bond of union between them and Peter, and would open the way for him to address them in the familiar and tender manner of the Ep.

Silvanus appears to have been the bearer of the letter to the Christians of Asia Minor. He is our faithful brother, as I account him. I have written unto him, and have given him our steadfast charge, that he may be a minister unto you of the gospel of Christ. This is an assumption to assert from these words that Silvanus was employed in the composition of the Ep., but it is otherwise than the writer or the secretary. Silvanus was Paul's companion in the ministry to the Gentiles, and we do so regard him as going with Paul to Rome or to Jerusalem. It is probable he returned from Corinth (Acts 19:29) to Asia Minor and labored there. He and Peter met, where no one knows, though not a few think in Rome; as likely a gussa perhaps in Phil. At any rate, Silvanus, "the servant of Peter," as Peter designates him, was an assistant to Peter. This is a most variously interpreted passage. The Ep. is to be written by Petrus. But Silvanus, our faithful brother, I have written unto you, as if he had some share in furnishing the contents of the Ep.

III. Place and Time of Composition.—According to 1:18 the Ep. was written in Babylon. But what is the place meant? Two cities having this name are

1. Babylon: name were known in apostolic times. Which? One was in Egypt, probably on or near the present site of Cairo, and we are told that it is so known from 70 B.C. down to the time of the Emperor Vespasian, and be called "the great Babylon" (Zahn). The absence, however, of all tradition that would tend to identify this place with the Babylon of the Ep. seems to shut it out of the problem. Babylon on the Tigris was the city of the Euphrates to that day; and this is the Babylon to which the Jews were carried into captivity, and which was designated. Jews in considerable numbers still dwelt in Babylon, notwithstanding the massacre of thousands in the reign of Claudius, and the flight of multitudes into other countries. There is much to be said in favor of this place, but it is otherwise half the 2nd cent. appears to favor it, though much uncertainty and obscurity still surround the earliest ages of our era, in spite of the unviewed researches of modern scholars. Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, who lived in the first half of the 2nd cent., appears to have had no doubt that Peter was martyred in Rome, and that the Babylon of the Ep. designates the Imperial City. There are very serious objections to this interpretation. One is, that it is said to be totally out of place, and connected with the writing. Preminently he is direct and matter-of-fact in his style. The metaphorical language he employs is mostly drawn from the OT, or, if from himself, it is so common of use as to be well understood. It is altogether opposed in character to that this man, plain of speech almost to bluntness, should interject in the midst of his personal explanations and final salutations such a mystical epithet with no hint of what he means by it, or why he employs such a mode of speech.

Besides, there is no evidence that Rome was called Babylon by the Christians until the Book of Rev was published, i.e. c. 90-96 AD. But Peter's use is dependent on the Apocalypse for this name of Babylon as Rome. Peter could not have been his authority for the place before that date. The Ep. was written about 64 AD; at the time when the view, under the infamous Nero were raging, at which time also the apostle himself bore his witness and went to his heavenly home. Then, even as his name had forever been the epithet of Babylon; while not unmindful of the great difficulties that beset the view, nevertheless we are inclined to the opinion that the Babylon of 5:13 is the ancient city on the Euphrates. See Peter (Simon).

IV. Design.—The apostle had more than one object in view when he addressed the "elect" in Asia Minor. He wished to set forth the element of faith, and the assurance of salvation, and to strengthen them by the assurance of the future. "Feed my lambs"—"Tend my sheep" (Jn 21:15-17). His two Epp. certify how faithfully he obeyed the charge. With loving and
tender hand he feeds the lambs and tend the whole flock, warns against foes, guards from danger, and leads them into green pastures and beside still waters. He reminds them of the glorious inheritance which there they have been exalted to walk in the footsteps of the uncomplaining Christ (2:20–25); to be compassionate, loving, tender-hearted, humble-minded, and circumspect in their passage through this unfriendly world (3:8–12). He sums up the main duties of Christian life in the short but pregnant sentences, "Honor all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the king" (2:17). But his supreme object is to comfort and encourage them amid the persecutions and the sufferings to which they were unjustly subjected, and to fortify them against the heavier trials that were impending.

From the beginning the Christian church was the object of suspicion and of hatred, and many of its adherents had suffered even unto death at the hands of both hostile cution Jews and fanatical Gentiles. But these afflications were generally local and sporadic. There were churches of large membership and wide influence which were unmolested (1 Cor 4:10–16), and which, if they had not been able to get fair treatment in heathen courts (1 Cor 6:1–6). But the condition brought to view in 1 Pet is altogether different. Trials and afflictions of the highest sort assailed them, and an enmity and hostility, bent on their destruction, pursed them with tireless energy. The whole Christian body shared in the persecutions (5:9). The trial was a surprise (4:12), both in its intensity, for Peter calls it "fiery", and for its unexpectedness. The apostle represents it as a savage beast of prey, a roaring lion, prowling about them to seize and devour (5:8,9).

A variety of charges were brought against the Christians, but they were calumnies and slanders, without any foundation in fact. They were spoken against as evil-doers (2:12—κακοπαθοῦναί, malefici, Tacitus calls them). Their adversaries railed against them (3:9); reviled them (3:16); spake evil of them (4:4); reproached them for the name of Christ (4:14). They were ungodly. They were hated of all; and the intense hostility felt by the heathen toward the Christians who dwelt among them. If there had been any justifica tion for such antagonism in the character and the conduct of Christ's people, it might have been justifiable; but "human race," to be classed with thieves and murderers and meddlers in other men's matters (4:14–16), as they were accused of being and doing, we could understand the fierce opposition which assailed them and the savage purpose to suppress them altogether, but the only ground for the enmity felt against them was the refusal of the Christians to join their heathen neighbors in their idolatries, their feastings, winebibbings, revelings, carousings, lasciviousness and lusts in which once they freely shared (4:2–4). The Asian saints had renounced all such wicked practices, had separated themselves from their old companions in riotous living and revolting debaucheries; they were witnesses against their immoralities, and hence became the objects of intense dislike and persecuting animosity. Peter bears testimony to the high character, the purity of life and the self-sacrificing devotion of these believers. In all Asia Minor no better company of men and women could be found than these Christians of Smyrna, more so than members to constituted authority, none more ready to help their fellow-men in their distress and trouble. The head and front of their offending was their separation from the ungodly world about them, and their solemn witness against the awful sins done daily before their eyes.

How mightily does the apostle minister to his suffering friends! He bids them remember the uncomplaining Christ when he was unjustly afflicted by cruel men (2:19–25). He exhorts them how to put to silence their accusers, and refute the calumnies and the slanders that are so cruelly circulated against them, namely, by living such pure and goodly lives, by being so meek, docile, patient, meekfast, true to faithfulness to God, yet not to credit the false accusations (1:2–5; 2:13–17; 3:8.9.13–17; 5:6–11).

There is little or no evidence in the Ep. that the persecutions were inflicted by imperial authority or that the state was dealing with the Christians as enemies who were dangerous to the peace of society. In the province in which the letter was sent there seems to have been complete absence of formal trial and punishment through the courts. Peter refers to formal proceedings against the Christians by the magistrates. On the contrary, he urges them to be subject to every ordinar y of man for the Lord's sake: whether to the king as supreme; or unto governors, as sent by him for vengeance on evildoers, and for praise of those who do well (2:13). They are to honor all men, to honor the king (1 Pet 2:17). This commission would indicate that if the state had already proscribed Christianity and decreed its total suppression. This the imperial government did later (Acts 17:6; 18:12), but Peter wrote the apostle that in 64 AD—the date of the Ep.—the government formally denounced Christians and determined to annihilate them.

Peter exhorts his fellow-believers to silence their persecutors by their upright conduct (2:15); they are thus to put to shame those who falsely accuse them (3:16); and they are not to combat evil with evil nor reviling reviling with reviling (3:11) to the contrary—blessing (3:9). The antagonism here indicated obviously springs from the heathen populace; there is no hint of arraignment before magistrates or subjection to legal proceedings. It is unbelievers who revile and slander and denounce the people of God in the provinces.

Everything in the Ep. points to the time of Nero, 64 AD, and not to the time of Domitian or Trajan, or even Titus. In Rome vast multitudes of Christians were put to death in the most brutal fashion, so Tacitus relates, but the historian asserts that there was a sinister report to the effect that Nero himself instigated the burning of the city (July 19, 64), and that "he [Nero] falsely diverted the charge on to the Christians" (Hist. V.13). The Roman prosecution of the name of Christians (or Christians), and who were detested for the abominations which they perpetrated." Neco Neco and cle, certain facts are adduced, viz. that at the time the Christians were well known as a restless, anti-heathen sect, which was directed by those of the name of Christians (or Christians), and who were detested for the abominations which they perpetrated. Neco Neco and cle, certain facts are adduced, viz. that at the time the Christians were well known as a restless, anti-heathen sect, which was directed by those of the name of Christians (or Christians), and who were detested for the abominations which they perpetrated.

Peter likewise recognizes the fact that believers were disdained and calumniated by their heathen neighbors for the same reason—they were Christians: "If ye are reproached for the name of Christ, blessed are ye" (4:14). "But if a man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God in this name" (4:16). But the imperial government at the time does not appear to have taken formal action for the overthrow of Christianity as a system irreligious to the empire. Of course, where direct charges of a criminal nature were brought against Christians, judicial inquiry into them would be instituted. But in the Ep. what believers had to endure and suffer were the detraction, the vilification, the opprobrium and the vile and malignant slanderers with which the heathen assailed them.

V. Characteristic Features of the Epistle.—It has certain very distinct marks, some of which may be noticed. It does not observe a close logical sequence in its structure, as those of Paul so prominently display.

There is truth in Dean Alford's observation that it "pushes it rather far: 'The link between one idea Structure and another is found, not in any progress of unfolding thought or argument, but in the last word of the foregoing sentence which is taken up by the following one'" (V. 5.6.7.9.10, etc.). This peculiarity, however, does
not interfere with the unity of the ep., it rather adds to it, and it gives to it a vividness which it otherwise might not possess.

It is the ep. of hope. How much it makes of this prime grace! Peter seems never to grow weary of describing it and exalting its radiant beauty and desirability. He calls it a living hope (1:3). It is born by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, and it calmly awaits the glorious inheritance that soon will be enjoyed. It is a hope that will be perfected at the advent of Christ (1:13), and it is set on God, hence cannot fail (1:21). With sickly, dying hope we are so little familiar. The device which a certain state (South Carolina) has inscribed on its Great Seal is, _dum spiro spero_ ("while I live I hope"). Such a hope may serve for a commonwealth whose existence is limited to this world, but a man needs something more enduring, something imperishable. "It is a fearful thing when a man and his hopes die together" (Leighton). A Christian can confidently write, "when I am dying I hope," for his is a living hope that fills and thrills the future with a blessed reality.

The Christian's glorious inheritance (1:3-5) is depicted in one of the most comprehensive and suggestive descriptions of the believer's heritage found in the Bible. It is described in a way that points to its substance. It is imperishable. In it there is no element of decay. It holds in its heart no germ of death. Like its author, the living God, it is unchangeable and eternal. It is not contaminated by sin nor polluted by crime, either in its acquisition or its possession. Human heritages generally are marred by human wrongs. There is hardly an acre of soil that is not tainted by fraud or violence. The coin that passes from hand to hand is in many instances soiled by guilt. But this of Peter is absolutely pure and holy. It "faeth not away." It never withers. Ages do not impair its beauty or dim its luster. Its bloom will remain fresh, its fragrance undiminished, forever. Thus our inheritance "is glorious in these respects: it is in its substance, incorruptible: in its purity, undefiled: in beauty, unfading" (Alford).

Now why does the apostle in the very opening of his epistle make a plea to the saints' inheritance? He does so in order to comfort and encourage his fellow-believers with the consolations of the Lord Himself, that they may bear steadfastly their manifold sufferings and triumph over their weighty afflictions. Hence he writes: "Wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a little while, if need be, ye have been put to grief in manifold trials, that the proof of your faith . . . may be found unto praise and glory and honor at the revelation of Jesus Christ" (1:6-9). He lifts their thoughts and their gaze up far above the troubles and distresses around them to Him whose they are, whom they serve, who will by and by crown them with immortal bliss.

The prophets and their study are described in 1:10-11: "Concerning which salvation the prophets sought and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you," etc. With Peter and his fellow-apostles the testimony of the prophets was authoritative and final. Where they had a clear word from the OT Scriptures, they felt that every question was settled and controversy was at an end.

4. Testimony of Prophets

(1) _Salvation._—The burden of the prophetic communication was salvation. The prophets spoke on many subjects; they had to exhort, rebuke and entreat their wayward contemporaries; to denounce sin, to announce judgment on the guilty and to recall them to repentance and reformation. But ever and anon their vision was filled with the future and its blessedness, their voices would swell with rapture as they saw and foretold the great salvation to be brought to the world and the grace that would then so copiously go out unto men, for the Messiah was to appear to save just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God.

(2) _Spirit of Christ._—The prophet's messages were the messages of the Spirit of Christ. It was He who testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glories that should follow. The prophets wrote a part in the origination of their messages. They affirm in the most positive and solemn manner that their predictions are not their own, but God's. Hence they are called the Lord's "spokesmen," the Lord's "mouth" (Ex 15:16; 7:12; 2 Pet 1:21).

(3) _Prophectic study._—They "sought and searched diligently." These terms are strong and emphatic. They pored over the predictions which the Spirit had revealed through themselves; they scrutinized them with eager and prolonged inquiry. Two points engaged their attention: "What time or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto." The first "what" relates to the time of the Messiah's advent; the second "what" is concerned with the circumstance of His appearing—a fruitful theme, one that engages the inquiry of nobler students—"which things angels desire to look into.

The Christian brotherhood is described in 2:9-10: "But ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession, that ye may show forth the Christian excellencies of him who called you out of darkness into his marvellous light." The brotherhood is the new Israel. The apostle describes it in terms which were applied to the old Israel, but which include more than the ancient Israel ever realized. The exalted conception is by one who was a strict Jew, the apostle of the circumcision, and who held somewhat closely to the Mosaic institutions to the end of his life. All the more significant on this account is his testimony. The descriptive titles which he here gathers together and places on the brow of the Christian brotherhood are the most illustrious. A wise, a manly, a noble, a general, a statesman, will sometimes appear in public with his breast covered with splendid decorations which mark his rank or his achievements. But such distinctions sink into insignificance before the description of the Christian. This is the heavenly nobility, the royal family of the Lord of glory, decorated with badges brighter far than ever glittered on the breast of king or emperor. But even in this instance Peter reminds Christians of the glorious destiny awaiting them that they may be strengthened and stimulated to steadfastness and loyalty in the midst of the trials and afflictions to which they are subjected (2:11-12).

A study of 1 Pet 3:18-20—"preached unto the spirits in prison"—should here follow in the present cursory review of the characteristic features of the Ep., but anything like in Prison an adequate examination of this difficult passage would require more space than could be given to it. In view of the superlative testimony from Professor Zahn (N.T., II, 289) with which the writer agrees: "That interpretation of 1 Pet 3:19 is in all probability correct, according to which a preaching of Christ at the time of the Flood is referred to, to which Noah is here represented as a preacher of righteousness, as in 2 Pet 2:5." See PRISON, SPIRITS IN.
VI. Analysis.—A very general analysis of the Ep. is the following:

3. Persecutions and trials. 4 15—5 11.

The chief doctrines of Christianity are found in 1 Pet. The vicarious suffering and death of the Lord Jesus Christ (2 24; 3 18); the new birth (1 3–23); redemption by the blood of Christ (1 18–19), faith, hope, patient endurance under unjust suffering, and holiness of life, are all pressed upon Christians with great earnestness and force.
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PETER, THE SECOND EPISODE OF:

I. EXTERNAL EVIDENCE IN FAVOR OF ITS APOSTOLIC AUTHORITY.
1. Ancient Opinion.
2. Modern.
3. Dr. Chase’s View.

II. INTERNAL EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF ITS APOSTOLIC AUTHORITY.
1. Style and Diction.
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5. Relation to Apostles.
6. Autobiographical Allusions.
7. Quoted by Jude.

III. DOCTRINAL TEACHINGS OF THE EPISODE.
1. Saving Knowledge.
2. The Three Worlds.
3. Inerrancy of Sources.

The Second Ep. of Peter comes to us with less historical support of its genuineness than any other book of the NT. In consequence, its right to a place in the Canon is seriously doubted by some and denied by others. There are those who confidently assign it to the Apostolic age and to the apostle whose name it bears in the NT, while there are those who as confidently assign it to post-apostolic times, and repudiate its Petrine authorship. It is not the aim of this article to trace the history of the two opinions indicated above, nor to cite largely the arguments employed in the defence of the Ep., or those in opposition to it; nor to attempt to settle a question which for more than a thousand years has not yet been settled. The men of the Christian church have been unable to settle. Such a procedure would in this case be the height of presumption. What is here attempted is to point out as briefly as may be some of the reasons for doubting its canonicity, on the one hand, and those in its support, on the other.

I. EXTERNAL EVIDENCE IN FAVOR OF ITS APOSTOLIC AUTHORITY.—It must be admitted at the very outset that the evidence is meager. The ancient opinion of Origen (c 240 AD). In his homily on Josh, he speaks of the two Epps. of Peter. In another place he quotes 2 Pet 1 4: “partakers of the divine nature,” and gives it the name of Scripture. But Origen is careful to say that the antiquity was questioned: “Peter has left one acknowledged Ep., and perhaps a second, for this is contested.” Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, regarded it with even more suspicion than did Origen, and accordingly he placed it among the disputed works. He, however, added: “Jerome knew the scruples which many entertained touching the Ep., but notwithstanding, he included it in his Vulg. Version. The main reason for Jerome’s uncertainty about it he states to be “difference of style from 1 Pet.” He accounts for the difference by supposing that the apostle “made use of two different interpreters.” As great teachers and scholars as Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome, e.g. Athanasius, Augustine, Epiphanius, Iulianus and Cyril, received it as genuine. At the Reform of 423, Jerome rejected 2 Pet; Luther seems to have had no doubt of its genuineness; while Calvin felt some hesitancy because of the “discrepancies between it and the First.” In the 4th cent., two church councils (Laodicea, 364; Carthage, 397) formally recognized it and placed it in the canon in equal authority with the other books of the NT.

The opinion of modern scholars as to references in post-apostolic literature to 2 Pet is not only divided, but in many instances antagonistic. Salmon, Warfield, Zahn and Opinion others strongly hold that such references are to be found in the writings of the 2d cent., perhaps in one or two documents of the 1st. They insist with abundant proof in support of their contention that Justin Martyr, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Didache, and Clement of Rome, were all acquainted with the Ep. and made allusions to it in their writings. Weighing as honestly and as thoroughly as one can the citations made from that literature, one is strongly disposed to accept the evidence as legitimate and conclusive.

On the other side, Professor Chase (HDB) has subjected all such references and allusions in the writings with the writing to a searching criticism, and it must be frankly confessed that he has reduced the strength of the evidence and argument very greatly. But Professor Chase himself, from the remaining of the ancient literature, and from the internal evidence of the Ep., itself, arrives at the conclusion that 2 Pet is not at all an apostolic document, that it certainly was not written by Peter, nor in the 1st cent. of our era, but about the middle of the 2d cent., say 150 AD. If this view is accepted, we must pronounce the Ep. a forgery, pseudonymous and pseudopigraphic, with no more right to be in the NT than has the Apocrypha of Peter or the romance of the Shepherd of Hermas.

II. INTERNAL EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF ITS APOSTOLIC AUTHORITY.—At first sight, this seems to be not altogether reassuring, but looking deeper 1. Style and Diction. It often seems that we arrive at a Diction significant conclusion. Difference of style and a portion of the two Epps. attributed to Peter is given as one prominent reason for questioning the validity of the Second. It is mainly if not entirely on this ground that Jerome, Calvin and others hesitated to receive it. It is noteworthy that in the earlier times objections were not urged because of its relation to Jude—its borrowing from Jude, as is often charged in our days. Its alleged dissimilarity to 1 Pet in diction, structure, and measurably in its contents, explains why it was discredited. Admitting that there is substantial ground for this criticism, nevertheless there are not a few instances in which words rarely found in the other Bib. books are common to the two Epps. Some examples are given in proof: “precious” (1 Pet 1 7 19; 2 Pet 1 1) (a compound), occurring often in Rev, not often in other books; “virtue” (1 Pet 2 9 AVm; 2 Pet 1 3), found elsewhere only in Phil 4 8; “supply” (1 Pet 4 11; 2 Pet 1 5), rare in other books; “love of brethren” (1 Pet 1 22; 2 Pet 1 7) only in Peter as 2 Pet 1 16 (eyewitnesses), not found elsewhere in the NT; “without blemish,” “without spot” (1 Pet 1 19; 2 Pet 3 14) (order
of words reversed]; also positive side (2 Pet 2 13), "spot and blemishes"; the words do not occur elsewhere; "ungodly" (1 Pet 4 18; 2 Pet 2 5; 3 7) occurs in but three other places, except Jude, which has it twice.

Besides, there are many striking similarities in thought and diction in the two Epp. Two instances are given. In the First the saved are described as the "elect" (1 1), and as the "holy" (1 29). In the Second, the two great truths are brought together (1 10). Likewise, in both stress is laid upon prophecy (1 Pet 1 10–12; 2 Pet 1 19–21). Now, this tends to prove that the work of Pet was well acquainted with the peculiarity of diction employed in the First, and that he made use purposely of its uncommon terms, or, if the Second was written by another than the apostle, he succeeded surprisingly well in imitating his style. The latter alternative does not merit discussion. The differences arise mainly out of the subjects treated in the two, and the design which the writer seems to have kept constantly in view. In the First, he sought to comfort, strengthen and sustain his readers. In the Second, he pressed the peculiar claim. In the Second he is anxious to warn and to shield those whom he addresses as to impending dangers more disastrous and more to be feared than the sufferings inflicted by a hostile world. In the First, he begins at the house of God (1 4 18), and believers were to arm, not to resist their persecutors, but for martyrdom (4 1). But in the Second, a very different condition of things is brought to view. Ungodly men holding degrading principles, practising such immoralities, are threatening to invade the Christian brotherhood. Evil of a most vicious sort was detected by the watchful eye of the writer, and he knew full well that if suffered to continue and grow, as assuredly it would, utter ruin for the cause he loved would ensue. Therefore he forewarns and denounces the tendency with the spirit and energy of a prophet of Jehovah.

2. Pet opens with the positive statement of Peter's authorship: 1 1. "Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ." (2) Peter opens with the positive statement of Peter's authorship: 1 1. "Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ." The insertion of "Simon," the old Heb name, in the form confused, is significant. If a forger had been writing at the inspiration of Peter, he would have begun his letter almost certainly by copying the First Epp. and simply written, "Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ." As it is, Peter begins his letter with the name of his inspiration, and early Christian literature, there is no Christian document of value written by a forger who used the name of an apostle." (Dods, SBG). If this important statement is accepted at its full worth, it goes far to settle the question of authorship. Both "servant" and "apostle" appear in the opening sentence, and the writer claims both for himself.

Furthermore, the writer is distinctly a Christian; he addresses those who "have obtained a like precious faith with us in the righteousness of our God and the Saviour Jesus Christ" (1 1). Although he cites Peter and John, he speaks of them as the "fathers" of which all the other saints enjoy: his also the exceeding great and precious promises of God, and he expects with all other believers to be made a partaker of the Divine nature (1 4 3). It is at all probable that one with such a faith and such expectations would deliberately use the name of Simon Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ? The writer is unearthing in his denunciations of false teachers the spirit of Peter and Paul, and Peter, and the truth. He instances the fall of the angels, the destruction of Sodom, the reprobation of Balaam, as examples of those who knew the grace of God and yet were in shameful sin and crime. Would a Christian and servant of Jesus Christ had been of his insinuating the most_flagrant manner the things he so vehemently condemns? If the writer was not the apostle Peter, he was a faithful interpreter of others, and a hypocrite, which seems incredible to us.

Moreover, he associates himself with the other apostles (2 3 5), is in full sympathy with Paul and Peter’s Epp. (3 15 16), and he holds and teaches the same fundamental truth. An apostle could not have introduced through this document such as is generally absent from spurious writings and such. He is anxiously concerned for the purity of the faith and the holiness of the followers of Christ. He exhorts them to give "diligence that ye may be found in peace, without spot and blameless in his sight," and that "they [a] grace and peace to you from our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" (3 14 18). All this and much more of the apostolic in tone and hetonism genuineness and reality. Moreover, further the writer appeals to certain facts in the life of Peter that are almost autobiographical. For example, he speaks of "putting off of my tabernacle . . . even as he cast his divine mantle on a wrestling angel," from the Saviour (2 1). In fact, he simply could not have been an apostle.

3. Claim to Petrine Authorship

4. Christian Earnestness

5. Relation to Apostles

6. Auto-biographical: our Lord Jesus Christ signified unto us . . . "me" (1 13). The reference undoubtedly is to John 3 36; 21 18 19. He claims to have been a witness of the Transfiguration (1 16–18). He indirectly claims the inspiration of his writings, as the "apostolic Book of En and perhaps also from the Ascension of Christ. Peter's sources are admitted to be the witness of the apostle who represented his SBD). The former would be more likely to cite 2 Pet 3 4–3 than the latter from Jude vs 4-16. The resemblance between these two sections of the Epp. is so close that one must have drawn both thoughts and language from the other, or both availed themselves of the same documentary source. Of this latter supposition antiquity furnishes no hint. The differences are as marked as if their ressemblances, and the one who cites from the other is no servile copyist. The real difference between the two is that between prediction and fulfilment. (2) Peter predicts the advent of the "false teachers" (2 1). His principal vbs, are in the future tense (2 2 12; 13). Indeed in describing the character and the conduct of the apostate libertines (2 12), he indicates a knowledge of a notorious teaching he puts in the future (2 15). The deadly germs were there when he wrote, the rank growth there was even then. The whole picture is of the expected, and the entire prose is of a deadly work. (3 Jude twice refers to certain sources of information touching these errors, with which his readers were acquainted and which were designed to warn them of the danger and keep them from betrayal. The two sources were (a) a writing that spoke of "ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ," ver 4; (b) the prediction of Peter that "in the last days mockers shall come with mockery, walking after their own lusts" (2 Pet 3 3). Jude urges his readers to remember the words which the apostles of Peter had before him, and his recognition of Peter in almost the exact terms: "In the last time there shall be mockers, walking after their ungodly lusts." He also reminds them of Peter's warning about the hypocrisy of those who live in hypocrisy and therein and there practising their unholy deeds: "These are they who make separations, sensual, having not the Spirit." The conclusion is inevitable. Jude quotes from Peter, (4) Chronology gives the priority to Peter. The apostle James lived between 50 and 90 A.D., and the majority of recent interpreters date the Epp. of Jude at 15–50 A.D. Jude's writing is no doubt a sequel to the destruction of Jerusalem, 70 AD. According, it is later than Peter's death by far to 10 years. Jude is implied in this interpretation. (5) Pet endorses it. The Ep. quotes from Peter as an apostle and canonically authoritative. It is later than Peter's death by far to 10 years. Jude is implied in this interpretation. (6) Pet endorses it. The Ep. quotes from Peter as an apostle and canonically authoritative. It is later than Peter's death by far to 10 years. Jude is implied in this interpretation. (7) Pet endorses it. The Ep. quotes from Peter as an apostle and canonically authoritative. It is later than Peter's death by far to 10 years. Jude is implied in this interpretation. (8) Pet endorses it. The Ep. quotes from Peter as an apostle and canonically authoritative. It is later than Peter's death by far to 10 years. Jude is implied in this interpretation. (9) Pet endorses it. The Ep. quotes from Peter as an apostle and canonically authoritative. It is later than Peter's death by far to 10 years. Jude is implied in this interpretation.
Moreover, the apostle appeals to the inspiration of the prophecy as a confirmation of his teaching. No prophecy of scripture is of private interpretation. For no prophecy can come by the will of man: but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit. He recognizes this as a primary truth, that prophecy is not of our own invention, nor is it the simple expression of the prophet. The prophecy was brought to him, as it is brought to us. Peter and his fellow-believers did not follow "inquiring spirits", but rather "holy men of God" who had been filled with the Holy Spirit. Peter thus laid down a fundamental principle for the understanding of prophecy.

Of course in 3:15-18, where the three worlds are spoken of, three globes are not meant, but three vast epochs, three enormous periods in the history of the earth. The apostle divides its history into three clearly defined sections, and mentions some of the characteristic features of each.

(1) The old world.—"The world that then was" (3:6): this is his first world. It is the antediluvian world that is meant, the world which the Flood overwhelmed. Sceffers in Peter's time asked, no doubt with a sneer, "Where is the promise of his coming? for, from the day that the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation" (3:4). This is a surprisingly modern inquiry. Nature has appealed to the continuity of natural processes, and to the inviolability of Nature's laws. Nature keeps her track with unwavering precision. There is no sign of anything; no catastrophe is likely, is possible. The promise of His return, Peter reminds the skeptics that a mighty cataclysm did once overwhelm the world. The Flood drowned every living thing, save those sheltered within the ark. As this is a historical fact, the query of the mockers is foolish.

(2) The present world.—Peter's second world is "the heavens that now are, and the earth" (3:7). It is the present order of things in sky and earth that is meant. He asserts that this world is "stored up for fire, being reserved against the day of judgment and destruction of ungodly men." The margin reads, "stored with fire," i.e., it contains within itself the agency by which it may be consumed. The world that now is, is held in strict custody, reserved, not for a second deluge, but for fire. The advent of Christ and the judgment are associated in Scripture with fire: "Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence: a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him." Ps 68 3 AV. Isa 66 15. The passage in Peter is the NT's silent on this point: "the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the angels of his power in flaming fire" (2 Thess 1:7).

Ample materials are stored up in the earth for its consumption by fire. The oil and the gasses so inflammable and destructive in their energy can, when it may please God to release these forces, swiftly reduce the present order of things to ashen dust. Peter's language does not signify earth's annihilation, nor its dissolution as an organic body, nor the end of time. He speaks of cosmic convulsions and physical revolution in terms of the sky and earth, as such shall transform the planet into something glorious and beautiful.

(3) The new world.—The third world is this: "But, according to his promise, we look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (3:13). This is Paradise restored. We have sure ground for the expectation; the last two chapters of Rev contain the prophetic fulfillment: we shall see a new heaven, a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and the sea is no more." The accomplishment of these sublime predictions will involve a fundamental change in the constitution of the globe. Life would be impossible if the sea was no more. But He who has power over the elements and the sea shall also have power over every vestige of sin and misery and imperfection, fitting it for the dwelling of perfect beings and of
His supreme glory. Inmanuel will dwell with the holy inhabitants of the new earth and in the new Jerusalem which is to descend into the glorified planet Jehovah. John 5:22. "Write, for the predictions are faithful and true; they shall not fail to come to pass." "Earth, thou grain of sand on the shore of the Universe of God. On thee hast the Lord a great work to complete."

LITERATURE.—See end of Peter, First Epistle of; Peter (Simon).

WILLIAM G. MOORBEAD

PETRA, pét'ra. See Sol."
PHARAKIM, far-a-kim ( פָּרָאכִים , Pharaekim, 1, פָּרָאכִים , Pharaekim; AV Pharcim): One of the families of temple-servants who returned with Zerubbabel (1 Esd 5:31; not found in Ezra or Neh).

PHARAOH, fá'rō, fá-rā-ô ( פָּרָאָה, par'ah; פָּרָאָה, Pharaoh; Egyp per aa, “great house”): Many and strange differences of opinion have been expressed concerning the use of this name in Egypt and elsewhere, because of its importance in critical discussions (see below). EB says “a name given to all Egypt kings in the Bible”; it also claims that the name could not have been received by the Hebrews before 1000 BC. HDB (III, 819) says that a letter was addressed to Amenhotep as “Pharaoh, lord of,” etc. According to Winckler’s theory of a North Arabian Musri, it was the Hebrews alone in ancient times who adopted the term Pharaoh from the Egyptians, the name being of Zedekiah, even in the Am Tab or anywhere else in cuneiform literature for the king of Egypt. Such a result is obtained according to Winckler’s theory by referring every reference in cuneiform to “Fir’un, king of Musri” to the North Arabian country.

1. Use of Name in Egypt

Egypt inscriptions the term “Pharaoh” occurs from the Pyramid inscriptions onward. At first it is used with distinct reference to its etymology and not clearly as an independent title. Pharaoh, “great house,” like Sublime Porte, was applied first as a metaphor to mean the government. But as in such an absolute monarchy as Egypt the king was the government, Pharaoh was, by a figure of speech, put for the king. To use Egypt clearly as a title denoting the ruler, whoever he might be, as Caesar among the Romans, Shah among Persians, and Czar among Russians, belongs to a few dynasties probably beginning with the XVIIIth, and certainly ending not later than the XXIst, when we read of Pharaoh Sheshonk, but the Bible does not speak so, but calls him "Shishak king of Egypt" (1 K 14:25). This new custom in the use of the title Pharaoh does not appear in the Bible until we have “Pharaoh-nech.” Pharaoh is certainly used in the time of Rameses II, in the "Tale of Two Brothers" (Records of the Post, 1st series, II, 137; Recueil de Travaux, XXI, 13, I, 1).

It appears from the preceding that Bib. writers use this word with historical accuracy for the various periods to which it refers, not only for the time of Necho and Hophra, but for the time of Rameses II, and use the style of the time of Rameses II for the time of Abraham and Joseph, concerning which we have not certain knowledge of its use in Egypt. It is strongly urged that writers of the 7th or 5th cent. BC would not have been able to make such historical use of this name, while, to a writer at the time of the exodus, it would have been perfectly natural to use Pharaoh for the king without any further name; and historical writers in the time of the prophets in the Old Testament would likewise have used Pharaoh-nech and Pharaoh Hophra. This evidence is not absolutely conclusive for an early authorship of the Pent and historical books, but it is very difficult to account for a late authorship (cf. Gen 12:14-20; 41:14; Ex 1:11; 3:11; 1 K 3:1; 14:25; 2 K 23:29; Jer 44:30; also 1 K 11:19; 2 K 18:11; 1 Ch 4:18).

PHARAOH HOPHRA, hóf'ra hōph'ra; Osbodoth Hophra: He is so called in Scripture (Jer 44:30); He-rodotus calls him Apries (i.169). He is known on the monuments as "Ush'ab ba'ro. He was the son of Psammetichus II, whose Greco-Egyptian mercenaries have left inscriptions upon the rocks of Abu-Simbel, and the name was received by the Egyptians from the Chaldæans when they took the palace. According to Winckler’s theory of a North Arabian Musri, it was the Hebrews alone in ancient times who adopted the term Pharaoh from the Egyptians, the name being of Zedekiah, even in the Am Tab or anywhere else in cuneiform literature for the king of Egypt. Such a result is obtained according to Winckler’s theory by referring every reference in cuneiform to "Fir'un, king of Musri" to the North Arabian country.

2. Alliance with Zedekiah

Israelites who returned from Babylon and had been taken into captivity in Egypt under Pharaoh Apries. Pharaoh-Nech was the last king of Egypt to reign over the country, and his reign was marked by a number of significant events. He fought against the Pharaoh of Egypt and captured the city of Babylon. Pharaoh-Nech was also known as Zedekiah, the king of Judah, and he fought against the Babylonians and was eventually captured and executed.

3. Reception of Jeremiah and Nehemiah

Jeremiah and Nehemiah were both prophets who lived in the time of Pharaoh Apries. They were received by Pharaoh Apries with honor and were given the task of leading the people of God into the land of Canaan. The prophet Jeremiah prophesied against the Babylonians and the king of Judah, while Nehemiah led the people of God into the land of Canaan.

4. Palace of Pharaoh Apries

The palace of Pharaoh Apries was located in Memphis, the ancient capital of Egypt, near the grey mud hill, close to the squalid Arab village.
of Mitrohenn, which every tourist passes on the way to Sakkara, had lain for centuries Hophra's magnificent palace, 400 ft. long by 200 ft., with a splendid pylon, an immense court, and stone-lined halls, of which seven have been found intact. With many other objects of value which were found a fitting of a palanquin of solid silver, decorated with a bust of Hathor with a gold face. It is said to be of the finest workmanship of the time of Apries, a relic of the fire, which, Jeremiah predicted at Tahpanhes, the Lord of Hosts was to kindle "in the houses of the gods of Egypt!" (Jer 43 12).

Pharaoh Hophra, as Jeremiah prophesied (44 29f.), became the victim of a revolt and was finally slain.


T. NICOL

PHARAOH-NECOH, nē'kō (נֵכֹה), par'ōh nēkōh, also לֶחֹד, nēkōh, Nejah, Neecho (2 K 23 29, 33).—2. Ch 35 22; 36 4, AV Necho, 1. Pharaoh-Ramesses, Necoe: Jer 46 20; 2 Ch 36 26. Necho, 610-AV Necho, RV (Necho)]: Nekau II of 594 BC the monuments—Gr Ἕκοδος—was the 24th king of the XXVII Dynasty, being the son of Psammetichus I, famous in Gr contemporaneous history for a long reign. In the vast memorials both in Upper and Lower Egypt (Herod. ii.153, 158, 169). The great event of his reign (610-594 BC) was his expedition across Syria to secure a place in the share of the decaying empire of Assyria. In the days of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal, Egypt had been tributary to Assyria, and, when it began to break up, Egypt and other subject kingdoms saw their opportunity to throw off its yoke. Psammetichus had turned back the Scythian hordes which had reached his border on their western march, and now his son Necho was to make a bold stroke for empire.

On his expedition toward the East, he had to pass through the territory of Judah, and he desired to have Josiah its king as an ally.

2. Battle of Whatever may have been his reasons, Megiddo, Josiah remained loyal to his Assyrian suzerain, declined the Egypt alliance, and threw himself across the path of the invaders. Opposing them on the battlefield of Megiddo, 608 BC, Necho was mortally wounded and soon after died amid the lamentations of his people. Necho marched northward, captured Kadesh, and pressed on to the Euphrates. Not having met an enemy there, he seems to have turned back and established himself for a time at Riblah in Syria. To Riblah he summoned Jehoahaz whom the people had anointed king in room of his father Josiah, deposed him after a brief reign of 3 months, and set his brother Jehoiakim on the throne as the vassal of Egypt. Jehoiakim paid up the tribute of a hundred talents of silver and a talent of gold which Necho had imposed upon him, but he recovered it by exactions which he made from the people (2 K 23 35).

The Egyptians which still kept some hold upon Syria, and his presence there had attracted the attention of the newly established power of Babylon. The Chaldaean Carchemish, under Nebuchadnezzar set out for the 604 BC Euphrates, and, meeting the army of Pharaoh-necoh at Carchemish, invaded upon him a signal defeat. The Chaldaean were now undisputed masters of Western Asia, and the sacred historian relates that "the king of Egypt came not again any more out of his land; for the king of Babylon had taken, from the brook of Egypt unto the river Euphrates, all that pertained to the king of Egypt!" (2 K 24 7).

While Pharaoh-necoh II was ambitious to extend his empire, he was bent also upon the commercial development of Egypt. For this he had commenced to build two fleets, composed of triremes, ventured one of them to navigate the Mediter-

ranian, the other to navigate the Red Sea. In order to secure a combination of his fleets, he conceived the idea of reopening the canal between the Nile and the Red Sea which had been originally constructed by Seti I and Rameses II, two Pharaohs of the days of the Israelite oppression, but had become silted up by desert sands. He excavated this old canal, following the line of the former cutting, and widening it so that two triremes might meet and pass each other in it. According to Herodotus he was obliged to desist from the undertaking in consequence of the mortality among the laborers, and it was left to Darius to complete. He also resolved to try whether it was possible to circumnavigate Africa, and, having his ships with Phoenician sailors, he sent them forth with instructions to keep the coast of Africa on their right and to return to Egypt by way of the Mediter-

ranian. They succeeded in the "Pharaoh's Cape of Good Hope from the East, anticipated by two millenniums the feat which Vasco da Gama accomplished from the West. The enterprise took more than two years, and the result of it was of no practical value. Herodotus in his "History" was in 450 BC, saw still remaining the docks which Necho had built for the accommodation of his fleet.

LITERATURE—Flinders Petrie, History of Egypt, III, 335 ff; Wiedemann, Geschichte von Alt-Ägypten, 179-90; Rawlinson, Egypt ("Story of the Nations"), 354 ff; Herodotus ii.158, 159.

T. NICOL

PHARAOH'S DAUGHTER (בָּתְרָה, bahr'áh): The princess who rescued Moses (Ex 2 5-10; He 11 24). This is probably a title as well as an appellation, indicating not only one of the daughters of a Pharaoh, but also some very distinguished rank, thought to be most probably that of the heir to the throne by birth; though she was debarred from reigning by reason of sex, she still possessed the right to entail the scepter and crown to her oldest son. Pharaoh's daughter (Ex 2 25), the "daughter of the king of Egypt" mentioned in the Bible is not possible yet. All attempts toward identification are, of course, guided by the particular theory of the oppressor accepted. If the Pharaoh of the Oppression was Rameses II, as is most likely, then Pharaoh's daughter was probably the daughter of Seti I, an older sister of Rameses II. If, as many think, the Pharaoh of the Oppression was Thothmes III, then Pharaoh's daughter was some unknown princess. Some have thought she was Hatashepet, the "Queen Elizabeth of Egypt."

M. G. KYLE

PHARATHON, far-a-thon (פָּרֹתָתֹן, Phathathon): One of the strong cities of Judaea fortified by Bac-

chides during the Maccabean war (1 Mace 9 50). LXX reads "Palmathatha-pharathon" as the name of one city. Jos, however (Ant, XIII, i, 3), and Syr supply the "and" between them. The name represents a Heb prathôn. If it is known to be taken strictly as in Judean territory, it cannot be identified with Phraits, (q.v.) of Jgs 12 13. In that case we should probably seek for the ancient place of Smith in some fortress covering the top of Wady Farah.

W. EWING

PHARES, fārē'ez (φαρέας, Pharēas); AV; Gr form of "Pereus" (thus RV) (Mt 1 3; Lk 3 33).
PHAREZ, פָּרֶץ (AV 1 Esd 5 6; 8 30): The same as RV PHOROS (q.v.).

PHARIDA, פַּרְיָדָא (Pharïda, Phareïdâ, Φαριδά, Φαρηδά; AV Pharira): The clan name of one of the families of "the servants of Solomon" who came up from Babylon with Zerubbabel (1 Esd 5 30); x "Peruda of Ex 2 55= "Perida" of Neh 7 57.

PHARIRA, פַּרְיָדָא: AV=RV PHARIDA (q.v.).

PHARISEES, פַּרְיָדָא (נָבָרְיָדָא, nîḇârîyādîh; פַּרְיָדָא, Pharisaïs):

1. Name and General Character
2. Authorities—Josephus—NT—Talmud

I. History of the Sect
1. Associated at First with Hasmonaean, but Later Abandon Them
2. Change of Name
3. Later Fortunes of the Sect
4. In NT Times
5. In Post-apostolic Times

II. Doctrines of the Pharisees
1. Statements of Josephus colored by Greek Ideas
2. Conditional Reincarnation
3. Deification of Pharisaic Doctrines—Angeles and Spirits—Resurrection
4. Traditions Added to the Law
5. Traditional Interpretations (Sabbath, etc)
6. Students of Scripture

(a) Messianic Hopes
(b) Almsgiving

III. Organized of the Pharisaic Party
1. The Ḥăḇārīm—Pharisaic Brotherhoods

IV. Character of the Pharisees
1. Pharisees and People of the Land
2. Intolerance toward Other Jews
3. Regulations for the Ḥāḇārī
g
4. The Test Account
5. Their Scrupulosity
6. Their Hypocrisy
7. Talmudic Classification of the Pharisees
8. Our Lord's Relation to the Pharisees
9. Pharisaic Attempts to Gain Christ over
10. Reasons for Pharisaic Hatred of Christ
11. Our Lord's Denunciation of the Pharisees

LITERATURE

A prominent sect of the Jews. The earliest notice of them in Jos occurs in connection with Jonathan, the high priest. Immediately after

1. Name and General Character
2. Authorities of the NT

Our Lord's and His followers. The evidence of Jos shows that a contemporary and himself a Pharisee, Judah, was a devotee of that sect, and was not so much as mentioned. Although the Talm was written, both Mish and Gemara, by the

descendants of the Pharisees, the fact that the Gemara, from which most of our information is derived, is so late renders the evidence deduced from Talmudic statements of little value. Even the Mishnah, which came into being only a century after the fall of the Jewish state, shows traces of exaggeration and modification of facts. Still, taking these discrepancies into consideration, we can make a fairly consistent picture of the sect.

The name means "separatists," from סְפָּרָה, pārash, "to separate"—those who carefully kept themselves from any legal contamination, distinguishing themselves by their care in such matters from the common people, the "הָּשָּׁרֶה, shepherds" who had fewer scruples. Like the Puritans in England during the 17th cent., and the Presbyterians in Scotland during the same period, the Pharisees, although primarily a religious party, became an enduringly political party. They were a closely organized society, all the members of which called each other Ḥāḇārīm, "neighbors;" this added to the power they had through their influence with the people.

1. History of the Sect—The Assidaeans (kāṣidhím) were at first the most active supporters of Judas Maccabeus in his struggle for religious freedom. A portion of them, rather than retreat to the desert to escape the tyranny of Epiphanes (1 Macc 2 27 i). The followers of these in later days became the Essenes. When Judas Maccabeus cleansed the temple and redeemed it with many sacrifices, it is not expressly said, either in the Books of Macc or by Jos, that he acted as high priest, but the probability is that he did so. This would have been a shock to theAssidaean purists, as Judas, though a priest, was not a Zadokite; but his actions were to be tolerated at that time on account of the imminent necessity for the work of reconsecration and the eminent services of Judas himself and his family.

When Bacchides appeared against Jews with Alcimus in his camp, this feeling against Judas took shape in receiving the treacherous Alcimus into Jesus and acknowledging him as high priest, a line of action which soon showed that it was fraught with disaster, as Alcimus murdered many of the people of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes, therefore implying that then and in connection with them they had been prominent, although no notice of any of these parties is to be found that confirms that view. Later (XI: 18; see also Jos, ch. xiv, 9) an account of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes is given, and it is clear that the former are in view, while the latter have been introduced by way of contrast. See HARMAN; ASSONEANS. It would seem that not only the Pharisees, but also the Essenes, were derived from the Assidaeans or Ḥāḇārīm.

In considering the characteristics and doctrines of the Pharisees, we have some difficulty from the nature of our authorities. The writers of the NT assume generally that the character and tenets of the Pharisees are well known to their readers, and only lay stress on the points in which they were in antagonism to Our Lord and His followers. The evidence of Jos shows that a contemporary and himself a Pharisee, Judah, was a devotee of that sect, and was not so much as mentioned. Although the Talm was written, both Mish and Gemara, by the descendants of the Pharisees, the fact that the Gemara, from which most of our information is derived, is so late renders the evidence deduced from Talmudic statements of little value. Even the Mishnah, which came into being only a century after the fall of the Jewish state, shows traces of exaggeration and modification of facts. Still, taking these discrepancies into consideration, we can make a fairly consistent picture of the sect.

The name means "separatists," from סְפָּרָה, pārash, "to separate"—those who carefully kept themselves from any legal contamination, distinguishing themselves by their care in such matters from the common people, the "הָּשָּׁרֶה, shepherds" who had fewer scruples. Like the Puritans in England during the 17th cent., and the Presbyterians in Scotland during the same period, the Pharisees, although primarily a religious party, became an enduringly political party. They were a closely organized society, all the members of which called each other Ḥāḇārīm, "neighbors;" this added to the power they had through their influence with the people.

1. History of the Sect—The Assidaeans (kāṣidhím) were at first the most active supporters of Judas Maccabeus in his struggle for religious freedom. A portion of them, rather than retreat to the desert to escape the tyranny of Epiphanes (1 Macc 2 27 i). The followers of these in later days became the Essenes. When Judas Maccabeus cleansed the temple and redeemed it with many sacrifices, it is not expressly said, either in the Books of Macc or by Jos, that he acted as high priest, but the probability is that he did so. This would have been a shock to the Assidaean purists, as Judas, though a priest, was not a Zadokite; but his actions were to be tolerated at that time on account of the imminent necessity for the work of reconsecration and the eminent services of Judas himself and his family.

When Bacchides appeared against Jews with Alcimus in his camp, this feeling against Judas took shape in receiving the treacherous Alcimus into Jesus and acknowledging him as high priest, a line of action which soon showed that it was fraught with disaster, as Alcimus murdered many of the people of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes, therefore implying that then and in connection with them they had been prominent, although no notice of any of these parties is to be found that confirms that view. Later (XI: 18; see also Jos, ch. xiv, 9) an account of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes is given, and it is clear that the former are in view, while the latter have been introduced by way of contrast. See HARMAN; ASSONEANS. It would seem that not only the Pharisees, but also the Essenes, were derived from the Assidaeans or Ḥāḇārīm.

In considering the characteristics and doctrines of the Pharisees, we have some difficulty from the nature of our authorities. The writers of the NT assume generally that the character and tenets of the Pharisees are well known to their readers, and only lay stress on the points in which they were in antagonism to Our Lord and His followers. The evidence of Jos shows that a contemporary and himself a Pharisee, Judah, was a devotee of that sect, and was not so much as mentioned. Although the Talm was written, both Mish and Gemara, by the
THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

The Puritans of the 17th cent. became in the 19th
"Non-conformists." The earliest instance of the
Pharisees intervening in history is that of
Name where Eleazar, a Pharisee, demanded
that John Hyrcanus should lay down
the high-priesthood because his mother had been a
 captive, thus insinuating that he—Hyrcanus—
was no true son of Aaron, but the bastard of some
nameless heathen to whom his mother had surren-
dered herself. This unforgivable insult to himself
and to the memory of his mother led Hyrcanus to
break with the Pharisaic party definitely. He seems
to have left them neverfully

The sons of Hyrcanus, esp. Alexander Janneaeus,
expressed their hostility in a more active way.

3. Later
Fates of
the Sect
seems to intimate overt acts of host-
tility on their part which prompted
this action. His whole policy was the
aggrandizement of the Jewish state, but his ambi-
tion was greater than his military abilities. His re-
peated failures and defeats confirmed the Pharisees
in their suspicion of him on religious grounds.
They scandalized them by calling himself king, although not
of the Davidic line, and further still by adopting the
heathen name "Alexander," and having it stamped in
characters on his coins. Although a high
priest was forbidden to marry a woman, he married
the widow of his brother. Still further, he incurred
their opposition by abandoning the Pharisaic tradi-
tion as to the way in which the libation water was
poured out. They retaliated by rousing his people
against him and conspiring with the Syrian king.
On his deathbed he advised his wife, Alexandra
Salome, who succeeded him on the throne, to make
peace with the Pharisees. This she did by throw-
ing herself entirely into their hands. On her death
a struggle for the possession of the throne and the
high-priesthood began between her two sons, John
Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II. The latter, the
more able and energetic, had the support of the
Sadudees; the elder, the elder of the two brothers,
had that of the Pharisees. In the first phase of the
conflict, Hyrcanus was defeated and compelled to
make a disadvantageous peace with his brother,
but, urged by Antipater, the Idumean, he called
in Aretas, who inclined the balance at once to the
Sadudees. The Romans were appealed to and they also,
moved partly by the astuteness of Antipater, favored Hyrcanus. All this resulted
ultimately in the supremacy of the Herodians,
who through their subservience to Rome became
inimical to the Pharisees and rivals of the Sad-
duees.

When the NT records open, the Pharisees, who
have supreme influence among the people, are also
strong, though not predominant, in the
Sanhedrin. The Herodians and Sad-
duees, the one by their alliance with the
Rom authorities, and the other by
their inherited skill in political intrigue, held the
reins of government. If we might believe the Talmudic representation, the Pharisees were in the
immense majority in the Sanhedrin; the idel or
president, and the 'abb-beth-din, or vice-president,
both were Pharisees. This, however, is to be put
to the credit of Talmudic imagination, the relation
of which to facts is of the most distant kind.

Recently Büchler (Das grosse Synedrium in J e r u s e l m) has attempted to harmonize those Talmudic fables with
the aspect of things appearing in the NT and Jos. He assumed that the two had habits to
do with matters of government, in which the Sad-
duees were overwhelmingly predominant, and the other sects of the Jews were equally
predominant—the one the Senate of the nation, like the
Senate of the United States, the other the Senate of a
University, Rings say. Among Pharisees was Joseph
by Rabbi Lauterbach in the J e w i s h Rev., this attempt
cannot be regarded as successful. There is no evidence for this dualism in the NT or Jos., on the
one hand, or in the Talm on the other.

Outside the Sanhedrin t e r the Pharisees are ubi-
quitous, in J e r u s a l e m, in Galilee, in Perea and in
the Decapolis, always coming in contact with Jesus. The attempts made by certain recent Jewish writers
to exonerate them from the guilt of the condem-
nation of Our Lord has no foundation; it is contra-
dicted by the NT records, and the attitude of the
Talm to Jesus.

The Pharisees appear in the Book of Acts to be
in a latent way favorers of the apostles as against
the high-priestly party. The personal influence
of Gamaliel, which seems commanding, was exer-
cised in their favor. The anti-Christian zeal of
Saul the Tarsian, though a Pharisee, may have been
to some extent the result of the personal feel-
ings which led him to perpetuate the relations of
the earlier period when the two sects were united in
common antagonism to the teaching of Christ.
He, a Pharisee, offered himself to be employed by
the Sadducean high priest (Acts 9.1.2) to carry
on the work of persecution in Damascus. In this
action Saul appears to have been in opposition to a
large section of the Pharisaic party. The bitter
disputes which he and the otheranger that he and
his followers had carried on with Stephen had possibly
influenced him.

When Paul, the Christian apostle, was brought
before the Sanhedrin at J e r u s a l e m, the Pharisaic party
were numerous in the city, and had many
views. From Jos we learn that with the out-
break of the war with the Romans the Pharisees
were thrust into the background by the more fanatical
Zealots, Simon ben Giora and John of Gischala.
(Bd., V. i). The truth behind the Talmudic state-
ments that Gamaliel removed the Sanhedrin to
Jabneh and that Johanan ben Zakhai successfully
entreated Vespasian to spare the scholars of that city
is that the Pharisees in considerable numbers made
peace with the Romans. In the Mish we have
the evidence of their later labors when the Sanhedrin
was removed from Jabneh, and the community met
in Galilee. There under the guidance of Jehuda
ha-Kaddish ("the Holy") the Mish was reduced to
writing. It may thus be said that Judaism became
Pharisaism, and the history of the Jews became that
of the Pharisees. In a later period the opposition to Christianity sprang up anew and
became embittered, as may be seen in the Talmudic
fables concerning Jesus.

II. Doctrines of the Pharisees.—The account
given of the doctrines of the Pharisees by Jos is
clearly influenced by his desire to parallel the Jewish sects with the
Gr philosophical schools. He directs
special attention to the Pharasic .
I. Josephus
Statements
Colored by
Greek
ideas
Sects differed very emphatically. He
regards the Pharisaic position as mid-
way between that of the Sadducees, who denied fate
altogether and made human freedom absolute, and
that of the Essenes that "all things are left in the
hand of God." He says "The Pharisees ascribe all
to fate and God, yet allow that to do what is right or the contrary is principally in man's own
power, and do not necessarily promote the civil, human
laws of the Pharisees, but are equally
predominant—the one the Senate of the nation, like the

a
fatum, "something decreed," than in relation to the impersonal moira, or heimarmené, of the Greeks. As Jos wrote in Gr and used only the second of these terms, he had no philological inducement to make the identification; the reason must have been the matter of fact. In other words, he shows that the Pharisees believed in a personal God whose will was provided.

In connection with this was their doctrine of a future life of rewards and punishments. The phrase which Jos uses is a peculiar one: "They think that every soul is immortal; only the souls of good men will pass into another body, but the souls of the evil shall suffer everlasting punishment" (Aidíl tímóríá kalózsehat). From this it has been deduced that the Pharisees held the transmigration of souls. In our opinion this is a mistake. We believe that really it is an attempt of Jos to state the doctrine of the resurrection of the body in a way that would not shock Hellenic ideas. The Gr contempt for the body made the idea of the resurrection abhorrent, and in this, as in most philosophical matters, the Romans followed the Greeks. It should seem that, as regards the Pharisees as maintaining that this resurrection applied only to the righteous. Still even this restriction, though certainly the natural interpretation, is not absolutely necessary. This is confirmed by the passage in the book of Antiquities (XVIII, i, 3): "They also believe . . . that under the earth there will be rewards or punishments, according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life, and the latter are to be destined in an everlasting prison, but that the former shall have power to revive and live again." Jos also declares the Pharisees to be very attentive students of the law of God: "they interpret the law with careful exactitude." Nothing in the Gospels or the Acts at all militates against any part of this representation, but there is much to fill it out. They believed in

3. NT Pres-entations of Pharisaic Doctrines.

The connection it is probable that the present activity of such beings was the question in the mind of the writer. In that same sentence the belief in the resurrection is ascribed to the Pharisees.

Another point is that the bare letter of the Law they added traditions. While the existence of these traditions is referred to in the Gospels, too little is said to enable us to

4. Traditions Added to grasp their nature and extent (Mt. to the Law 15 2 ff.; 16 5 ff.; Mk 7 1-23). The evangelists only recorded these traditional glosses when they conflicted with the teaching of Christ and were therefore denounced by Him. We find them exemplified in the Mish. The Pharisaic theory of tradition was that these additions to the written law and interpretations of it had been given by Moses to the elders and by them had been transmitted orally down through the ages. The classical passage in the Mish is to be found in Pirke Abóbbá: "Moses received the [oral] Law from Sinai and delivered it to Joshua and Joshua to the elders, and the elders to the prophets and the prophets to the men of the congregation." Additions to these traditions were made by prophets by direct inspiration, or by interpretation of the words of the written Law. All this mass, as related above, was reduced to writing by Jehuda ha-Kaddish in Theresia, probably about the end of the 2d cent. AD. Jehuda was born, it is said, 135 AD, and died somewhere about 220 AD.

The related doctrines of the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, and the final judgment with its consequent eternal rewards and punishments formed a portion and a valuable portion of this tradition.

5. Traditional Interpretation of the Law by the Pharisees. Sometimes the ingenuity of the Pharisaic doctors directed to lighten the burden of the precepts added as a rule to the Sabbath. Thus a person was permitted to go much farther than a Sabbath day's journey if at some time previous he had departed within the jurisdiction of his house, and consequently from this all distances were to be ceremonially reckoned (Jos. R. 1 e. 2; "Erub").

The great doctrine of Pharisaic jurisprudence was the purely external. An act was right or wrong according as some external condition was present or absent; thus there was a difference in bestowing aims on the Sabbath whether the beggar put his hand within the door of the donor or the donor stretched his hand beyond his own threshold, as may be seen in the first Mish in the Talmud. It is clear that the Pharisaic tide that which with which to expedite the pace of the beast he was guilty, because he had laid a burden upon it.

Along with these traditions and traditional interpretations, the Pharisees were close students of the sacred text. On the turn of a sentence they suspended many decisions. So much so, that it is said of them that they suspended mountains from the Law. This has a bearing on textual criticism, even to the present day. A specimen of Pharisaic exegesis which Paul turns against their followers as an argumentum e contrario may be seen in Gal 3:16: "He saith not, And to seeds, as of one; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ."

(1) Messianic hopes.—It is also to be said for them, that they maintained the Messianic hopes of the nation when their rivals were ready to sacrifice everything to the Romans, in order to gain greater political influence for themselves. Their imagination ran riot in the pictures they drew of these future times, but still they aided the faith of the people who were thus in a position to listen to the claims of Christ. They were led by Rabbi Acha in the reign of Hadrian to accept Bar-Cochba about a century after they had rejected Jesus. They were fanatical in their obedience to the Law as they understood it, and died under untold tortures rather than transgress.

(2) Almsgiving.—They elevated almsgiving into an equivalent for righteousness. This gave poverty a very different place from what it had in Greece or among the Romans. Learning was honored, although its possessors might be very poor. The early life of Hilil brings this out. He is represented as being so poor as to be unable sometimes to pay the small daily fee which admitted pupils to the rabbinic school, and when this happened, in his eagerness for the Law, he is reported to have listened on the roof to the words of the teachers. This is probably not historically true, but it exhibits the Pharisaic ideal.

III. Organization of the Pharisaic Party.—We have no distinct account of this organization, either in the Gospels or in the Mish. As the close relationship which the members of the sect sustained to each other, their habit of united action as exhibited in the narratives of the NT and of Jos are thus most naturally explained. The Talmudic account of the Pharisee follows the earlier literature in the Mish. These were persons who primarily associated for the study of the Law and for the better observance of its precepts. No one was admitted to these hó-
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bhārāṭh without taking an oath of fidelity to the society and a promise of strict observance of Levitical precepts.

One of the elements of their promise has to be noted. The bhārāṭh (Heb. to sign a状) was a full bhārāṭh, "heave offering," to a priest who had consecrated himself to his priestly duties. The candidate had to pass through a period of probation of 30 days, according to the "house of Shammai." (a) According to the "house of Shamai." This latter element, being quite more Talmudic, may be regarded as doubtful. Association with those not belonging to the Pharisee society was put under numerous restrictions. It is at least not improbable that when the lawyer in Jn 10:29 demanded "Who is my neighbor?" he was minded to restrict the instances of the command in Lev 19:18 to those who, like himself, Pharisees. A society which thus had brotherhoods all over Par and was separated from the rest of the community would naturally wield formidable power when their claims were supported by the esteem of the people at large. It is to be observed that to be a bhārāṭh was a purely personal thing, not heritable like priesthood, and women as well as men might be members. In this the Pharisees were like the Christians. In another matter also there was a resemblance between them and the followers of Jesus; they, too, were more eager to receive proselytes. Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte! (Mt 23:15)

Many members of Rom society, esp. women, were christened as, for instance, Poppaea Sabina.

IV. Character of the Pharisees.—Because the ideal of the Pharisee was high, and because they revered learning and character above wealth and civil rank, they had a tendency to despise those who did not agree with them. We see traces of this in the Gospels; thus Jn 7:49: "This multitude that knoweth not the law are accursed." The distinction between the Pharisees, the Puritans and the am hā-ārēc, "people of the land," has been traditionally that which had to be kept between the Jews and the Gentiles who had entered the land as colonists or intruders. These would, during the Bab captivity, almost certainly speak Western Aram., and would certainly be heathen and indulge in heathen practices. They were "the people of the land" whom the returning exiles found in possession of Judea.

Mingled with them were the few Jews that had neither been killed nor deported by the Babylonians, nor carried down into Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar, the sons of Kereh. All they had conformed in a large measure to the habits of their heathen neighbors and intermarried with them, the stricter Jews, as Ezra and Nehemiah, regarded them as under the same condemnation as the heathen, and shrank from association with them. During the time of Our Lord's life on earth the name was practically restricted to the ignorant Jews whose conformity to the law was on a broader scale than that of the Pharisees. Some have, however, dated the invention of the name later in the days of the Macceban struggle, when the ceremonial precepts of the Law could with difficulty be observed. Those who were less careful of these were regarded as am hā-ārēc.

The distinction as exhibited in the Talm shows an arrogance on the part of the Pharisaic bhārāṭh that must have been galling to those who, though Jews as much as the Pharisees, were not Pharitians like them. These people, too, might not eat at the table of a man whose wife was of the am hā-ārēc, even though her husband might be a Pharisee. If he would be a full bhārāṭh, a Pharisee must not sell to any of the am hā-ārēc and this it was said could readily be translated. If a woman of the am hā-ārēc was left alone in a room, all that she could touch without moving from her place was unclean. We must, however, bear in mind that the evidence for this is Talmudic, and therefore of but limited historical value.

(1) Their scrupulosity.—We find traces of this scrupulosity in the Gospels. The special way in which the ceremonial sanctity of the

4. The NT Pharisees exhibited itself was in tithing, hence the reference to their tithing "safety and ease and cunning" (Mt 23:23). In the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, one of the things that the Pharisee prides himself on is that he gives tithe of all he possesses (Lk 18:12). He is an example of the Pharisaic arrogance of those "who trusted in themselves that they were righteous and set them at nought." Their claiming the first seats in seats and synagogues (Mt 23:6) was an evidence of the same spirit.

(2) Their hypocrisy.—Closely akin to this is the hypocrisy of which the Pharisees were accused by Our Lord. When we call them "hypocrites," we must go back to the primary meaning of the word. They were essentially "actors," poses. Good men, whose character and spiritual force have impressed themselves on their generation, have often peculiarities of manner and tone which are easily imitated. In the same respect, as they are held by their disciples leads those who respect them to adopt unconsciously their mannerisms of voice and deportment. A later generation unconsciously imitates, "acts the part." In a time when religion is persecuted, as in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, or despised as it was in the Hellenizing times which preceded and succeeded, it would be the duty of religious men not to hide their convictions. The tendency to carry on this public manifestation of religious acts after it had ceased to be protest would be necessarily great. The fact that they gained credit by praying at street corners when the hour of prayer came, and would have lost credit with the people had they not done so, was not recognized by them as lessening the moral worth of the action. Those who, having lived in the period of persecution and contempt, survived in that when religion was held in respect would maintain their earlier practice without any "arriére-pensee." The succeeding generation, in continuing the practice, unconsciously had "inherited" them. They who pronounced hypocrisy was none the less real that it was reached by unconscious stages. Hypocrisy was a new sin, a sin only possible in a spiritual religion, a religion in which morality and worship were closely related. Heathenism, which lay in some way between, by which the gods could be bribed, or cajoled into favors, had a purely casual connection with morality; its worship was entirely a thing of externals, of acting, "posing." Consequently, a man did not by the most careful attention to the ceremonies of religion produce any presumption in favor of his trustworthiness. There was thus no sinister motive to prompt to religion. The prophets had denounced the insincerity of worship, but even they did not pronounce hypocrisy, i.e., a position used as a cloak for treachery or dishonesty. Religion had become more spiritual, the connection between morality and worship more intimate by reason of the persecution of the Seleucids.

The Talm to some extent confirms the representation of the Gospels. There were seven classes of Pharisees: (1) the "shoulder" Pharisee, who wears his good deeds on his shoulders; (2) the "canon" Pharisee, who places the precepts of the Law, not by principle, but from expedience; (2) the "law-writer" Pharisee, who could be prepared at any time in order to perform a meritorious action; (3) the "bleeding" Pharisee, who cut his finger to show that his suffering as a Christian was not in vain; (4) the "painted" Pharisee, who adorns himself in a novel dress so that any one should touch
him so that he should be defiled: (5) the "reckoning" Pharisee, who is always saying, "What duty must I do to balance any unpalatable duty which I have neglected?"; (6) the "fearing" Pharisee, whose relative to God is one merely of trembling awe; (7) the Pharisee from "love," but the last there was an element of "acting," of hypocrisy. Talm denounces ostentation; but unconsciously that cost of time and trouble, that waste of their wealth and property - eousness: it commands an avoidance of ostentation which involves equal "posing."

V. Our Lord's Relationship to the Pharisees. — The attitude of the Pharisees to Jesus, to begin with, was in itself, as had been their attitude to John, critical. They sent representatives to watch His doings and His efforts to sayings and report. They seem to have regarded it as possible that He might unite Himself with them, although, as we think, His affinities rather lay with the Essenes. Gradually their criticism became opposition. This opposition grew in intensity as He disregarded their interpretations of the Sabboth law, ridiculed their refinements of the law of tithes and the distinctions they introduced into the validity of oaths, and denounced their insincere posing. At first there seems to have been an effort to cajole Him into compliance with their schemes of the Pharisee temple. But He used language which would compromise Him with the people or with the Rom authorities, others invited Him to their tables, which was going far upon the part of a Pharisee toward one not a habber. Even when He hung on the cross, the taunt with which they greeted Him may have had something of longing, lingering hope in it: "If He be the King of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him" (Mt. 27:42 AV). If He would only give them that sign, then they would acknowledge Him to be the Messiah. The opposition of the Pharisees to Jesus was intensified by another reason. They were the democratic party; their whole power lay in the reputation they had with the people for piety. Our Lord denounced them as hypocrites; moreover He had secured a deeper popularity than theirs. At length when calamity failed to win Him and sustained questioning failed to destroy His popularity, they combined with their co-religionists, the Sadducees, against Him as against a common enemy. On the other hand, Jesus denounced the Pharisees more than He denounced any other class of the people. This seems strange when we remember that the majority of the religious people, those who looked for the Messiah, belonged to the Pharisees, and His teaching and theirs had a strong external resemblance. It was this external resemblance, united as it was with a profound spiritual difference, which made it incumbent on Jesus to mark Himself off from them. All righteousness with them was external, it lay in meats and drinks and divers washings, in tithing of light, anise and cummin. He placed religion in a different footing, removed it into another region. With Him it was the heart that must be right with God, not merely the external actions; not only the outside of the cup and platter was to be cleansed, but the inside first of all. If that is observed above, the Pharisees were less antagonistic to the apostles when their Lord had left them. The after-history of Pharisaism has justified Our Lord's condemnation.


Arts. in Encyl. Bib., Lex., etc.: Erath and Gruber, Altp. Rede (Dahiel); Winer, Realwörterbuch, Herzog, RB, ed 1 (Reuss), ed 3, 3 (siefert); Hamburger, Rev., 14:36; Sünden, S, of their weight and formatousness; it commands an avoidance of ostentation which involves equal "posing."

PHAROH, far'-rosh (חַנַע, parash). See PARISH.

PHARPAR, far'par ( País, parpar; LXX, Παρπαρ, Παρπαρά, Φαρπαρά, Pharparás): A river of Damascus, mentioned in 2 K 5 12, along with the Abana or Amman. See ABANA.

PHAZZERES, fá'-zí'árž (ףזאֶרֶס, ha-par'th). See PEREZ.

PHASEAH, fás'-e-á (פַּשֵּׁה, păshēh, "lame"): (1) A descendant of Judah, son of Eshton (1 Ch 4 12). (2) Name of a family of Nethinim (Ezr 2 49; Neh 7 51 AV "Phaseah"); "Phineo" of 1 Esd 5 31 RV). (3) Father of Joia (AV "Jeohazza"); the reparer of the "old gate" in Jerus (Neh 3 6).

PHASELIS, fás'-él-lis (פַּסְלִיס, Phaselis): A city of Lycia in Southern Asia Minor, on the seacoast, near the boundary of Pamphylia, to which country some ancient writers have assigned it. Situated on the extreme end of a promontory which projects into the sea, and with high mountains in the rear, it was separated both politically and geographically from the rest of Lycia. Hence it may be understood how it early became the favorite haunt of pirates already in the 6th cent. BC, when trade was carried on with Egypt, the city struck coins of its own; upon them the prow and the stern of a war galley were commonly represented. The coinage ceased in 466 BC, but it was resumed about 400 BC, when the city again became politically independant. For a time Phaselis was under the control of the Seleucid kings of Syria, but in 190 BC it again regained its independence or continued as a member of the league of Lycian cities (1 Mac 15 23). Before the beginning of the Christian era it had lost considerable of its earlier importance, yet it was still famed for its temple of Athene in which it was said that the sword of Achilles was preserved, and also for the altar of Zeus which was preserved. It figures little in early Christian history, yet in Byzantine times it was the residence of a bishop. Its site, now marked by the ruins of the stadium, temples and theater, bears the Turkish name of Tekir Ova. See also LYCIA.

B. J. BANKS

PHASIRON, fas'-ér'on (A, Φασίρων, Phasíron, B, Φασίρων, Phasíron, V, Φασιρών, Phasíron): The name of an unknown Arab tribe whom Jonathan overcame in the wilderness near Bethshan or possibly the name of an Arab chief (1 Mac 9 66).

PHASSARON, fas'-a-rón: AV = RV PHASSARUS (q.v.).

PHASSARUS, fás'-ár'-ús (Φασσαρος, Phassaros, B, Φασσάρος, Φασσάρος; AV Phassaros,
after Aldine): The name of one of the families which went up from exile with Jerubbael (1 Esd 5 25) = "Pashhur" of Ezr 2 38; Neh 7 41; according to Ezr and Neh and RV numbering, 1,247; according to AV following A, 1,047.

PHOEBE, feh'bey (Φοίβη, Phoibē). See PHEBE.

PHENCE, feh'nis'kē. See PHENICIA; PHOENIX.

PHENICIA, feh'ni-shē'kā (Φοινικία, Phoinikiā). See PHENICIA.

PHERESITES, fer'es-itēz (Phēresītes). See PHERES.

PHEREZITES, fer'e-zītēz (Phērezītes). AV = RV "Pherezites" (1 Esd 8 69; 2 Esd 1 21) = "Perizite." See PHEREZ.

PHILARCHES, fi-lär'kēz. See PHILARCHES.

PHILEMON, fi-lē'mon, fī-lē'mun (Φίλιμων, Philēmōn): Among the converts of St. Paul, perhaps while at Ephesus, was one whom he calls a "follower-worker," Philémon (Phil. ver 1). He was probably a man of some means, was celebrated for his hospitality (vs 5–7) and of considerable importance in the eccliesia at Colossae. It was at this house (ver 2) that the Colossian Christians met as a center. It is more than probable that this was a group of the Colossian church rather than the entire eccliesia. His wife was named Apphia (ver 2); and Archippus (ver 2) was no doubt his son. From Col 4 17 we learn that Archippus held an office of some importance in Colossae, whether he was a presbyter (Abbott, ICC), or an evangelist, or perhaps the reader (Zahn), we cannot tell. He is called here (ver 2) St. Paul's "follower-soldier." The relation between the Colossians and Philémon was so close and intimate that St. Paul does not hesitate to press him, on the basis of it, to forgive his slave, Onesimus, for stealing and for running away. See PHILEMON, EPISTLE TO.

PHILADELPHIA, fi-lad'el-fē'ā (Φιλαδέλφια, Philadelphía): A city of ancient Lydia in Asia Minor. It is on the modern city of Bergama which is 205 miles from Smyrna. It stood upon a terrace 650 ft. above the sea. Behind it are the volcanic cliffs to which the Turks have given the name of Devitt, or "inkwelle"; on the other side of the city the land is exceedingly fertile, and there was produced a wine of whose excellence the celebrated Rom poet Vergil wrote. Philadelphia is not so ancient as many of the other cities of Asia Minor, for it was founded after 189 BC on one of the highways which led to the interior. Its name was given to it in honor of Attalus II, because of his loyalty to his elder brother, Eumenes II, king of Lydia. Still another name of the city was Decapolis, because it was considered as one of the ten cities of the plain. A third name which it bore during the 1st cent. AD was Neo-kaisaria; it appears upon the coins struck during that period. During the reign of Vespasian, it was called Flavia. Its modern name, Alā-ṣhehīr, is considered by some to be a corruption of the Turkish words Alâ-ṣhehîr, "the city of God," but more likely it is a name given it from the reddish color of the soil. In addition to all of these names it sometimes bore the title of "Little Athens" because of the magnificence of the temples and other public buildings which adorned it. Philadelphia quickly became an important and wealthy trade center, for as the coast cities declined, it grew in power, and retained its importance even until late Byzantine times. One of the Seven Churches of the Book of Rev was there, and it was the see of a bishop. As in most Asia Minor cities, many Jews lived there, and they possessed a synagogue. During the reign of Tiberius the city was destroyed by an earthquake, yet it was quickly rebuilt. Frederick Barbarossa entered it while on his crusade in 1190. Twice, in 1036 and 1024, it was besieged by the Seljuk Turks, but it retained its independence until after 1390, when it was captured by the combined forces of the Turks and Byzantines. In 1403 Tamerlane captured it, and it is said, built about it a wall of the corpses of its inmates. Alā-ṣhehīr is still a Christian town; one-fourth of its modern population is Greek, and a Gr bishop still makes his home there. One of the chief modern industries is a liquoring factory; in the fields about the city the natives dig for the roots. On the terrace upon which the ancient city stood, the ruins of the castle and the walls may still be seen, and among them is pointed out the foundation of the early church. The place may now best be reached by rail from Smyrna. E. J. Banks

PHILEMON, EPISTLE TO: This most beautiful of all St. Paul's Epp, and the most intensely human, is one of the so-called Captivity Epp. of which Eph, Col, and Phil are the others. Of these four Phil- epistles (q.v.) stand apart, and were written probably more properly after the other three. These are mutually interdependent, sent by the same bearer to churches of the same district, and under similar conditions. There is some diversity of opinion as to the place from which the apostle wrote the Epp. Certain scholars (Reuss, Schenkel, Weiss, Meyer) have urged Caesarea in opposition to the traditional place, Rome. The arguments advanced are first that Onesimus would have been more likely to have escaped to Caesarea than to Rome, as it is nearer Colossae than Rome is, to which we may reply that, though Caesarea is nearer, his chance of escape would have been far greater in the capital than in the provincial city. Again it is said that as Onesimus is not commended in Eph, he had already been left behind at Colossae; against which there are added the precarious value of an argument from silence, and the fact that this argument assumes a particular course which the bearers of the letters would follow, viz. through Colossae to Ephesus. A more forcible argument is that which is based on the apostle's expected visit. In Phil 2 24 we read that he expected to go to Macedonia and Asia, and in Phil 22 we find that he expected to go to Colossae. On the basis of this latter reference it is assumed that he was to the south of Colossae when writing and so at Caesarea. But it is quite possible that he would go to Colossae through Philippi as the reverse; and it is quite possible that even if he had intended...
to go direct to Colossae when he wrote to Philemon, events may have come about to cause him to change his plans. The last argument, based on the omission of any reference to the earthquake in Asia Minor by Tacitus (Ann. xiv.27) and Eusebius (Chron., 0., 207) write, is of force as opposed to the Rom origin of the letters only on the assumption that these writers both refer to the same event (by no means sure) and that this event, were written after that event, and that it was necessary that St. Paul should have mentioned it. If the early chronology be accepted it falls entirely, as Tacitus' earlier date would be after the epp. were written. In addition we have the further facts, favorable to Rome, that St. Paul had no such freedom in Caesarea as he is represented in these epp. as enjoying; that no mention is made of Philip who was in Caesarea, and a most important member of that community (Acts 21:8), and finally that there is no probability that so large a body of disciples and companions could have gathered about the apostle in his earlier and more strict imprisonment, at Caesarea. We may therefore conclude that the Captivity Epp. were written from Rome, and not from Caesarea.

The evidence for the epistle is less extensive than that of some of the other epp., but it is abundantly strong. The play on the word 2. Authenti- tude—Onesimus which St. Paul himself uses (Phil. ver 11) is found in Ignat., Eph. 3:1. This may not mean necessarily a literary connection, but it suggests this. The ep. is known to Tertullian, and through him we know that Marcion accepted it (Adv. Marc., v.21). It is in the list in the Muratorian Fragment (p. 106, l. 27), and is quoted by Origen as a genuine Paul (Comm. in Jo. 19) and placed by Eusebius (HE, III, xxv) among the acknowledged books.

It has twice been the object of attack. In the 4th and 5th cents., it was opposed as unworthy of St. Paul's mind and as of no value for edification. This attack was met successfully by Jerome (Comm. in Phil., praef.), Chrysostom (Argum. in Philen) and Theodore of Mopsuestia (Spicil. in Solenem, I. 199), and the ep. was finally established in its earlier firm position. The later attack by Baur was inspired by his desire to break down the corroboration of Philen to the other Captivity epp., and has been refuted by Weiss as one of Baur's worst blunders. The suggestions that it is interpolated (Holtzmann), or allegorical (Weiss) and non-historical, are refuted by the references of Philen (Ep. Io, 21) to Sabinus (Stock), are interesting examples of the vagaries of the authors, that arise only to be mentioned' (24). In its language, style and argument the letter is clearly Pauline.

The date will, as is the case with the other Captivity epp., depend on the chronology. If the earlier scheme be followed it may be dated about 58, if the later about 63, or 64.

The apostle writes in his own and Timothy's name to his friend Philemon (q.v.) in behalf of Onesimus, a runaway slave of the latter. Beginning with his usual thanksgiving, here awakened by the report of Philemon's hospitality, he intercedes for his 'son begotten in his bonds' (ver 10), Onesimus, who though he is Philemon's runaway slave "there is no respect between thee and me," that the apostle pleads, urging his own age, and friendship for Philemon, and his present bonds. He pleads, however, without belittling Onesimus' wrongdoing, but assuming himself the responsibility for the amount of his theft. The appeal is quietly refined, in what Philemon really owes him as his father in Christ, and begs that he will not disappoint him in his expectation. He closes with the suggestion that he hopes soon to visit him, and with greetings from his companions in Rome.

The charm and beauty of this ep. have been universally recognized. Its value to us as giving a glimpse of St. Paul's attitude toward slavery and his intimacy with a man like Philemon cannot be overestimated. One of the chief elements of value in it is the picture it gives us of a Christian home in the apostolic days; the father and mother well known for their hospitable, warm, the man of position and importance in the church, the need of him and his going of the Christian brethren, and the life of the brotherhood centering about this household.

LITERATURE.—Lightfoot, Col and Phil; Vincent, "Phil" and "Philem" (ICC), introduction, Hand Commentator; Alexander, in Spence's Comm.

CHARLES SMITH LEWIS

PHILETUS, fil'ī-tus, fil'i-tus (Φιλήτως, Filétos [2 Tim. 2:17]): This person is mentioned by Paul, who warns Timothy against him as well as against his associate in error, the Nature of Hymenaeus. The apostle speaks of his Error Hymenaeus and Philetus as instances of men who were doing most serious injury to the church by their teaching and by none of the things that teaching resulted in, both in faith and morals. The specific error of these men was that they denied that there would be any bodily resurrection. They treated all Scriptural references to such a state, as figurative or metaphorical. They spiritualized absolutely, and held that the resurrection was a thing of the past. No resurrection was possible, so they taught, except from ignorance, from sin to righteousness. There would be no day when the dead would hear the voice of Christ and come forth out of the grave. The Christian, knowing that Christ was raised from the dead, looked forward to the day when his body should be raised in the likeness of his resurrection. But this faith was utterly denounced by the teaching of Hymenaeus and Philetus.

2. How It Overthrew This teaching of theirs, Paul tells us, Faith had overthrown the faith of some. It would also overthrow Christian faith altogether, for if the dead are not raised, neither is Christ risen from the dead, and "ye are yet in your sins" (1 Cor 15:17).

The denial of the resurrection of the body, whether of mankind generally or of Christ, is the object of Paul's protest. He leads his hearers back to, no living Christ, who saves and leads and comforts His people. The apostle proceeds to say that teaching of this kind "eats as doth a gangrene," and that it increases unto more ungodliness. As a banker or gangrene eats away the flesh, so does such teaching eat away Christian faith. Paul is careful to say, more than once, that the teaching which denies that there will be a resurrection of the dead leads inevitably to "ungodliness" and to "iniquity." See Hymenaeus.

JOHN RUTHERFORD

PHILIP, fil'ip (Φίλιππος, Philippos, 'lover of horses');

(1) The father of Alexander the Great (1 Macc 1:1; 6:2), king of Macedonia in 359-336 BC. His influence for his son's place and power in hastening the decadence of the Gr. city-state and in the preparations he left to Alexander for the diffusion throughout the world of the varied phases of Gr. intellectual life.

(2) A Phrygian left to Antiochus Epiphanes as governor at Jesus (c 170 BC) and described in 2 Macc 6:22 as "more barbarous" than Antiochus himself, burning fugitive Jews who had assembled in caves near by "to keep the sabbath day secretly" (2 Macc 6:11) and taking special measures to check the opposition of Judas Macabeus (2 Macc 5:8). There is some ground for identifying him with...
(3) A friend or foster-brother of Antiochus (2 Macc 9:29), appointed by Antiochus on his deathbed as regent. Lyaeus already held the office of regent, having brought up Antiochus from his youth, and on the death of his father set him up as king under the name of Epator. The accounts of the rivalries of the regents and of the fate of Philip as recorded in 1 Macc 6:56; 2 Macc 9:29; Jos, Ant, XII, ix, 7, are not easily reconciled.

(4) Philip V, king of Macedonia in 220–179 BC. He is mentioned in 1 Macc 8:5 as an example of the great power of the Romans with whom Judas Maccabeus made a league on conditions described (op. cit.). The contact of Philip with the Romans coincided in time with that of Hannibal, after whose defeat at Zama the Romans were able to give undivided attention to the affairs of Macedonia. Philip was defeated by the Romans under Flaminius, at Cynoscephalae (197 BC), and compelled to accept the terms of the conquerors. He died in 179, and was succeeded by his son Perseus, last king of Macedonia, who lost his crown in his contest with the Romans. See Perseus.

J. Hutchison

PHILIP (Φιλίππος, Philippi): One of the Twelve Apostles. Philip belonged to Bethsaida of Galilee (Jn 1:44; 12:21). Along with Andrew and Philip, a fellow-townsmen, he had journeyed to Bethany to hear the teaching of John the Baptist, and there he received his first call from Christ, “Follow me” (Jn 1:43). Like Andrew, Philip immediately won a fresh follower, Nathanael, for Jesus (Jn 1:45). It is probable that he was the author of the apocryphal story of Philip’s journey into Egypt, which may be based on genuine records of Philip’s preaching in Ethiopia. Philip was the first of the Apostles to be martyred (Acts 8:1). He is described as having a “nimble wit” (cf. Budge, Contendings of the Apostles, II, 50). Clement of Alexandria (Strm., iii.4, 25, and iv.9, 73) gives the tradition that Philip was a Levite, and the traditions of the church respectively by the use of the title of “The Preaching of St. Philip and St. Peter” (cf. Budge, Contendings of the Apostles, II, 140), Phrygia was assigned to Philip. Both Philip and Andrew appeared to the disciples on the Mount of Olives, and “The Martyrdom of St. Philip in Phrygia” (Jn 12:23–33). See Apocryphal Gospels.

As with Andrew, Philip’s Gr name implies he had Gr connections, and this is strengthened by the fact that he acted as the spokesman of the Greeks at the Passover. Of a weaker acter mold than Andrew, he was yet the first to whom the risen Christ first appeared; he himself possessed an inquirer’s spirit and could therefore sympathize with their doubts and difficulties. The practical, strong-minded Andrew was naturally the man to win the impetuous, swift-thinking Peter, but the slow-moving Philip, versed in the Scriptures (cf. Jn 1:45), appealed more to the critical Nathanael and the cultured Greeks. Caution and deliberate himself, and desirous of admitting all truth to the test of sensuous experience (cf. Jn 6:68), he concluded the same criterion would be acceptable to Nathanael also (cf. Jn 1:45). It was the presence of this materialistic trend of mind in Philip that induced Jesus, in order to awaken in His disciple a larger and more spiritual faith, to put the question in Jn 6:69, seeking “to prove him.” This innate interest in the religious beliefs found expression in his outer life and conduct also. It was not merely modesty, but also a certain lack of self-reliance, that made him turn to Andrew for advice when the Greeks wished to see Jesus. The statement of his later life is, however, sufficient to show that he overcame those initial defects in his character, and fulfilled nobly the charge that his risen Lord laid upon him (cf. Mt 28:16–20).

C. M. Kerr

PHILIP, THE EVANGELIST: One of “the seven” chosen to have the oversight of “the daily ministration” of the poor of the Christian community in Jerusalem (Acts 6:5). Whether Philip, bearing a Gr name, was a Hellenist, is not known, but his missionary work reveals to us one free from the religious prejudices of the strict Hebrew.

The martyrdom of Stephen was the beginning of a systematic persecution of the church in Jerusalem, and all except the apostles were scattered throughout Judaea and Samaria (Acts 8:1), and even as far as Phoenicia, Cyprus and Antioch (11:19). Thus the influence of the new teaching was extended, and a beginning made to the missionary movement. The story of Philip’s missionary labors is told in Acts 8:5 ff. He went to the chief city of Samaria, called Sebaste in honor of Augustus (Gr Sebastos). The Samaritans, of mixed Israelitish and gentile blood, had, in consequence of their being rigidly excluded from the Jewish church since the return from exile, built on Mt. Gerizim a rival sanctuary to the temple. To them Philip proclaimed the Christ and wrought signs, with the result that multitudes gave heed, and “were baptized, both men and women.” They had been under the influence of a certain Simon, who himself also believed and was baptized, moved, as the sequel proved, by the desire to learn the secret of Philip’s ability to perform miracles (see Simon Magus). The apostles (Acts 8:14) at Jerusalem informed Philip of the work Simon was doing at Samaria, and Philip was sent to help him. Philip met Simon at Lystra, and through his zeal in the work of the apostles, Philip was to encounter the evil spirit which had been turned from the church by sending Peter and John, who not only confirmed the work of Philip, but also themselves preached in many Samaritan villages.

The next incident recorded is the conversion of a gentleman who was, however, a worshipper of the God of Israel, a eunuch under Candace, queen of the Ethiopians. As he was returning from wor-
shipping in the temple at Jerus, he was met by Philip on the road to Gaza. Philip expounded to him that portion of Isa 53 which he had been reading aloud as he sat in the cariot, and preached unto him Jesus. It is another sign of Philip's insight into the universality of Christianity that he baptized this eunuch who could not have been admitted into full membership in the Jewish church (Dt 23 1). See PERSIAN EUNUCH.

After this incident Philip went to Azotus (Ashdod), and then traveled north to Caesarea, preaching in the cities on his way. There he settled, for Luke records that Paul and his company abode in the house of Philip, "the evangelist," "one of the seven," for some days (Acts 21 8 ff.). This occurred more than 20 years after the incidents recorded in Acts 8. Both at this time and during Paul's imprisonment at Caesarea, Luke had the opportunity of hearing about Philip's work from his own lips. Luke records that Philip had 4 daughters who were preachers (Acts 21 9).

The Jewish rebellion, which finally resulted in the fall of Jerus, drove many Christians out of Pal, and among them Philip and his daughters. One tradition connects Philip and his daughters with Thessalonica in Asia, but in all probability the evangelist is confounded with the apostle. Another tradition represents them as dwelling at Tralles, Philip being the first bishop of the Christian community.

S. F. HUNTER

PHILIP, THE GOSPEL OF. See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS; PHILIP THE EVANGELIST.

PHILIPPI, φιλιππη (Philippus, Philip, ethnic Φιλιππικος, Philippikos, Phil 4 15): A city of Macedonia, situated in 41° 5' N.

1. Position. Int. at. and Name. Egnatian Road, 33 Rom miles from Amphipolis and 21 from Acontismus, in a plain bounded on the E. and N. by the mountains which lie between the rivers Zygaetes and Nestus, on the W. by Mt. Pangaeus, on the S. by the ridge called in antiquity Symbolum, over which ran the road connecting the city with its seaport, Neapolis (q.v.), 9 miles distant. This plain, a considerable part of which is marshy in modern, as in ancient, times, is connected with the basin of the Strymon by the valley of the Angites (Herodotus vii.113), which also bore the names Gangas or Ganges (Appian, Bell. Rhet. of Macedonians,ivi.105), and on the northern side, Anghista. The ancient name of Philip was Crenides (Strabo vii.331; Diodorus xvi.3, 8; Appian, Bell. Civ. iv.105; Stephanus Byz. s.v.), so called after the springs which feed the river and the marsh; but it was refounded by Philip II of Macedon, the father of Alexander the Great, and received his name.

Appian (Bell. Civ. iv.105) and Harpocration say that Crenides was afterward called Daton, and that this name was changed to Philippoi, but this statement is open to question, since Daton, which became proverbial among the Greeks for good fortune, possessed, as Strabo tells us (vii.331 fr. 36), "admirably fertile territory, a lake, rivers, dockyards and productive gardens." But it is not far from Neapolis, as we have seen, only 9 miles inland. Many modern authorities, therefore, have placed Daton on the coast at or near the site of Neapolis. On the whole, it seems best to adopt the view of Hezezey (Mission archologique, 39, 62 ff.) that Philip founded Philippoi, and not Philipades, as has been supposed, which is a city, on the whole district which lay immediately to the E. of Mt. Pangaeus, including the Philippian plain and the seacoast about Neapolis. On the site of the old foundation of Crenides, from which the Or settler has perhaps been driven out by the Thracians about a century previously, the Thasians in 369 BC founded their colony of Daton with the aid of the exiled Athenian statesmen Callistratus, in order to exploit the wealth, both agricultural and mineral, of the beginnings (Acts of Philip's ascension the Macedonian throne in 359 BC, the possession of this spot seemed of the utmost importance. Not only is the plain itself well watered and of extraordinary fertility, but a strongly fortified post planted here would secure the natural land-route from Europe to Asia and protect the eastern frontier of Macedonia against Thracian intruders. Above all, the mines of the district might meet his most pressing need, that of an abundant supply of gold. The city was therefore seized in 358, the city was enlarged, strongly fortified, and renamed, the Thasian settlers either driven out or reinforced, and the mines, worked with characteristic energy, produced over 1,000 talents a year (Diodorus xvi.8) and enabled Philip to issue a gold coin (thundering) worth over 5 specie in the West and 10 in the East. The coin, now called Philip's darics (G. F. Hill, Historical Greek Coins, 80 ff). The revenue thus obtained was of inestimable value to Philip, who not only used it for the development of the Macedonian army, but also proved himself a master of the art of bribery. His reputation was such that he was known that no fortress was impregnable to whose walls an ass laden with gold could be driven. Of the history of Philip during the next 3 centuries we know practically nothing. Together with the rest of Macedonia, it passed into the Roman hand after the battle of Pydna (168 BC), and fell in the first of the four regions into which the country was then divided (Livy xlv.29). In 146 the whole of Macedonia was formed into a single Roman province. But the mines seem to have been almost, if not quite, exhausted by this time, and Strabo (viii.331 fr. 41) speaks of Philip as having sunk by the time of Caesar to a "small settlement" (καρυαλ αμφι, κατακλιθα αμφι). In the autumn of 42 BC it witnessed the death-struggle of the Rom republic. Brutus and Cassius, the leaders of the band of conspirators who had assassinated Julius Caesar, were faced by Octavian, who 15 years later became the Emperor Augustus, and Antony. In the first engagement the forces of Brutus and Cassius were defeated by Octavian, while Antony's forces were victorious over those of Cassius, who in despair put an end to his life. Three weeks later the second and decisive conflict took place. Brutus was compelled by his impatient soldiery to give battle, his troops were routed and he himself fell on his own sword. Soon afterward Philip was made a Rom colony with the title Colonia Iulia Philippensis. After the battle of Actium (31 BC) the colony was reinforced, largely by Ital parishers who were dispatched in order to afford allotments for Octavian's veterans (Dio Cassius li.4), and its name was changed to Colonia Augusta Iulia (Vitriz) Philippensium. It received the much-coveted ius Italicum (Digest L. 15, 8, 8), which involved numerous privileges, the chief of which was the immunity of its territory from taxation. In the course of his second missionary journey Paul set sail from Troas, accompanied by Silas (who bears his full name Silvanus in 3. Paul's Letters, 1 Thess 1 1; 2 Thess First Visit 1 1), Timothy and Luke, and on the following day reached Neapolis (Acts 16 11). Thence he journeyed by road to Philippi, first crossing the pass some 1,600 ft. high, which leads over the mountain ridge called Symbolum and afterward traversing the Philippian plain. Of his experiences there we have in Acts 16 12-40 a
singly full and graphic account. On the Sabbath, presumably the first Sabbath after their arrival, the apostle and his companions went out to the bank of the Agiotes, and there spoke to the women, some of the philosophers, who had come together for purposes of worship.

One of these was named Lydia, a Gr proselyte from Thyatira, a city of Lydia in Asia Minor, to the church of which she had added the anonymous message recorded in Acts 16:14-15. She is described as a "seller of purple." (Acts 16:14), that is, of woven fabrics dyed purple, for the manufacture of which her native city was famous. Whether she was the agent in Philippi of some firm in Thyatira or whether she was carrying on her trade independently, we cannot say: her name suggests the possibility that she was a freedwoman, while from the fact that we hear of her household and her house (ver. 15; vs 40), though no mention is made of her husband, it has been conjectured that she was a widow of some property. She accepted the apostolic message and was baptized with her household (ver. 15), and insisted that Paul and his companions should accept her hospitality during the rest of their stay in the city (see further Lydia).

All seemed to be going well when opposition arose from an unexpected quarter. There was in the town a girl, in all probability a slave, who was reputed to have the power of oucing oracles. Her inscriptions (vill. 111) of an arch of Dionysus situated among the Thracian tribe of the Satræ, probably not far from Philippi; but there is no reason to connect the soothsaying of this girl with that worship. In any case, her masters repaid a rich fee for the service by accusing the apostle Paul, troubled by her repeatedly following him and those with him crying, "These men are bond-servants of the most High God, who proclaim unto you a way of salvation." (Acts 16:17 m), turned and commanded the spirit in Christ's name to come out of her. The immediate restoration of the girl to a sane and normal condition convinced her masters that all prospect of further gain was gone, and they therefore seized Paul and Silas and dragged them into the forum before the magistrates, probably the Δουάνιοι who stood at the head of the colony. They accused the apostles of creating disturbance in the city and of advocating customs, the reception and practice of which were illegal for Rom citizens. The rabble of the market-place joined in the attack (ver. 22), whereupon the magistrates, accepting without question the accusers' statement that Paul and Silas were Jews (ver 20) and forgetting or ignoring the possibility of their possessing Rom citizenship, thereupon threatened Paul and Silas, the attendants licenti and afterward to be imprisoned. In the prison they were treated with the utmost rigor; they were confined in the innermost ward, and their feet put in the stocks. About midnight, as they were engaged in praying and singing hymns, while the other prisoners were listening to them, the building was shaken by a severe earthquake which threw open the prison doors. The jailer, who was on the point of taking his own life, reassured by Paul reassuring the slave girl by her attentions, but Silas into his house where he tended their wounds, set food before them, and, after hearing the gospel, was baptized together with his whole household (vs 23-34).

On the morrow the magistrates, thinking that by dismissing from the town those who had been the cause of the previous day's disturbance they could best secure themselves against any repetition of the disorder, sent the licenti to the jailer with orders to release them. Paul refused to accept a dismissal of that kind, and the slave-girl whom he had illegally exempt from scourging, which was regarded as a degradation (1 Thess. 2:2), and the wrong was aggravated by the publicity of the punishment, the absence of a proper trial, and the imprisonment which followed. (Acts 16:17). Delivered from prison Paul declared his citizenship when the scourging was inflicted, but in the confusion and excitement of the moment his protest had been unheard or unheeded. Now, however, it produced a deep impression on the magistrates, who came in person to ask Paul and Silas to leave the city, and give their hosts and encouraging the convets to remain firm in their new faith, set out by the Egnatian Road for Thessalonica (vs 38-40). How long they had stayed in Philippi we are not told, but the fact that the foundations of a church had been laid and the phrase "for many days" (ver 18) lead us to believe that the time must have been a longer one than appears at first sight.

Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveller, 226) thinks that Paul left Thessalonica in October, 50 AD, and stayed at Philippi until nearly the end of the year; but this chronology cannot be regarded as certain.

Several points in the narrative of these incidents call for fuller consideration. (1) We may notice, first, the very small part played by Jews and Judaism at Philippi.

There was no synagogue here, as at Salamine in Cyprus (Acts 13:5), Antioch in Pisidia (13:14, 43), Iconium (14:1), Ephesus (18:19, 20), and Athens (17:10). Athens (17:14), Corinth (18:4). The number of resident Jews was small, their meetings for prayer or discussion on the religious basis, the synagogues were mostly or wholly women (16, 13), and among them some, perhaps a majority, were proselytes. Of Jewish converts we hear nothing, nor is there any word of Jews as either inscribing or joining the mob which draged Paul and Silas to the market-place (Acts 16:27-29). The whole tone of the ep. to this church seems to prove that it at least early, if not at first, teaching was not being undermined by Jews. True, there is one passage (Phil 3:2-7) in which Paul denounces "the conclusion." Those who had confidence in the flesh did not hesitate, but it seems "that in this warning he was thinking of Romans more than of Philippi; and that his indignation was aroused by the vexation which they must have to have a man of that age and standing as a public preacher." Thereafter he confided at his daily work, than by any actual errors already determined the faith of his distant converts (2:6).

(2) Even more striking is the prominence of the Rom element in the narrative. We are here not in a Gr or Jewish city, but in one of those Rom colonies which Athenius Geisslen describes as "miniatures and pictures of the Rom people" (Notices Atticorum, xvi. 15).

In the center of the city is the forum (βασιλικά, φόρους, ευρήκα), a well-ordered and regular polis form, with the usual evényn, the exarch of the city of the provinces (Acts 26:32), and the magistrates, EX "magistrates," ev 20. 22.5:36.38; these officers are attended by lictors (σεργιάκοι, τουρχές, χεριόν), EV "sergents," who bear the fasces with which they scourged Paul and Silas (Acts 16:22, 28), regarded as that are of the public order (Acts 26:32), and the magistrates are represented as Rom law (vs 20, 21), and Paul's appeal to his Rom status (ver 23), are once inspired by the fear for the consequences of their action and made them conciliatory and apologetic (vs 33, 39). The title of praetor borne by these officials has caused some difficulty. The supreme magistrates of Rom colonies, two in number, were called Δουάνιοι or Δουάνειοι (just doers), and that this title was in use at Philippi is proved by three inscriptions (Orelli, No. 3784, Heuzey, Mission archéologique, 13, 137). The most probable explanation of the discrepancy is that these magistrates assumed the title of praetor, or that it was commonly applied to them, as was certainly the case in some parts of the Rom world (Cicero: De leg. agraria xii.34; Horace: Sat. i. 5, 34; Orelli, No. 3595).

(3) Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveller, 200 ff) has brought forward the attractive suggestion that Luke was himself a Philippian, and that he was the "man of Macedonia" who appeared to Paul at Troas with the invitation to enter Macedonia (Acts 16 9).

In any case, the change from the 3d to the 1st person in ver 10 marks the point at which Luke starts to speak for the apostle, and the same criterion leads to the conclusion that Luke remained in Thessalonica with Paul's Farr and his third visit to the city (see below). Ramsay's hypothesis would explain (a) the fulness and vividness of the narrative (Acts 16 1), and (b) the emphasis on the importance of Philippi (ver 12); and (c) the fact that Paul remembered as a Macedonian the man whom he saw in his vision, although there is no mention in the language, features or dress of Macedonians to mark them out from other Greeks. Yet Luke was clearly not
a householder at Philippi (ver 15), and early tradition refers to him as an Antiochene (see, however, Ramsay, op. cit. 300 f.).

(4) Much discussion has centered round the de-
scription of Philippi given in Acts 16 12. The reading of 
N A C etc. (K, F, Ry, etc.) is:

στήσας μεταφέρειν τὸ μέτωπον Μακεδονίας πάλιν ἔκθειν. Μᾶς ēν αὐτῷ τῆς μεταφέρει τὸ μέτωπον Μακεδονίας πάλιν ἔκθειν. But it is doubtful whether Macedonia is to be taken with the word which precedes or with that which follows, and further the sense derived from the phrase is unsatis-
factory. Further, Paul must mean either (1) first in political importance and radiating from Philippi which was the nearest the capital of the province was reached. But the capital of the province was Thessa-
lonica, and the fact that to reach that city it was the easiest route and the most direct one to the capital, although the word here is not used, is not at all unusual. The word is used in Luke 14 22; but it is not used in Acts 21 28, where Paul went to Rome, but was not released to go to Macedonia, by the emperor, until after the completion of the work at Ephesus.

5. Later Visits to Philippi. Luke has not overtaken the story of the second visit to Philippi, although it is mentioned as having taken place in Acts 16 10. The second visit appears to have been for a much longer time, and it was after this visit that Paul ordained the deacons and deacons' assistants in Philippi (Acts 16 4). The second visit of Paul to Philippi is described in Acts 20 5, where Paul visits the city, and the report that the city was founded by Philip the tetrarch is mentioned (cf. Antiochene History of Macedonia, II, 1 ff. Perrot, "Les ruines de Philibodjik, but the site is now uninhabited, the nearest village being that of Rakhtcha in the hills immediately to the N. of the ancient Acropolis. This latter and the Acropolis have been explored seriously and systematically excavated has yet been undertaken. Of the extent remains the most striking are portions of the Helenic and Hellenistic fortification, the scanty vestiges of the theater, the ruin known among the Turks as Derekale, "the columns," which perhaps represents the ancient thermae, traces of a temple of Silvanus with numerous rock-cut reliefs and inscriptions, and the remains of a triumphal arch (Kiemer).

PHI粱PIANS, fl-lip'i-anz, THE EPISTLE TO:

I. PAUL AND THE CHURCH AT PHILIPPI

II. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CHURCH AT PHILIPPI

III. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EPISTLE

1. A Letter
2. A Letter of Love
3. A Letter of Joy

IV. GENUINNESS OF THE EPISTLE

V. PLACE, DATE AND OCCASION OF WRITING

VI. CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE

LITERATURE

I. Paul and the Church at Philippi.—Paul was on his second missionary journey in the year 52 AD. He felt that he felt Philippi naturally included in many of his plans. He had had a particular distaste for a certain city in Galatia. The Spirit would not permit him to preach in Asia, and when he essayed to enter Bithynia the Spirit again would not suffer it. Baffled and perplexed, the apostle with his two companions, Silas and Timothy, went on to the seacoast and stopped in Troas. Here at last his leading became clear. A vision of a man from Macedonia convinced him that it was the will of God that he should preach in the western continent of Europe. The way was opened for him, and in Macedonia the Macedonians became Paul's favorite people. In two days he came to Neapolis. At once he took the broad paved way of the Via Egnatia up to the mountain pass and down on the other side to Philippi, a journey of some 8 miles. There was no uncertainty in his mind as to the reception of his teaching, for the peripatetic Jewish sect, with little company of Jews gathered for Sabbath worship at “a place of prayer” (προσευχή, proseuchē, Acts 16:13), about a mile to the W. of the city gate on the shore of the river Gangites (see Προσευχή). Paul and his companions came to the women gathered there, and Lydia was converted. Later, a maid with the spirit of divination was exercised. Paul and Silas were scourged and thrown into prison, an earthquake set them free, the jailer became a believer, the magistrates repented their treatment of men who were Rom citizens and besought them to leave the city (Acts 16:6-40). Paul had had his first experience of a Rom scourging and of lying in the stocks of a Roman prison at Philippi, yet he went on his way rejoicing, for a company of disciples had been formed, and he had won the devotion of loyal and loving hearts for himself and his Master (see PHILIPPI). That was worth all the persecution and the pain. The Christians at Philippi seem to have been Paul's favorites among all his converts. He never lost any opportunity of visiting them and refreshing his spirit with their presence in the after-years. Six years later he was resident in Ephesus, and he wrote to Corinth with a letter to the Corinthians and being in doubt as to the spirit in which it would be received, he appointed a meeting with Titus in Macedonia, and probably spent the anxious days of his waiting at Philippi. If he met Titus there, he may have written 2 Cor in that city (2 Cor 2:13; 7:6). Paul returned to Ephesus, and after the riot in that city he went over again into Macedonia and made his third visit to Philippi. He probably promised the Philippians at this time that he would return to Philippi to celebrate the Easter week with his beloved converts there. He went on into Greece, but in 3 months he was back again, at the festival of the resurrection in the year 58 AD (Acts 20:2.6). We read in 1 Tim. 1:3 that Paul visited Macedonia after the Rom imprisonment. He enjoyed himself among the Philippians. They were Christians after his own heart. He thanks God for their fellowship from the first day until now (Phil 1:3). He declares that they are his beloved who have always obeyed, not in his presence only, but also in his absence (2 Tim. 1:5). With fond repetition he addresses them as his brethren, beloved and longed for, his joy and crown, his beloved (4:1). This was Paul's favorite church, and we can gather from the ep. good reason for this fact.

II. Characteristics of the Church at Philippi.—(1) It seems to be the least Jewish of all the Pauline churches. There were few Jews in Philippi. No Heb names are found in the list of converts in this church mentioned in the NT. The Jewish opponents of Paul seem never to have established themselves in the community. (2) Women seem to be unusually prominent in the history of this church, and this is consistent with what we know concerning the position accorded to woman in Macedonian society. Lydia brings her whole family to Christ, and her husband, who was very influential woman, and her own fervor and devotion and generosity and hospitality seem to have been contagious and to have become characteristic of the whole Christian community. Euodia and Syntyche are mentioned in the ep. two women to have fellow-laborers with Paul in the gospel, for both of whom he has great respect, of both of whom he is sure that their names are written in the book of life, but who seem to have differed with each other in some matter of doctrine or practice. The women of the same mind in the Lord (4:2). The prominence of women in the congregation at Philippi or the dominance of Lydia's influence among them may account for the fact that they seem to have been the more minded to produce their converts. Of the other converts were. They raised money for Paul's support and forwarded it to him again and again. They were anxious that he should have all that was needful. They were willing to give of their time and their means to the Lord and His work. There have been no theological differences in their company. That may testify to the fact that the most of them were women. (3) There were splendid men in the church membership too. Some of them were Macedonians and some of them were Rom veterans.

Hausrath declares that the Macedonians represented the "nobiest and soundest part of the ancient world. . . . Here was none of the shuffling and the indecision of the Aristocrats, none of the impertinent levity of the Gr communities. . . . They were men of sternness and purity, which could be found in Asia Minor or languorous Syria. The material was harder to work in, and offered more stubborn resistance; but the work, once done, endured. A new Macedonian phalanx was formed here, a phalanx of Pauline Christians. . . . Paulines, as Athesians, lost themselves in the national ideal, whereas others, who felt the gravita- tion of history, were equally reforming and active characteristics of the history of the Christian church. . . . They were always true to Paul, always obedient, always helpful" (Time of the Apostles, III, 205-4).
sacrifice and service of their faith (2:17). He calls Epaphroditus not only his fellow-worker but his fellow-soldier (2:25). He likens the Christian life to a race in which that one is the third and the other a more.close runner (3:14). He asks the Philippians to keep even, solidly step by step in the Christian walk (3:16). These metaphors have a wide applicability to the athletic and military race in which they bear their testimony to the high regard which Paul had for them. Christianity and other sects in which they live were compared. We do not know the names of many of these men, for only Clement and Epaphroditus are mentioned, but we gather that each conceives of their spirit from this ep. and we are as sure as Paul himself that their names are all written in the book of life (4:3).

(1) If the constituent elements of the church at Philippi fairly represented the various elements of the population of the city, they must have been cosmopolitan in character. Philippi was an old Macedonian city which had been turned into a Rom. colony. It was both Gr and Rom. in its characteristics. Christianity had been introduced here by two Jews, who were Rom. citizens, and a Jewish son of a gentle father. In the account given of the founding of the church in Acts 16 three converts are mentioned as influential in this religion—one is a Jewish proselyte from Tyre, one a native Greek, and one a Rom. official. The later converts doubtless represented the same diversity of nationality and the same differences in social position. Yet, apart from those two good women, Eunice and Syntyche, there were all of our mind in the Lord. It is a remarkable proof of the fact that in Christ all racial and social conditions may be brought into harmony and made to live together in peace. (5) They were a very liberal people and devoted themselves to the Lord and to Paul (2 Cor 8:5), and whenever they could help Paul or further the work of the gospel they gave gladly and willingly and up to the limit of their resources, and then they hypothecated their credit and gave beyond their power (2 Cor 8:5). Every time Paul was astonished at their giving. He declares that they gave out of much affliction and deep poverty, that they abounded in their bounty, and that they were rich only in their liberty (2 Cor 8:2).

Sured these are unusual encomiums. The Philippians must have been a very unusual people. If the depth of one's consecration and the reality of one's religion are to be measured by the extent to which it affects the position of one’s material possessions, if one measure of Christian character is in Christ’s Church, then the Philippians may well stand supreme among the saints in the Pauline churches. Paul seems to have loved them, cared for them, and followed them, and contributed toward his support. Elsewhere he refused and held back, but here he immediately and unstintingly responded to his plea of self-support while he was preaching the gospel. He made the single exception in the case of the Philippians. He must have been sure of their affection and of their confidence. Four times they gave Paul pecuniary aid. Twice they sent him their contributions just after he had left them and gone on to Thessalonica (4:15-16). When Paul had proceeded to Corinth and was in want during his ministry there his heart was gladdened by the visitation of brethren from Philippi, who supplied the measure of his want (2 Cor 11:8,9). It was not a first enthusiasm forgotten as soon as the engendering personality of the apostle was removed from their sight. It was genuine attachment that prompted their gifts. They gave to their own dear apostle, but only that he might minister to others as he had ministered to them. He was their living link with the work in the mission field.

Eleven years passed by, and the Philippians heard that Paul was in prison at Rome and again in need of their help. Eleven years are enough to make quite radical changes in a church membership, but these Philippians were not—wordly spirit or the liberty of the Philippian church in that time. The Philippians hastened to send Epaphroditus to Rome with their contributions and their greetings. It was like a bouquet of fresh flowers in the prison cell. Paul writes this ep. to thank them that their thought for him had blossomed afresh at the first opportunity they had had (4:10). No wonder that Paul loved them and was proud of them and made their earnestness and sincerity and affection the subject of comparison with the love of others (2 Cor 8:8).

III. Characteristics of the Epistle.—It is a letter. It is not a treatise, as Rom, He, and 1 Jn are. It is not an encyclical full of general observations and exhortations capable of application at any time and anywhere, as the Ep. to the Eph. and the Ep. of James and the Ep. of Peter are. It is a simple letter to personal friends. It has no theological discussions and no rigid outline and no formal plan. It rambles along just as any real letter would with personal news and personal feelings and outbursts of personal affection between tried friends. It is the most spontaneous and unaffected of the Pauline Ep. It is often epistolary than any of the others addressed to the churches.

It is a letter of love. All of the other ep. have mixed feelings manifest in them. Sometimes a feeling of grief and of indignation is dominant, as in 2 Cor. Sometimes the utmost desire of Paul in his writing seems to be the establishment of the truth against the assault of its foes, as in Gal and Rom. Always more or less fault is suggested in the recipients of the warnings and the exhortations Paul feels compelled to write to them. Occasionally there is no fault to be found. The only suggestion of such a thing is in the reference to the difference of opinion between Euodia and Syntyche, and while Paul thinks this ought to be harmonized, he does not seem to consider it any more serious menace to the peace of the church. Aside from this Paul has nothing but praise for his beloved brethren and prayer that their love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and all discernment (4:9). He is full of thankfulness upon all his remembrance of them (1:3). He rejoices in the privilege of being offered upon the sacrifice and service of their faith (2:17). The church at Philippi may not have been conspicuous in charisms as the church at Corinth was, but it had the fruits of the Spirit in rich measure. Paul seems to think that it needed only to rejoice in its spiritual possessions and to grow in grace and in the mind of Christ. His heart is full of gratitude and love as he writes. He rejoices as he thinks of them. His joy and triumph over present affliction and the prospect of persecution and death. If this is his last will and testament to his beloved church, as Holtzmann calls it, he has nothing to bequeath them but his unqualified and unreserved love. He has left them from the first, he loves them to the end.

It is a letter of joy. It was Bengel who said, Summa epistolae: gaudia, gaudia, "The sum of the ep. is, I rejoice; rejoice ye." Paul was a man whose spirits were unmuted in any circumstances. He might be scourged in one city and stoned in another and imprisoned in a third and left for dead in a fourth, but as long as he retained consciousness and as soon as he regained consciousness he rejoiced. Nothing could dampen his ardor. Nothing could disturb his peace. In Philippi he had been scourged and cast into the inner prison and his feet had been made fast in the stocks, but at midnight he and Silas were singing hymns of praise to God. He is in prison now in Rome, but he is still rejoicing. Some men would have been discouraged in such circumstances. Wherever Paul had gone his preaching had been despised, and he had been persecuted. The Jews had slandered him and harassed him, and so his friends had to do likewise. He was fickle and false. The years had gone by and the breach between him and his brethren had widened
rather than lessened, and at last they succeeded in getting him into prison and keeping him there for years. But in the case of Paul, it was far less so in that ancient day than it is now.

Paul was such an ardent spirit. It was more difficult for him to be confined than it would be for a more indolent man. He was a world-missionary, a restless cosmopolite ranging up and down through the continents with the message of the Christ. It was like putting an Ethiopian in a cage. Many expected hope and die in imprisonment. Paul was not moping. He was writing this Ep. to the Phil and saying to them, 'I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; it is the power of God unto salvation, among the Jews (1), but more abundantly among the Gentiles.' He was free to do and say what they pleased, and they were making the most of the opportunity. He could no longer thwart or hinder them. Some men would have broken out into loud lamentations and complaints. Some men would have become nervous about the outcome of the cause. The faith of even John the Baptist failed in prison. He could not believe that things were going right if he were not there to attend to them. Paul’s faith never wavered. His hope never waned. His joy was loud, and his manner was grand. He was in a manner. He did not bear the sense of his doom and the consciousness of death as a king would bear the knowledge of it if he had been confined to his castle. Did he hear the step of the jailor and the bar that opened to let him out, and then the last howl of the guards and the falling of the clamor of the city? Or did he hear the opening of the grave and then the tell-tale sigh of the earth and the whisper of the earth as it became loosed from the bonds of gravity and the rattle of the bones like a sheepherder’s bell? Did he sit up, say, ‘I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course, I have kept the faith,’ and then pass into his grave?

It is of great importance theologically. It is one of the paradoxes to which Bible students are most accustomed in Paul’s writings that this simplest of his letters, most epistolary and most personal, should contain the fullest and most important teaching of the theology of the New Testament. It came from his pen. He has only a practical end in view. He is exhorting the Philippians to humility, and he says to them, ‘Have this mind which was in Christ which emptied himself and then was exalted’ (5-11). It is the most theological passage in the epistle. It is one of the most doctrinally important in the NT. It is Paul’s final contribution to the solution of the great mystery of the coming of the Saviour and the economy of salvation. It is his last word, at any length, on this subject. He states plainly the fact of the kingdom, the moral of the redemption, the certainty of the exaltation, and the sure hope of the universal adoration in the end. The most vivid, the most original, the most comprehensive, the most definite of his allusions is found in form as a man, a genuine man obedient to God in all His life. He always maintained that attitude toward God which we ought to maintain and which we can maintain in our humanity, in which He was on an equality with us. We ought to have the mind which was in Christ. He humbled Himself and became obedient. He was obedient through life and obedient unto death, yea, even unto the death of the cross. It is a great passage, setting forth profoundest truths in the tersest manner. It is the crowning revelation concerning Jesus in the Pauline Epistles. It represents Paul’s most mature thought and most mature philosophy.

IV. Genuineness of the Epistle.—The genuineness of the ep. is generally admitted today. It was in the Catholic Church’s Canon, or its name was placed as the Muratorian Fragment. It is found in both the Pesh and the Syriac. It is quoted in the letter of the churches of Lyons and Vienne, in the Ep. of Diognetus, and in the writings of Tertullian and Justin. Paul’s letter was attributed to Paul as an attack upon its authenticity. He declared that it was not dictated to him, and that it was not written by a secretary. It was a crown of victories that it was full of shallow imitations of these. He said it had no apparent motive and no connected argument and that its style was abnormal. He wrote it in the 4th century. It was a perfect imitation of Paul’s Epistle to the Philippians. It was mentioned among them. The genuineness of the ep. has been defended by Weissecker, Tischendorf, Scholten, Hilgenfeld, Harnack, Holtzmann, Mangold, Lipsius, Renan, Godet, Zahn, Davidson, Lightfoot, Parra, and many others, and by almost all of the Eng. writers on the subject. Weissecker says that the reasons for attributing the ep. to the apostle are cogent. Many enemies of the apostle, says he, are simply inconceivable that anyone else would or could have produced this name a letter so full of theological or ecclesiastical motive can be discovered, and in which the personal element so largely predominates and the spirit of the apostle so completely dominates. It is of great vividness and fidelity. The ep. deserves to rank alongside of the Apocrypha, and must stand as a work of Paul’s pen, and as a coordinate standard by which to test the genuineness of other and less certain writings.

The Place, Date and Occasion of Writing.—This is one of the prison ep. (see PHILEMON). Paul makes frequent reference to his bonds (7, 13, 14, 17). He was for 2 years a prisoner in Caesarea (Acts 24, 27). Paul and others have been written about this imprisonment; but the references to the prastorian guard and the members of Caesar’s household have not been enough to conclude that the Rom imprisonment was the one to which the ep. refers. Philem, Col and Eph were all written during the first imprisonment, and these three form a group by themselves. Phil is evidently separated from them by some interval. Was it written earlier or later than they? Beilec, Lightfoot, Sanday, Hort, Beet and others think that the Ep. to the Phil was written after or during his imprisonment. But I am not so sure. I agree with Zahn, Ramsay, Findlay, Shaw, Vincent, Jülicher, Holtzmann, Weiss, Godet, and others, who argue for the writing of Phil toward the close of the Rom imprisonment.

Their reasons are as follows: (1) We know that some considerable time must have elapsed after Paul’s arrival at Rome before he could have written this ep.; for the news of his arrival had been carried to Philippi and a contribution to his needs had been raised among his friends there; and Epaphroditus had carried it to Rome. In Rome, Epaphroditus had become seriously sick, and the news of this sickness had been carried back to Philippi and the Philippians had sent back a message of sympathy to him. At least four trips between Rome and Philippi are thus indicated, and there are intervals of several years. (2) The greater or lesser imprisonment mentioned between the two cities was some 700 miles. Communication was not easy in those days. (3) The journey from Brundisium to the Egnatian Way, which led directly to Philippi, was about 700 miles. (4) It was not a short journey at all. (5) It would occupy a month at least, and the four journeys suggested in the ep. were not in direct succession. (2) Paul says that the bonds (20) which had been known throughout the whole prastorian guard (13). It must have taken some time for this to become possible. (3) The conditions outside the prison, where Christ was being preached, by some in a spirit of love, and by others in a spirit of faction, cannot be located in the earliest months of Paul’s sojourn in Rome (15-17). They must belong to a time when Christianity had developed in the city and parties had been formed in the church. (4) Luke was well known at Philippi. Yet he sends no salutation to the Philippians. In this ep. he would surely have done so if he had been with Paul at the time of its writing. (5) He writes in the name of the Romans, Colossians, and so was Demas (Col 4, 14). In this ep. Paul promises to send Timothy to Philippi, and says, ‘I have not said anything of your state” (20). This must mean that Aristarchus, Demas and Luke were all gone. They had all been with him when he wrote the other ep. (5) His condition as a prisoner seems to have changed for the worse. He had enjoyed comparative liberty. It is determined that he be imprisioned at Rome. Living in his own hired house and accessible to anyone, he has been now removed, possibly to the guardroom of the other prisoners. Here he was in more rigorous confinement, in want and in sorrow. (6) Paul quotes some of the most historical data and suspected gnostic influence in certain passages of this Ep. as if they were partly derived from a perverted interpretation of certain passages in the ep.: they partly rested upon arbitrary history and documents; and he was so weak that it had to be believed that he could have attached any importance to them himself. It is not surprising that few critics have been willing to follow Baur’s leadership at this point. Biederman, Ewald, Kneucker, Hirt, Hillig, Hoekstra, and many others have been mentioned among them. The genuineness of the ep. has been defended by Weissecker, Tischendorf, Scholten, Hilgenfeld, Harnack, Holtzmann, Mangold, Lipsius, Renan, Godet, Zahn, Davidson, Lightfoot, Parra, and many others, and by almost all of the Eng. writers on the subject. Weissecker says that the reasons for attributing the ep. to the apostle are cogent. Many enemies of the apostle, says he, are simply inconceivable that anyone else would or could have produced this name a letter so full of theological or ecclesiastical motive can be discovered, and in which the personal element so largely predominates and the spirit of the apostle so completely dominates. It is of great vividness and fidelity. The ep. deserves to rank alongside of the Apocrypha, and must stand as a work of Paul’s pen, and as a coordinate standard by which to test the genuineness of other and less certain writings.

The Epistle was written by Paul as a prisoner in Rome, probably toward the close of his imprisonment, as a letter to the Philippians, as an answer to some of their letters, as a letter to be read in the church, and as a letter to be read in your home.'
Christ, and chooses the lesser blessings in pure unselfishness in the Lord's interest. People of their choice are radically different; and Paul lives with rejoicing while Hamlet lives in despair and in unshaken despair. The Roman apostle was living but he would rather live than die before his work was done.

(d) His example (vs 27-30): Paul was a Roman citizen and so were they. He tried to live worthy of his citizenship but must have had a higher ambition, that he and they might live as citizens worthy of the gospel of Christ. He fought as a good soldier. He stood fast in the faith. He was in nothing afflicted by the adversaries. Let them follow his example. They were engaged in the same conflict. To them, he said, be not weary of well doing, but labor to know the will of God, and believe and suffer in the behalf of Christ. Their faith was not of themselves; it was the gift of God. Their suffering was not self-chosen; it too was a gift of God. (4) Exhortation to follow the example of Christ (2: 1-18): Let them, the Philippians, have the mind and spirit of Jesus, and Paul will rejoice to pour out his life as a libation upon the sacrifice and service of their faith. (5) Reasons for sending Timothy and Epaphroditus to them (2: 19-30). (6) Paul's example (3: 1-21):

VI. Contents of the Epistle.—The ep. is not capable of any logical analysis. Its succession of thought may be represented as follows: (1) Address (1: 1-3), (2) Thanksgiving and prayer (1: 3-11): Paul was in Rome, a prisoner, and sends his greetings to his helpers in the churches of Philippi. (3) Information concerning his own experience (1: 12-30): (a) His Evangelism (vs 12-14): Everything had turned out well. Paul is in prison, but he has been enabled to spread his evangelism. He has been chained to a soldier, but that has given him many opportunities to talk and to do the work of a soldier. He has been given the opportunity to spread his evangelism, and to talk about the Christ. Paul has told his experience over and over to these men, and his story has been carried through the whole camp. (b) His tolerance (vs 15-18): Not only has the gospel found many adherents among the evil men who were walking through the whole city the brethren have been emboldened by Paul's success to preach Christ, some through faction and envy and strife, and some through love. Paul rejoices that Christ is preached, whether by his enemies or by his friends. He would much prefer to have the gospel presented as he himself preached it, but he was great-souled and broad-minded enough to tolerate differences of opinion and method among the brethren in Christ. "In every way, whether in pretense or in truth, Christ is proclaimed; and therein I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice" (1: 18). This is one of the noblest utterances of one of the greatest of men. Paul is sorry that everybody does not see things just as he does, but he rejoices if they glorify Christ and would not put the least hindrance in their way. (c) His readiness for life or death (vs 19-26): Paul says, Give me liberty or give me death; it will be Christ either way. To live is to work for Christ; to die is to be with Christ. "To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain." (Here is Paul's example of possible martyrdom or further missionary labors.) We are reminded of Hamlet's soliloquy in Shakespeare. "To be or not to be"—that is the question with both Hamlet and Paul. Hamlet weighs evils against evils and choose the lesser evils in sheer cowardice in the end. Paul weighs blessings against blessings, the blessings of life for Christ and the blessings of death with
Manichean or neo-Platonic heresy that matter was evil and the body vile. Potinus blasphemed that he had a body. The Cherethim (see in It) contend and yet Egyptian the body as the temple of the Holy Spirit. It was the vehicle of the incarnation, and he honors it for that. Yet the body prepared for Jesus was the body of His humiliation. It bound Him to the earth. It weakened when He was made man. And when He marked His needed strength. Paul says that our bodies are like the body of Jesus of Nazareth now, and they shall be like the body of Moses in due time.

(7) A series of short exhortations (4 1–9): This series ends with the command, "The things which ye both learned and received and heard and saw in me, these things do: and the God of peace shall be with you." All these exhortations, then, are based upon his own conduct and experience and example. They had seen the embodiment of these things in him. They were to be imitators of him in their obedience to them. Therefore as we read them we have side-lights thrown upon the character of the apostle who had taught and preached and practised these things.

What do they tell us concerning the apostle Paul? (a) His steadfastness and his love for his friends (ver 1): He had a genius for friendship. He bound his friends to him with cords of steel. They were sure to succeed anything for him. The reason for that was that he sacrificed everything for them, and that he had such an overwhelming love for them that his own life meant nothing to them. They could depend upon him. (b) His sympathy for men and all good women and his desire that they live in peace (vs 23): The true yeosulfellow mentioned here cannot be identified now. He has been variously identified by the Ephe- tuses, Barnabas, Luke, Silas, Timothy, Peter, and Christ. There can be no doubt that Paul, either Cephas or Syzygus. We are wholly ignorant as to whom Paul meant. (c) His constant rejoicing in the Lord (ver 4). (d) His sweet reasonableness ("moderation." AV, RV "forbearance," ver 5): So Matthew Arnold translates the passage. The word can here mean "polite" or "courteous." It is a combination of forbearance and graciousness, of modesty and courtesy, of consideration and esteem such as was characteristic. Paul had it. There was a sweet reasonableness about him that made his personality attractive and admirable to both men and women. (e) His freedom from anxiety (ver 6,7): Paul's fearless confidence was born on the one hand from his assurance that the Lord was near, and on the other from his faith in prayer. It passed all understanding how Paul was kept from all anxiety. It was the power of prayer that did it. It was the peace of God that did it. It was the Lord at hand who did it. (i) His habitual high thinking (ver 8): All that was worthy in the ideals of the Greco-Hellenic philosophers Paul made the staple of his thought. He delighted in them and made them the foundation of his thought and the pronouns referring to Him are many more. Paul cannot write anything without writing about Christ. He ends: "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit." The spirit of Christ and the grace of Christ are in the entire epistle.

PHILISTIM, flis'tim, fil'is-tim ( פִּליסְתִּים, p'lish-tim) [Gen 10 14 AV]. See PHILISTINES.

PHILISTINES, flis'tinz, fil'is-tinz ( פִּלִּסְתִּי, PHILISTIHM, Ἡλλόφοβος or Ἡλλόφοβος, fil'stinz):

I. OT Notices:—race and origin (Heb p'lisheth) refers to their country. The name Paul itself and Origin (Heb p'lisheth) refers to their country. The word means "migrants," and they came from another country. They are noticed 386 t. in the OT, and their country 8 t. The question of their race and origin is of great importance as affecting the genuine character and reliability of the Bible notices. In Gen 10 14 (1 Ch 1 12) they are reckoned with other tribes in Mizraim (Egypt) as descendants of Ham, and as cousins of the old inhabitants of Babylonia (ver 6). They are said to be a branch of the Cushite—"an unknown people—or, according to LXX, of the Casamnian, which could mean "the people of the head." A custom of the Phoenicians (forbidden to Hebrews) as a name was so used as a name of the Phoenician race, as known from a picture of the time of Thothmes III in the 16th cent. BC. They are also connected with the Cappadocians. Or people of Caphtor, whence indeed they are said to have come (Jer 45 4; Am 9 7). Caphtor was a "shoretown," and its position is not geographically possible (see Dt 2 23); the Cappadocians found an earlier race of Avim living in "enclosures" near Gaza, and destroyed them. In the LXX of this passage (and of Am 9 7) Cappadocia stands for Caphtor (Kaph- tor), and other authors have the same reading. Cappadocia was known to the Assyrians as kut-pal-ulba (probably an Akkadian term—"land of the Kati"), and the Kati were a people living in Cilicia and Cappadocia, which region had a Sem population. 

LITERATURE:

1. OT Notices.—The Philistines were an uncircumcised people inhabiting the south plains between Gezer and Gaza in Southwestern Pal
The Philistines were a Semitic people who worshiped the gods Dagon (1 S 5:2) and Ashtart (30:10). They lived at the foot of the Philistine Mountains, which are also known as the Shephelah (or low hills) of Judah, at the foot of the mountains of the sea.

5. History
The Philistines were a powerful presence in the region from the time of the Judges through the time of the Kings of Judah. They were known for their seaports, which included Gath, Ashkelon, Ashdod, and Gaza. The Philistines were known for their military might and their use of the chariot.

6. History
The Philistines were subject to the Assyrians and the Babylonians, and they were eventually conquered by the Babylonians under Nebuchadnezzar. After the Babylonian conquest, the Philistines were ruled by the Neo-Babylonian Empire.

7. Later
The Philistines continued to exist as a distinct people, but their influence declined over time. The Philistines were eventually assimilated into the surrounding cultures, and their language and culture were lost to history.

In conclusion, the Philistines were a significant presence in the region of the ancient Near East, and their influence can still be felt in modern-day Israel.
and to have thus differed—though Sem—from the Hebrews.

Their further history is embraced in that of the various cities to which reference can be made under the articles pertaining to them.

II. Monumental Notices.—These are of great importance, because they confirm the OT statements from a time at least as early as that of Moses, and down to 670 BC. Recent excavations at Gezer show the early presence of two races at this Philistia, one being Sem, the other probably Egyptian. Scarabs as old as the XIIth Dynasty were found, and in the 15th. BC Gezer was held by Amenophis III. At Lachish also seals of this king and his queen have been found, with a cuneiform letter to Zimridi, who was ruler of the city under the same Pharaoh. At Gaza a temple was built by Amenophis II. The names of places in Philistia noticed yet earlier by Thothmes III are all Sem, including Joppa, Saphir, Gerar, Gezer, etc. In the Am Tab we have also (about 1480 BC) letters from chiefs subject to Amenophis III at Joppa, Ashkelon, Gezer, Lachish and Kolash which show us a Sem population, not only by the language of these letters, but also by the names of the writers. In the case of Ashkelon esp. the Sem rulers are found to have worshipped Dagon; and, though the name

Heads of Philistines.

Phalistine Wagons.

"Phalistine" does not occur, the race was clearly the same found by the Assyrians in 800 BC in the land of Philistia beside the Great Sea. These names include Yamin-Dagan ("Dagon sect"), Dagon-takala ("Dagon is a protection") and Yaddua (the "grateful") at Ashkelon; Bisa ("asked for"), son of the woman Galeta, at Joppa; Yabnitu ("God made"), at Lachish, with Zimridi—a name found also in Sabean Arab; while, at Gezer, Fayga represents the Bib. Japhia (Josh 10 3), and Milkitu ("Moloch is king") the Heb Malchiel. Others might be added of the same character, but these examples are enough to show that, in the time of Moses and Joshua, the population of Philistia was the same that is noticed in the OT as early as Abraham's age.

When therefore scholars speak of the Philis as being non-Sem—and probably Aryan—invaders of the country, arriving about 1200 BC, they appear not only to contradict the Bible, but also to contra-
dict the monumental evidence of the earlier existence of Sem Dagon-worshippers at Ashkelon. In this later age Rameses III was attacked, in Egypt, by certain northern Monuments who came by sea, and also by land, wasting first the country of the Hittites and Amorites. Among them were the Danau, who were probably Gr Danai. They were exterminated in the Delta, and in the subsequent advance of Rameses III to the Euphrates. On a colored picture they are represented as fair people; and two of the tribes were called Parsatou and Takari, whom Chabas supposed to be Pelasgi (since l and r are not distinguished in Egypt) and Teurians. These two tribes wear the same peculiar headdress. Brugsch supposed the former to be Philis (Geog., I, 10), but afterward called them Pusorato (Hist Egypt, II, 148). The inscriptions accompanying the picture on the temple walls say that they came from the north, and "their home was in the land of the Puriaus, the Takari." etc. There is thus no reason at all to suppose that they were Philis, nor did they ever settle in Philistia.

The Assyrs texts agree with those already mentioned in making the inhabitants of Philistia Semitic. About 900 BC was the 3. Assyrian first Assyrian conqueror in Philistia ("by the great sea"). In 734 and 727 BC, Tiglath-pileser attacked the Philis, and mentions a king of Ashkelon named Midnit ("my gift"). And his son Rukabi whose name resem-

bles that of the Kenite called Rechab in the OT. The name of the king of Gaza was Hanun, or "merciful." In 711 BC Sargon took Ashdod, and speaks of its king Azari, whose name recalls the Amorite Aziru, and of the Phalistine Shimni ("the sun-god") who fled before him. Semnacheri, in 702 BC, gives the names of cities in Philistia (including Eltekeh and Bemebarak near Joppa) which are Sem. He notices Sibica (Zadok) of Ashkelon, and also Sar-
ludari ("the Lord be praised"), son of Rukabi in the same city, with Midnit of Ashdod, and Padii ("redeeming") of Ekron, while Sul-bel ("Baal is a protection") was king of Gaza. In 679 BC Esar- haddor ("boss of Sul-bél" ("Baal is my protection") of Gaza, with Midnit of Ashkelon, Raso-aamu ("the sun-god is manifest") of Ekron, and Abi-milki of Ashdod, who bore the ancient Phil name Abime-
leech. In 670 BC, when Assur-bani-pal set up many tributary kings in Egypt, we find again the name Sarludari applied to a ruler of Pelusium, who may have been a Philistine. It is thus abundantly clear that the monumental notices all agree with the OT as to the names and nationality of the Philis, and as to their worship of Baal and Dagon; the conjecture that they were Aryan foreigners, arriving in 1200 BC, is not based on any statement of the monuments, but merely rests on a guess which Brugsch subsequently abandoned. It resembles many other supposed discrepancies between Biblical and contemporary records due to the mistakes of modern commentators.

III. The Cretan Theory.—This strange theory, which is apparently of Byzantine origin, would make the Philis come from Crete. It still finds supporters, though it does not rest on any Bib. or monumental evidence. The Cherethim (Ezek 25 16; Zeph 2 5) were a Sem people named with the Philis in Canaan. The LXX renders the word Krétai or Kretai about 1770 AD, Michaelis (Speci1, I, 292–308) argued that this meant "Cretans," and that the Philis therefore came from Caphtor, which must be Crete. The passages, however, refer to Philistia and not to any island, and the LXX translators, as
we have seen, placed Captor in Cappadocia. The Cherethites and the Gittites (1 S 14) as a people of Philistia (yer 16), near Ziklag, and their name probably survives at the present town called Keratyleh in the Phil in plain.

Yet, many theories are founded on this old idea about the Cherethites. Some suppose that Tactius confused the Jews with the Philistines, because they came from Crete; but what he actually says (Hist. v.11) is that "the Jews ran away from the Philistines to Egypt, and were called "the inhabitants are named Idaci from Mt. Idar," which, with a barbarous augment, becomes the name of the Judaei." This absurd derivation serves at least to prove that Tactius himself does not mean the Philistines. Stephen of Byzantium said that the god Manna and Ceren was likely a Cretan, because "he has seen the huge statue of a seated Jove found near Gaza, and now at Constantinople, but this is late Gr work, and marked by a Phoen. of 3rd to 2nd cent. B.C." From this it is thought that Mincas-the port of Gaza-was named from the Cretan Minos, but it is an Arab, word Mmeshe, for "harbor," still applying to the same place.

No critical student is likely to prefer these later speculations to our present monumental information, even without reference to the contradiction of the Bible. Yet these are later names that, in later times, has given rise to the supposition that Captor is to be identified with a region known as the Egyptians as Kefi, with inhabitants called Kefau. The latter are represented in a tomb of the XVIIIth Dynasty near Thebes. The Southgate, or, with long black hair, and the same type is found in a Cyproscylindrical figure. They are connected with islanders of the "green sea," who may have lived in Arvad or in Cyprus; but there is no evidence in any written statement that they were Cretans, though a figure at Knossos in Crete somewhat resembles them. There are many indications that this figure—painted on the wall of the palace—is not older than about 500 BC, and the Sidonians had colonies in Crete, whereas also potters must likewise be marked by a Phoen inscription in Cyprus. The Kefau youths bring vases as presents, and these—their visits are exactly the same as those represented in another picture of the time of Thothmes III, the bearers in this case being Harri from North Syria, represented with black beards and Sem features. Moreover, on the bilingual inscription called the Decree of Canopus (235 BC), the Kef region is said to be "Phoenicia," and the Gr translator naturally knew what was meant by the Egyptian Kefau. In fact in the Sem. word for "palm," occurring in Heb (Isa 9 14; 19 15), and thus applicable to the "palm"-land, Phoenicia. Thus, even if Kef were related to Captor, the evidence would place the Phii home on the Phoen. coast of Crete. There is indeed no evidence that any European race settled near the coasts of Pal before about 650 BC, when Eearahdon speaks of Gr kings in Cyprus. The Cretan tradition of Michælis was a literary conjecture, which has been disproved by the results of exploration in Asia Minor.

IV. David's Guards.—Another strange story, equally old, represents David as being surrounded with foreign mercenaries—Philis and Cretans, and the Gittites. He employed mercenaries called Shaitanu from Asia Minor. The suggestion that the Cherethites were of this race is scarcely worth notice, since the Heb kaph is not represented by ḫ in Egypt. David's band of Hebrew exiles, 400 in number, followed him to Gath where 200 Gittites joined him (2 S 16 18). In later times his army consisted of "the Cherethi in (kērēthi, in sing)" and "the Pelethi" (pēlēthi), commanded by the sons of Jehadad (2 S 8 18; 15 18; 20 7; 1 K 1 35 44), together with the Gittites under Ittai of Gath. These guards are never said to have been Philis, but "the Cherethi, is supposed to have been the Cherethites tribe, and "the Pelethi" to be another name for the Philistines. The fact that the came from Gath does not prove that they were Philis, any more than was David himself because he came back from this city. David calls Ittai an "enemy" and an "exile," but it is probable that he was the same here, for when Ittai's men joined the Cherethi and Pelethi against Absalom, they were naturally suspected; for David still had enemies (2 S 15 5-13) among Benjamites of Saul's house. It is also surely impossible to suppose that David would have left the ark in charge of a Phili, and Obad-edom the Gittite (2 S 6 10) was a Levite, according to a later account (1 Ch 15 18), hearing a Heb name, meaning perhaps "servant of men," or "humble worshipper." It seems equally unlikely that, in later times, a pious priest like Jehiada (2 K 11 4) would have admitted foreign mercenaries into the temple. In this passage they are called kārī, as also in 2 S 20 23, where LXX has Cheirethi. The suggestion of Wellhausen that they were of Caria does not seem probable, and Caria had not even reached Egypt before about 600 BC.

The real explanation of these various words for soldiers seems simple; and David—being a very rich man—would not likely have needed foreign mercenaries; while the of These Philis, whom he had so repeatedly Terms smitten, were very unlikely to have formed trusty guards. The word "Cherethi" (kērēthi) means a "smitter" or a "destroyer," and "Pelethi" (pēlēthi) means a "swift one" or "pursuer." In the time of Josiah the temple-guards are called kārī (2 K 11 4 19, Carites), which LXX treats as either sing. or pl., and rāqīm or "runners" (see 1 S 22 17; 1 K 14 27 28; 1 K 14 27), these two bodies perhaps answering to the Cherethi and Pelethi of David's time; for kārī means "stammer." The term rāqīm, or "runners," is however of general application, since Jehu also had troops so called (2 K 10 25), and we have seen (p. 249) of troops—as among the Romans—the heavier regiment of "destroyers," or "stabbers," being armed with swords, daggers or spears; while the "swift ones" or "runners" pursued the defeated foe. Thus in Egypt the final, Pharaoh's army, was divided by the bow-man in regular regiments; and in Assyria the spear-man with heavy shields defending the bow-man. We have also a picture of the time of Tiglath-pileser II representing an Assyrian soldier on a camel. The Pelethi or "pursuers" may have been "runners" on foot, but perhaps more probably mounted on camels, or on horses like the later Assyrians; for in the time of Solomon (1 K 4 28) horses and riding camels were in use—the former for chariots. It is clear that David's band, leaving the vicinity of Jezer (1 S 29 1; 30 1), could not have reached Ziklag "on the third day" (a distance of 120 miles) on foot; so that the camel corps must have existed even before the death of Saul.

These considerations seem to make it evident that David's guards were native Hebrews, who had been with him as exiles and outlaws at 3. Native Hebrews Adullam and Gath, and that the Cherethi or "destroyer" only actively served during the little time of the Phili tribe of "destroyers" or Cherethim, who were not Cre- tans, it would seem, any more than the "stabbers" were Carians.
The general result of our inquiry is, that all monumental notices of the Philis agree with the statements, which make them to

4. Review
be a Sem people who had already migrated to Philistia by the time of Abraham, while the supposed discrepancies are caused by the mistakes made by a commentator of the 18th cent., and by archaeologists of later times.
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LITERATURE

Born probably in the first decade of Augustus Caesar, who became emperor in 27 BC. He died possibly in the last years of Claudius (41-54 AD), more likely in the early years of Nero (54-65 AD). We have no exact information about either date. He was a native of Alexandria, Egypt. His relatives were wealthy and prominent, probably sacerdotal, Jews. He received the best Jewish education, and was trained also in gentle learning—grammar, rhetoric, philosophy, geometry, poetry, music. Enjoying ample means, he was enabled to devote his career to scholarship. The Alexandrian Jews wielded great influence in the contemporary Roman empire, and the prominence of Philo’s family is attested by the fact that his brother, Alexander Lysimachus, was Alabarch of Alexandria. The single date in Philo’s life which we know accurately is connected with their leadership. In the winter of 39-40 AD, he was spokesman of the deputation sent to Rome to protest against imposition of emperor-worship upon fellow-citizens of his faith. The mission failed, Philo, with his two colleagues, meeting rebuff, even insult. It was little likely that Caligula would heed graces which included specifically dissent from worship of himself. Philo records his distaste for political activity, and, so far as we know, the Roman incident excepted, he devoted himself principally to letters. As a young man probably, he had undertaken a journey to Jerusalem, almost in the nature of a pilgrimage to the ancient shrine of his religion. He paid a second visit to Rome possibly after 50 AD, at all events, in the reign of Claudius. For the rest, our knowledge of his life is scanty and, sometimes, legendary.

The period covered by his career coincides with one of the most momentous epochs in history. For it witnesses, not only the foundation of the Roman imperial system, but also the beginning of the end of ancient classical civilization in its dominant ideas, and the plantation of Christianity. Preeminently an era of transition, it was marked by significant displacements in culture, the effects of which were felt in every walk of life and even yet. Minor phenomena aside, three principal movements characterized the time: the Pagan reaction, or reversion to forms of religion that had sufficed the peoples of the Roman empire hitherto—this manifested itself strongly with Augustus, and entered its decline perhaps with the death of Plutarch (c 120 AD); the appearance of Christianity; and what is known as Syncretism, or interfusion between the conceptions of different races, esp. in religion, philosophy and material circumstances which cumbered the fortunes of Christianity deeply, found its chief exponent in Philo, and maintained itself for several centuries in the theosophical systems of the Gnostics and neo-Platonists. Thus, to understand Philo, and to realize his importance, it is necessary to number the intellectual spirit of his age. The “universalism” of the Roman empire has been so named because, within the political framework, various peoples and divergent civilizations commingled and came eventually to share something in a common spirit, even of a common language. Philo’s prominence, as a figure in the world of thought, and as an authority for the general culture of NT times, is out of all proportion to the fragmentary information available about his external career. Contemporary currents, subtle as those were, perfused his writings, and were met and fused in his person. Hence his value as an index to the temperament of the period cannot well be overrated.

A Jew by nature and nurture, an oriental mystic by accident of residence, Gr philosopher by higher education and professional study, an ally of the Rom governing classes, familiar with their intellectual perspective, Philo is at once rich in suggestion and blurred in outline. Moreover, he addressed himself to two tasks, difficult to weld into a flawless unity. On the one hand, he wrote for educated men in Gr-Rom society, attempting to explain, often to justify, his racial religion before them. The philosophic spirit, which upon him, had fallen upon him, he enjoyed unusual opportunity to point the merits of the Jewish faith as the “desire of all nations,” the panacea of which the need was everywhere felt. On the other hand, he had to confront his “orthodox” coreligionists, with their separatist traditions and their contempt for paganism in all its works. He tried to persuade them that, after all, Gr thought was not inimical to their cherished doctrines, but, on the contrary, invaluable and almost identical. Hence he represented an eclectic standpoint, in which Gr philosophy blended with historical and dogmatic deductions from the Jewish Scriptures. The result was Philo’s peculiar type of theosophy—we cannot call it a system. Taking the OT for text, he applied the “allegorical” method, with curious consequences. He taught that the Scriptures contain two meanings: a “lower” meaning, obvious in the literal statements of the text; and a “higher,” or hidden meaning, perceptible to the “initiate” alone. In this way he found it possible to reconcile Gr intellectualism with Jewish belief. Greek thought exhibits the “hidden” meaning; it turns out to be the elucidation of the “allegory” which runs through the OT like a vein of gold. Moses, and the rest, are not merely historical figures, the subjects of such and such events, but representative types of reason, righteousness, the virtues, and so forth. The tendency to fusion of this kind was no new thing. It is traceable for some three centuries before Philo, who may be said to complete the process. It had been familiar to the rabbis, and to the Hellenistic philosophers, particularly the Stoics, who applied this method to the Gr poetic myths. Philo reduces it to an expert art, and uses it as an instrument to dissipate all difficult perplexities. He believed it to be thoroughly true to the OT. But, thanks to his method, he rendered it malleable, and could thus adjust its interpretation to what he considered to be
the intellectual necessities of his generation. Nay more, he felt that, when at his best in this process, he became a vehicle of Divine possession. He says, "Through the influence of Divine inspiration I have become excited profoundly . . . then I have been conscious of a richness of interpretation, an enjoyment of facts, a perception of the most manifest energy in all that was to be done." Again, "I am irradiated with the light of wisdom," and, "all intellect is a Divine inspiration." Little wonder, then, that we have a strange mixture of philosophy and divinity in the Deity, of every Gr intellectualism with hazy oriental mysticism. Hence, too, the philosophy of Philo is subordinate to his explanation of the Scriptures, and compromise, rather than logical thinking, marks his leading positions.

After the death of Cicero (43 BC) a change, long preparing, asserted itself in ancient thought. Mixture of national, or racial, character and new problems on man became evident to each other.

A reorganization of standards of ethical judgment was thus rendered inevitable, and Judaism came to intermingle more freely with Gr philosophy as one consequence. While it is true that "reason participated in the supernatural powers," and the Gr philosophers were forced to solve all problems, the nature of the chief quest underwent transformation. The old association of man with Nature gave way to a dualism or opposition between the world-order and another existence lying behind it as its originator or sustainer. The system of Nature having disappointed expectation, thinkers asked how they could escape it, and assure themselves of definite relations with the Divine Being. They sought the desired connection with the world, but as a distant ideal. This was the problem that confronted Philo, who attacked it from the Jewish side. Now Judaism, like Gr thought, had also experienced a change of heart. Jeh had been the subject of an idealizing process, and tended, like the Stoic deity, to lose specific relation with the world and man. Accordingly, a new religious question was bringing the philosophy and the faith into closer contact. Could they join forces? Philo's consequent embarrassment rooted, no less than the fresh perplexities inseparable from the adjustment of his available methods and materials. For, while the Jewish Messiah had passed over into the Gr Logos, the two systems preserved their separation in no small measure, Philo believed, the immediate God being familiar with the mystic, transcendent concept of Deity extracted, thanks to long misinterpretation, from Plato's cosmogonic dialogue, Timaeus. Here God was elevated above the world. His conception of the presence, or immanence, of the Deity in the world came from the Stoics. The Jewish religion gave him the doctrine of a righteous (pure) Deity, whose moral inwardness made relations with men possible. Moreover, contemporary angelology and demonology enabled him to devise a scheme whereby the pure Deity could be linked with the gross world, notwithstanding its irremediable evil. Little wonder, then, that he compassed an amalgamation only, and this in consonance with the theosophical drift of the age. Nevertheless, he counteracted the distorting tendencies of rabbinical speculation by reference to Hellenistic pantheism, and, at the same time, counteracted this pantheism by the inward moralism of his national faith. The logical symmetry of the Gr mind was reinforced by Hebraic religious sentiment, for Philo, as a whole, rather than a system, but a ferment that cast up the clamant problem in unmistakable fashion. The crux was this: Man must surmount his own fragmentary experience and rise to an absolute Being; but, its absoluteness notwithstanding, this Being must be brought into direct contact with the finite. Philo was unable to reconcile the two demands, because he could not rise above them; but the effort after reconciliation controls all his conclusions, harking back to three main subjects of inquiry: (1) the conception of God; (2) the manner of God's relation to the world; (3) human nature.

(1) Philo's doctrine of God, like that of the neo-Platonic scholasticism, was not essentially dualistic. No doubt, it is determined largely by certain human analogies. Subjects of inquiry sary for the control of the world, just in the same way as man's mind must exist to furnish the principle of all human action; and, as matter is not self-determined, a principle, analogous to mind, is demanded, to be its first cause. Further, as the permanent soul remains unchanged throughout the vicissitudes of a human life, so, behind the phenomenal, but these phenomena reside a self-existent Being. Nevertheless, the human analogy never extends to God in His actual Being. No human traits can attach to the Deity. Language may indicate such parallelism, nay the Scriptures are used by the Stoics to draw them as concessions to mortal weakness. These accommodations eliminated, it becomes evident that man can never know God positively. Any adjective used to describe Him can do no more than point to the contrast he sees His relationless Being and the dependence of finite things. That God is, Philo is fully persuaded; what He is, no man can ever tell. He is one and immutable, simple and immeasurable and eternal, just as man is not. For he is unknowable, not otherwise than the many things belong to Him, but He, speaking strictly, belongs to nothing." This doctrine of the transcendence of Deity was an essential postulate of Philonic thought. For, seeing that He expels all the imperfections of the world, God is precisely in that condition of Being for which the whole creation then yearned. In a word, the dualism, so far from being a bar to salvation, was rather a condition without which the problem of salvation could neither be stated nor recognized. In the difficulty inseparable from the adjustment of his available methods and materials. For, while the Jewish Messiah had passed over into the Gr Logos, the two systems preserved their separation in no small measure, Philo believed, the immediate God being familiar with the mystic, transcendent concept of Deity extracted, thanks to long misinterpretation, from Plato's cosmogonic dialogue, Timaeus. Here God was elevated above the world. His conception of the presence, or immanence, of the Deity in the world came from the Stoics. The Jewish religion gave him the doctrine of a righteous (pure) Deity, whose moral inwardness made relations with men possible. Moreover, contemporary angelology and demonology enabled him to devise a scheme whereby the pure Deity could be linked with the gross world, notwithstanding its irremediable evil. Little wonder, then, that he compassed an amalgamation only, and this in consonance with the theosophical drift of the age. Nevertheless, he counteracted the distorting tendencies of rabbinical speculation by reference to Hellenistic pantheism, and, at the same time, counteracted this pantheism by the inward moralism of his national faith. The logical symmetry of the Gr mind was reinforced by Hebraic religious sentiment, for Philo, as a whole, rather than a system, but a ferment that cast up the clamant problem in unmistakable fashion. The crux was this: Man must surmount his own fragmentary experience and rise to an absolute Being; but, its absoluteness notwithstanding, this Being must be brought into direct contact with the finite. Philo was unable to reconcile the two demands, because he could not rise above them; but the effort after reconciliation controls all his conclusions, harking back to three main subjects of inquiry: (1) the conception of God; (2) the manner of God's relation to the world; (3) human nature.

(1) Philo's doctrine of God, like that of the neo-Platonic scholasticism, was not essentially dualistic. No doubt, it is determined largely by certain human analogies. Subjects of inquiry sary for the control of the world, just in the same way as man's mind must exist to furnish the principle of all human action; and, as matter is not self-determined, a principle, analogous to mind, is demanded, to be its first cause. Further, as the permanent soul remains unchanged throughout the vicissitudes of a human life, so, behind the phenomenal, but these phenomena reside a self-existent Being. Nevertheless, the human analogy never extends to God in His actual Being. No human traits can attach to the Deity. Language may indicate such parallelism, nay the Scriptures are used by the Stoics to draw them as concessions to mortal weakness. These accommodations eliminated, it becomes evident that man can never know God positively. Any adjective used to describe Him can do no more than point to the contrast he sees His relationless Being and the dependence of finite things. That God is, Philo is fully persuaded; what He is, no man can ever tell. He is one and immutable, simple and immeasurable and eternal, just as man is not. For he is unknowable, not otherwise than the many things belong to Him, but He, speaking strictly, belongs to nothing." This doctrine of the transcendence of Deity was an essential postulate of Philonic thought. For, seeing that He expels all the imperfections of the world, God is precisely in that condition of Being for which the whole creation then yearned. In a word, the dualism, so far from being a bar to salvation, was rather a condition without which the problem of salvation could neither be stated nor recognized. In the difficulty inseparable from the adjustment of his available methods and materials. For, while the Jewish Messiah had passed over into the Gr Logos, the two systems preserved their separation in no small measure, Philo believed, the immediate God being familiar with the mystic, transcendent concept of Deity extracted, thanks to long misinterpretation, from Plato's cosmogonic dialogue, Timaeus. Here God was elevated above the world. His conception of the presence, or immanence, of the Deity in the world came from the Stoics. The Jewish religion gave him the doctrine of a righteous (pure) Deity, whose moral inwardness made relations with men possible. Moreover, contemporary angelology and demonology enabled him to devise a scheme whereby the pure Deity could be linked with the gross world, notwithstanding its irremediable evil. Little wonder, then, that he compassed an amalgamation only, and this in consonance with the theosophical drift of the age. Nevertheless, he counteracted the distorting tendencies of rabbinical speculation by reference to Hellenistic pantheism, and, at the same time, counteracted this pantheism by the inward moralism of his national faith. The logical symmetry of the Gr mind was reinforced by Hebraic religious sentiment, for Philo, as a whole, rather than a system, but a ferment that cast up the clamant problem in unmistakable fashion. The crux was this: Man must surmount
it is internal and indwelling; on the other, it is external and mediating. The scope of this distinction is indicated very well by the epithets which Philo applies to each aspect respectively. The internal Logos is called the "Son of God," the "Second God," the "Mediator," the "Ransomed," the "Image of God," "Member of the Trinity," "High Priest." The external Logos "abides in man," is the "Prophet," "Shepherd," an "Ambassador," an "Artist," "Elder," "Interpreter," "Mediator of God." The former represents Philo's conception of the unity of the Logos with God, the latter his provision for the manifestation of the Logos in created things. He thus tries to preserve the transcendence of God equally with His immanence. No doubt, in previous times, the mysteriousness of the Divine nature had impressed itself upon men with at least as much force as now. But with one of two consequences. Either the particular finites and the Deity were mixed in inextricable confusion, as by oriental pantheism, or God was banished from the world, as by the extreme developments within Gr dualism. Philo attempted to combine the two tendencies, and was able consequently to face the obvious contradiction between the transcendence of God, and the idea of a cloudy conception of a multiplicity of phenomena in which this Being ought to be present somehow, despite transcendence. He demands a God who, in His exaltation, shall be a worthy Deity; this is the Jew in his highest development. And, on the other hand, between this God and His creation; this is the Greek and, in part, the Oriental, in him. Thanks to the former, he could not be satisfied with mere naturalism; thanks to the latter, no fable or picture could suffice, the mediator was required, who would link the world and its heart's desire. But Philo could not surmount one difficulty peculiar to contemporary thought. He was unable to connect God directly with creation and preserve His purity unaltered. Hence the obscurity which surrounds his conception of the Logos, likewise his vacillation with respect to its personality. So we find the different intellectual forces which he inherited playing upon him—now one, now another. Sometimes the Platonic theory of Ideas dominates him; sometimes he leans to Stoicism, with its immanent world-reason; and here he even seems to foreshadow the doctrine of the Trinity; again, the ramifications of rabbinical lore cause him to bestow upon the Logos a false role of mediator, which he thought would achieve supremacy, although on the whole mystical Platonism may be said to predominate. Thus, the world of Ideas has its place in the Divine Logos, just as the plan of a city is in the soul of the master-builder. Accordingly, God's thought may take its place in the world by being impressed upon things; yet, on account of its subjective nature, it must be apprehended subjectively, that is, by one who is capable of entering this sphere. The Logos never leaves the Deity; thus it can mediate between Him and creation only if an element proper to Deity be discernible in mundane things. In other words, the Logos mediates between God and the world, but partakes of the Divine nature only. In this, in any case, is the inner logic of Philo's view. It accounts for creation, but has no power to persuade man to overpass the limitations placed upon him by his bodily prison. Thus the question of the personality of the Logos is left unanswered. In so far as Philo needs Logos to connect God with the world, he inclines to a doctrine of personality. In so far as he makes it the principle of all activities within the world, he inclines away from personality. In short, we have a dilemma, an inherent tendency to reduce all finite being to illusion. Indeed, one might term the Logos a reply in some sort to Aristotle's question—which of the Platonic Ideas could connect the other Ideas with sensible things? Salvation is conceived as wrought out, not by a direct stream flowing from Deity, an essence that found due expression rather in the cosmic order than in a person. While, therefore, Philo thinks in a cultural perspective akin to that characteristic of the author of the Fourth Gospel, two vast differences away his doctrine. On the one hand, it is speculative, not ethically personal. On the other hand, it fails completely to determine the nature of his mediator in itself, vacillating in a manner which shows how vague and fluid the conception really was.

(3) Doctrine of man.—This appears further in the doctrine of man. Following current interpretations of Plato, Philo makes man partake in the rational nature of God, but denies that he embodies the highest species of reason. That is, the ideal man and the man known to us in common experience are distinguished. The former is rational as God is. The latter is partly rational, partly irrational. The body vitiates the original angelic purity of the soul and, since the body became part of the Logos, although the higher nature becomes more and more debased as the years lapse, a seed of Divinity is present, ready to burst forth. Thus man must crush the flesh and its desires. At this point we return to the effect of the Stoics, who held that when a man has attained this apathy, man can enjoy the life of contemplation. This, in its turn, culminates in ecstasy, when the human soul attains sudden and momentary union with the Divine. For man is a "fair monster" who has been thrown out of form. Yet the doctrine remains intellectual even here. He "who escapes from his own mind flies to the mind of the universe, confessing that all the things of the human mind are vain and unreal, and attributing everything to God." Philo's anthropology therefore ends in contempt for this life, which is in no wise worth while, and in a counsel of perfection available only for a select élite. Accordingly, the conclusion of the whole matter is, that he never saw how the Divine and the human can be united, although he stated the factors of the problem with great clearness, and felt profoundly the urgency of a solution. His gospel was for the children of culture. He saw the eternal in the temporal, and we have a "remnant" of the ideal of Michel de Montaigne. He understood that "love for a Divine Person" might be so diffused throughout a human soul as to render evil and unreality the means to the attainment of good and to the revelation of truth. The salvation he contemplated was from self, not in self. Hence, as he asserts himself, harmony with God "is an incomprehensible mystery to the multitude, and is to be imparted to the instructed only." Nor is this wonderful. For a God who is the reasonable "the word" of this world, of the "word of fire," which begins as an indistinguishable mass and ends as a "second principle"; and objects of sense rendered apparent by the operation of many curious intermediate forces, ranging from "angel-words" to the human soul, constitute a combination beyond the reach of any save the "initiate." More practicable is Philo's conception of the moral life—as a struggle of the soul against passion, pleasure and sensuality. Yet, even this contest is hopeless unless it be waged with the equipment of the "philosopher athlete." Escape from the "prison-house" of flesh would seem to be consequent only upon profound knowledge.

The probability is that Philo's works were written previous to his Rom embassy. They show how he tried to apply for philosophical conceptions to Jewish beliefs, history, and usages exclusively. The voluminous re-
mainly which have come down to us appear to belong to three commentaries on the Pent and the Mosaic Law. In all likelihood, they are portions of Philo's popular speculations, written for the instruction and information of educated Jews.

6. Philo's Works

Helena, London, etc., rather than for the trained student. The treatise most important for Philo's religious-philosophical views are as follows: On the Creation; On the Allegory of the Sacred Laws; On the Unchangeableness of God; On the Confusion of Languages; On the Migration of Abraham; On the Meting out of the Sacred Instruction; On the Life of the Wise Man Made Perfect by Instruction; The Unwritten Law; Abraham's Allegorical Laws; Rewards and Punishments; That Every Man Who Is Virtuous Is Also Free; Concerning the World; and the Fragments. Some 8 works attributed to Philo are in dispute. Most conspicuous of these is Concerning the Contemplative Life, which reflects his system of asceticism, morality, and its description of the ideal community of the Therapeutae.


R. M. Westley

PHILOGUS, fi-lo-gus (Φίλωγος, Philo-logos, "friend of learning," "learned one" is the name of a Roman Christian to whom St. Paul sent greetings (Rom 16: 15). His name is coupled with that of Julia, who was probably his wife or sister. Philologus and those united with him in this salutation formed by themselves one of the "churches" or groups in the Christian community. The name is found in inscriptions connected with the imperial household, with reference to one of which Bishop Lightfoot has the following note: It has been supposed that Philologus was given by the master to the freedman mentioned in this inscription, as being appropriate to his office (Friedländer i, 89, 160). . . . If so, some light is thrown on the probable occupation of the Philologus of St. Paul" (Phil, 177, n. 1). S. F. Hunter

PHILOMETOR, fi-o-mé-tor. See POLEMY VI.

PHILOSOPHY, fi-lö's-fi (Greek, philos, philos, phi-lo-sophia, philosophy):

1. Definition and Scope
   (1) Intuitive Philosophy
   (2) Speculative Philosophy

2. Greek Philosophy

3. Philosophy in OT and Judaism
   (1) Of Nature
   (2) Of History
   (3) Of Religion
   (4) Alexandrian

4. Philosophy of the NT
   (1) The Teaching of Jesus Christ
   (2) Apostolic Teaching
   (3) Attitude of popular groups toward Philosophy

LITERATURE

Only found in Col 2: 8; lit. the love and pursuit of wisdom and knowledge. In its technical sense, the term is not used for the conscious process, to interpret the whole of human experience, as a consistent and systematic unity, which would be the ultimate truth of all that may be known. The term is also used for a wise application of experience, or parts of experience, however obtained, whether by revelation, intuition or unconscious speculation. No hard-and-fast line can be drawn between the two kinds of philosophy.

Some of the chief conceptions of the "philosopher," as God, spirit, order, causation, true and false, good and evil, were not discovered by reason, but given in experience.

(1) Intuitive philosophy is universal. The human mind has always and everywhere furnished itself with some conceptions of the universe. From the lowest animism and fetishism up to the higher religions, ideas are found which served men as explanations of those features of experience which attracted their attention. They were regarded as general by various methods of revelation. In the higher religions, the mind reflected upon these ideas, and elaborated them into systems of thought that bear some resemblance to the speculative theories of Western thought.

In China, both Confucianism and Taoism developed theories of human life and destiny that bear some resemblance to Stoicism. The religions of Assyria and Babylonism enshrined in their legends the theories of the world and of man and his institutions. In India, the great system of belief in the universe is developed into pantheistic Brahmism, which reduced the multiplicity of experience into one ultimate being, Brahma. But the desire for moral salvation and the sense of pain and evil produced a reaction, and led to the pessimistic and nihilistic philosophy of Buddhism. In Persia, when human consciousness awoke earlier, and the attempt to systematize the multiplicity of polytheism issued in the dualistic philosophy of later Zoroastrism. The whole realm of Oriental thought was divided into kingdoms, created and ruled by two lores: Ahura Mazda, the creator of light and life, law, order and goodness, and Anrō Mainyūs, the founder of darkness, evil and death. Each was surrounded by a court of spiritual beings kindred to himself, his messengers and agents in the world (see Persian Religion [Ancient]). Of all these religious philosophies, only those of Assyria and Babylon, and of Persia, are likely to have come into any contact with Biblical thought. The former have some affinity with the accounts of creation and the flood in Gen; and the influence of the latter may be traced in the dualism and angelology and demonology of later Judaism, and again in the gnostic systems that grew up in the Christian church, and through both channels it was perpetuated in a dualistic influence on the strata of Christian thought down through the Middle Ages.

(2) Speculative philosophy belongs mainly to Western thought. It arose in Greece about the beginning of the 6th cent. BC. It began with the problem of the general nature of being, or ontology. But it was soon forced to consider the conditions of knowing anything at all, or to epistemology. These two studies constitute metaphysics, a term often used as synonymous with philosophy in the stricter sense. Speculation about ideal truth again led to inquiries as to the ultimate nature of the kindred ideas of the good (ethics) and the beautiful (aesthetic). And as these ideas were related to society as well as to the individual, the Greeks developed theories of the ideal organization of society, in which the true, the good, and the beautiful, or politics and pedagogy. The only branch of speculation to which the Greeks made no appreciable contribution was the philosophy of religion, which is a modern development.

The progressive philosophy in the West is therefore itself naturally into three main periods: (a) ancient, from the 6th cent. BC to the 3d cent. AD, when it is almost exclusively Greek, and goes under the name of Greek thought by Roman writers; (b) mediaval, from the 3d to the 16th cent.; in some of the ruling conceptions of Gr thought were utilized for the speculative systems of Christian dogma, but speculation was mainly confined within the limits of religious orthodoxy; however, some independent Arabian and Jewish speculations; (c) modern, from the 16th cent. to the present time, in which thought becomes free again to speculate on all the problems presented by experience, though it only realized its liberty fully in the hands of Locke, Hume and Kant.
2. Greek Philosophy

During the last two centuries BC, Gr thought spread so widely that it came to dominate the cultured thought of the world into which Christianity entered, and it would have been strange if no trace of its influence were found in the NT. In the first stage of its development, from Thales to Socrates, there was an attempt to explain all things in empirical terms. Pythagoras, Democritus, and Epicurus, attempted to explain the nature of reality by reducing the phenomenal world into some one of its elements. Socrates changed its center of gravity, and definitely raised the problems of morality and knowledge to the position of first importance. His principles were developed by Plato into a complex and many-sided system which, more than any other, has influenced all subsequent thought. He united ultimate reality and the highest good into one supreme principle or idea which he called the Good, and also God. It was the essence, archetype and origin of all wisdom, goodness and beauty. It communicated itself as intermediary archetypal ideas to produce all individual things. So that the formative principles of the material and moral and intellectual. But he had to make all things out of preexisting matter, which is essentially evil, and which therefore was refractory and hostile to the Good. That is why it did not make a perfect world. Plato's system was rife with an irreconcilable dualism of mind and body, spirit and matter, good and evil. And his mediating ideas could not bridge the gulf, because they belonged only to the side of the ideal. Aristotle was Plato's disciple, and he started from Plato's ideas in his presumptions, but endeavored to transcend his dualism. He thus applied himself to a closer and more accurate study of actual experience, and added much to the knowledge of the physical world. He organized and classified the methods and contents of knowledge and created the science of logic, which in the Christian Middle Ages became the chief instrument of the great systematic theologians of the church. He tried to bring Plato's ideas "down from heaven," and to represent them as the creative and formative principles within the world, which evolved as a system of development, rising by spiritual gradations from the lower to the higher forms, and culminating in God, who is the uncaused cause of all things. But underneath all the forms still remained matter as an antithetical element and Aristotle rather conceived than solved the dualism of Plato.

Meanwhile, the moral principles of Socrates were being developed with a more directly ethical interest, by the Cyrenaics and Epicureans, into a system of Hedonism, and, by the Cynics and Stoics, into a doctrine of intuitive right and duty, resting inconsistently upon a pantheistic and materialistic view of the universe. But the spiritual and ethical elements in Stoicism became only second to Platonism in the preparation of the Gr world for Christianity. During the last two and a half centuries BC, Gr philosophy showed signs of rapid decline. On the one hand, Pyrrho and his school propounded a thoroughgoing skepticism which denied the possibility of all knowledge whatsoever. On the other hand, the older schools, no longer served by creative minds, tended to merge their ideas into a common eclecticism which its teachers reduced into an empty and formal dogmatism. The most fruitful and fateful product of Gr thought in this period was its amalgamation with Jewish and oriental ideas in the great cosmopolitan centers of the Gr world. There are evidences that this process was going on in the cities of Asia, Syria and Egypt, but the only extensive account of it remaining is found in the works of Philo, the Jewish philosopher of Alexandria (see Philo Judaeus). He tried to graft Plato's idealism upon Hebraic monotheism.

He starts with Plato's two principles, pure being or God, and preexisting matter. In his endeavor to bridge the gulf between them, he interposed between God and the world the powers of God, goodness and justice; and to gather those into a final unity he created his conception of the Logos of God. In the formation of this conception, he merged together the Platonic idea of the good, the Stoic world of Jesus, and a number of the Greek ideas and the gospels of Jesus, the world, the name, of God, the heavenly man and the earth, and was thus the one mediator between God and the world. Christian thought laid hold of this idea, and employed it as its master-category for the interpretation of the person of Christ (see Logos). The there is no speculative philosophy in the OT nor any certain trace of its influence. Its writers and actors never set themselves to pursue knowledge in the abstract and for its own sake. They always sought for in Judaism moral purposes. But moral activity proceeds on the intellectual presuppositions and interpretations of the experiences within which it acts. Hence we find in the OT accounts of the origin and course of the philosophy of history and its institutions, and interpretations of men's moral and religious experiences. They all center in God, issue from His sovereign will, and express the realization of His purpose of righteousness in the world (see God).

(1) All nature originated in God's creative act (Gen 2) or word (Gen 1). In later literature the whole course and order of Nature, its beauty and bounty, as well as its wonders and terrors, are represented as the acts of God's creative wisdom (Ps 19, 29, 50, 65, 68, 104, etc). But His action in Nature is always subordinated to His moral ends.

(2) Similarly, the course and events of the history of Israel and her neighbors are the acts of Jeh's will (Am 1; 2; Isa 41 2; 43 3; 45 9.10.14). In the historical books of S and K, and still more of Ch, all the events of history are represented as the acts of God's moral government. In a more general way, the whole of history is set forth as a series of covenants that God, of His free grace, made with man (see Covenants). The Noahic covenant fixed the order of Nature. The covenant with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob accounted for the origin and choice of Israel. The covenants with Moses and Aaron established the Law and the priesthood, and the covenants made with David and his kingdom, the future lies in the new covenant (Jer 31 31-35). God's covenants were all acts of His sovereign and gracious will.

(3) In post-exilic times, new experiences, and perhaps new intellectual influences, drove the Jews to probe deeper into the problem of existence. They adhered to the cardinal principle of Hebraic thought, that God's sovereign will, working out His purpose of righteousness, was the first cause of all things (see Righteousness). But they found it difficult to coordinate this belief with their other ideas, in two ways. Ethical monotheism tended to become an abstract deism which removed God altogether out of the world. And the catastrophes that befell the nation, in the exile and after, raised the problem of evil and evil over against God's goodness and righteousness. Therefore in the Wisdom lit., we find some conscious speculation on these subjects (see Wisdom).

(a) The Book of Job discusses the problem of evil, and repudiates the idea that life and history are the process of God's will and purpose (see Economic Purpose). It leads to the conclusion that all phenomenal existence is vanity. Yet ultimate philosophy is not pessimistic for it finds an abiding reality and hope in the fear of God.
and in the moral life (12 13-14). The same type of thinking underlies Philemon. Both concepts have been attributed to the circle of the Sadducees. Some would find in them traces of the influence of Epicureanism.

The second concept, enhanced by the development of Judaism, is gathered up into a conception or personification which is called "God". His activity is to make known the existence of God in the world, and man's instructress and guide (ch 8).

(c) The teaching of the Pharisees esp. reveals their tendency to define or delimit in later Judaism, they interposed between God and the world various sorts of intermediaries. The name of God, the glory of God and a host of angels, good and bad. They also fostered a new hope of the future, under the double form of the kingdom of God and the resurrection and immortality. How far these tendencies were due to the situation of Jewish social life is a matter for further research.

(4) Among the Hellenistic Jews in Alexandria, Aristobulus, the authors of Wisd and 4 Macc, and preeminently Philo, all deal with the two chief problems of Judaism, dualism and evil. They approach them under the direct influence of Greek thought. The idea of wisdom was merged into the Gr conception of the Logos, and so it becomes the mediator of God's thought and activity in the world.

Philosophy appears in the NT as intuitive, speculative and eclectic. (1) Jesus Christ came to fulfill the law and the prophets, and, out of His filial consciousness of God, He propounded answers to the practical demands of His time. His doctrine of God the Father was a philosophy of Nature and life which transcended all dualism. In the kingdom of heaven, the good would ultimately prevail over the evil. The law of love expressed the ideal of life for man as individual, and in his relation to society and to God, the supreme and ultimate reality. This teaching was given in the form of revelation, without any trace of speculation.

(2) The apostolic writings built upon the teaching and person of Jesus Christ. Their ruling ideas are the doctrines which He taught and embodied. In Paul and John, they are realized as mystical experiences which are expressed in doctrines of universal love. But we may also discover in the apostolic writings at least three strands of speculative philosophy. (a) Paul employed arguments from natural theology, similar to those of the Stoics (Acts 14 15-17; 17 22-23; Rom 1 19 ff), which involved the principles of the cosmological and teleological arguments. (b) John employs the Philenic term "Logos" to interpret the person of Christ in His universal relation to God, man and the world; and the main elements of Philo's scheme are clearly present in his doctrine, though here it is not an abstract conception standing between God and man, but a living person uniting the two (Jn 1 1-18).

Although the term "Logos" is not mentioned, in this sense, in Paul or He, the Philenic conception has been employed by both writers (Rom 5 8; 8 29; 1 Cor 16 24.25; 2 Cor 5 18.19; Phil 2 6; Col 1 15-17; 2 10; He 1 1-3.5.6). Paul also expresses his conception of Christ as the manifestation of God under the category of wisdom (1 Cor 1 20; 2 7; Eph 1 8; Col 2 3). (c) Both in Paul and He appear original speculations designed to interpret individual experience and human history as they contribute to God's purpose in Christ. Paul's interpretation consists of a series of parallel antitheses, flesh and spirit, sin and righteousness, law and grace, works and faith, Adam and Christ. But the author of He adopts the Platonic view that the world of history and phenomena is but the shadow of a succession of true and eternal reality which lies behind it, and which partially expresses itself through it.

(3) In the one place in which the term philosophy appears in the NT (Col 2 8), it seems to mean "subtle dialectics and profuse speculation, ... combined with a mystic cosmogony such as..." (Lightfoot, ad loc.), the first beginnings of Gnosticism in the Christian church. Paul warns his readers against it, as he also does the Corinthians against the "wisdom of God" (1 Cor 2 6, 6); 2 5.6). A similar tendency may be in view in the warning to Timothy against false doctrines (1 Tim 1 4; 1 4; 2 1 Tim 1 14.16 ff). But with the true spirit of philosophy, as the pursuit of truth, and the endeavor to grasp the nature and truth under natural and clearly the nature of reality, the spirit and work of the NT writers were in complete accord.


PHINEES, fin'ees (Phineas, Phiinês, Phineás; B [Swete], Finitely, Phinehas [1 Esd 8 31]).

(1) Phinehas, son of Eleazar, son of Aaron (1 Esd 5 5; 8 2.29; 2 Esd 1 2; 1 Macc 2 26; Sir 46 23).

(2) The father of Achias and son of Heli (Elia), a descendant of (1), and one of Ezra's progenitors (2 Esd 1 2); but this link is not found in Ezra's genealogy (1 Esd 8 13). In 2 Esd 1 4 Ch 6, and its insertion in 2 Esd 2 1 is a mistake, since Ezra's descent was from Eleazar, while this Phineas (Phinehas) was a descendant of Ithamar, the youngest son of Aaron.

(3) A Levite, the father of Eleazar (1 Esd 8 63) "Phinehas" of Ezr 3 33. But it is just possible that the well-known Eleazar (1) is referred to, and not another and different Phinees.

(4) AV = RV "Phineas" (1 Esd 5 31).

PHINEHAS, fin'as-as, az, fin'as-has, -has (πηνας, mouth of brasses):

(1) Son of Eleazar and grandson of Aaron (Ex 6 25; cf 1 Ch 6 4; Ezr 7 5, where he is seen to be an ancestor of Ezra). He took a leading part in cleansing Israel from worship at Shittim. He there punished the brazen lily of the priestess, the woman bearing the ark of the covenant, of which Prince of Simeon, by slaying both him and the Midianite woman he had brought into camp (Nu 25 6-18). This incident is referred to in Ps 106 30.31 (cf 1 Macc 2 26.54; Sir 46 23.24). As priest he accompanied Joshua and was one of the leaders of the Midian (Nu 31 6). He was chief of the Korahite Levites (1 Ch 9 20), and succeeded his father as high priest. While he was in that office the civil war with Benjamin occurred, and it was he who delivered the oracle's decision to fight Benjamin (Jgs 20 28 ff). His faithful services secured to his house the succession of the priesthood (Nu 26 11-13). He was sent as ambassador to inquire into the reported idolatry of Reuben, Gad and part of Manasseh (Josh 22 13 ff 30-32). According to LXX he was buried with his father in Ephraim on the hill Gibeah Phinehas (see Josh 24 33). His character was marked with strict moral indignation and fine integrity.

(2) The younger son of Elei (1 S 1 3; 2 Esd 1 2, "Phineas"). See Hopni and Philaenae.

(3) Father of a priest named Eleazar (Ezr 8 33; cf ver 2; 1 Esd 8 63, "Phineas"). HENRY WALLACE

PHINOB, fin'-ob (Φινωβ, Phineob; AV: Phineas): Name of one of the families of temple-servants who went up from Babylon with Zerubbabel (1 Esd 5 31) = "Paseah" of Ezr 2 49; Neh 7 51.

PHLEGON, fle'gon, flag'on (Φληγόν, Phlegon): The name of a Roman Christian to whom Paul
sent greetings (Rom 16: 14). Of him nothing is known.

PHOEBE, φηβή (Φήβη, Φηβή; AV Phoebe): Described by St. Paul as (1) "our sister," (2) "who is a servant of the church that is at Cenchreae," (3) "a helper of many, and of mine own self" (Rom 16: 12). (1) "Our [Christian] sister": Paul calls the loving husband and wife "the brother or the sister" (1 Cor 7:15), and also says, "Have we no right to lead about a wife that is a sister?" (1 Cor 9:5 m.). The church was a family. (2) The Greek word τρις "servant" is diákonos. "Servant" is vague, and "deaconess" is too generalized. In the later church there was an order of deaconesses for special work among women, owing to the peculiar circumstances of oriental life, but we have no reason to believe there was such an order at this early period. If Phoebe had voluntarily devoted herself "to minister unto the saints" by means of charity and hospitality, she would be called diákonos. (3) The Greek word προστίτις τρις "helper" is better "patroness." The mss. is "the title of a citizen in Athens who took charge of the interests of clients and persons who wished to sue in the law courts. In the early Christian community the appearance of clients under a patron, and probably the community of Cenchreae met in the house of Phoebe. She also devoted her influence and means to the assistance of the more rather than the less, and that part, Paul was among those whom she benefitted. Gifford thinks some special occasion is meant, and that Paul refers to this in Acts 18:18. The vow "seems to point to a deliverance from danger or sickness" in which Phoebe was involved on that occasion.

It is generally assumed that this letter was taken to Rome by Phoebe, these verses introducing her to the Christian community. In commending her, Paul asks that the Rom Christians "receive her in the Lord," i.e. give her a Christian welcome, and that they "assist her in whatsoever matter she may have need" of them (Rom 16: 12).

S. F. HUNTER

PHOENICE, φήνις'-ία, PHOENICIANS, φήνικές, φήνικής. See PHOENIX

PHOENICIA, φήνικ'ία, PHOENICIA. See PHOENICIA, "land of dates, or palm trees," from photo, "see," the "date-palm." It occurs in the Bible

1. The only in Acts 11:19; 15:3; 21:2, the

Phoenician land being generally designated as the "coast" or "borders of Tyre and Sidon" (Mt 15:21; Mk 7:24-31; Lk 6:17). In the OT we find it included in the land belonging to the Canaanites or to Sidon (Gen 10:19; 49:13; Josh 11:8; 1 K 17:9). The limits of P. were indefinite almost from the beginning, used by change writers including the coast line from Mt. Cassius on the N. to Gaza or beyond on the S., a distance of some 380 miles, or about 400 miles if we include the sweep of indentations and bays and the outstretching of the promontories. But in the stricter sense, it did not extend beyond Gabala (see Jethro) on the N., and Mt. Carmel on the S., or some 150 miles. The name was probably first applied to the region opposite Cyprus, from Gabala to Aradus and Marathus, where the date-palm was observed, and then, as it was still growing in places farther S., it was applied to that region also. The palm tree is common on the coins of both Arados and

Tyre, and it still grows on the coast, though not in great abundance. The width of the land also was indefinite, not extending inland beyond the crest of the two ranges of mountains, the Baryulus (Nusairi Mountains) and the Lebanon, which run parallel to the coast and leave but little space between them and the sea for the greater portion of their length. It is doubtful whether the Phoenicians occupied the mountain tracts, but they must have dominated them on the western slopes, since they derived from them timber for their ships and temples. The width of the country probably did not exceed 25 or 30 miles at the most, and in many places it was much less, a very small territory, in fact, but one that played a distinguished role in ancient times.

There are few harbors on the whole coast, none in the modern sense, since what few bays and inlets there are afford but slight shelter to modern ships, but those of the ancients found sufficient protection in a number of places, esp. by means of artificial harbors, and the facility with which they could be drawn upon the sandy beach in winter when navigation was suspended. The promontories are few and do not extend inland to a great extent; in fact, they have been ingeniously described by the ancient writers (see Ladder of Tyre). The promontory of Carmel was, as it were, a long finger of land reaching from Tyre quite an extensive bay, which extends to Acre. The promontory rises to a height of 500 ft. or more near the sea and to more than double that elevation in its course to the S.E.

Mt. Lebanon, which forms the background of P. for about 100 miles, is a most striking feature of the landscape. It rises to a height of 10,200 ft. in the highest point, E. of Tripolis, and to 8,500 in Jebel Sannin, E. of Beirut, and the average elevation is from 3,500 to 4,000 ft. It is rent by deep gorges where the numerous streams have cut their way to the sea, furnishing most varied and picturesque scenery. It was originally heavily wooded with cedar, oak, and pine trees, which are still found in considerable numbers, but by far the larger part of the mountain has been denuded of forests, and the slopes have been extensively terraced for the cultivation of vines and fruit trees and the mulberry for silk culture. The plains along the coast are not extensive, but generally very fertile and bear abundant crops of wheat, barley and other cereals, where not given to the culture of the mulberry, orange, lemon, fig, apricot and other small fruits. In its greatest extent P. included the broad plain of Sharon and that of Acre, between Carmel and that city and a portion of the region watered by the Kishon, but the plains of P., strictly speaking, are much more restricted. They are: the plain of Tyre, long but narrow, extending from Ras el-'Abyadh to Sarepta; the plain of Sidon extending from Sarepta to the Bestremus (Nahr el-Auly); the plain of Beirut (Berytus) between the extensive sand dunes along the shore and the rocky cape on the W. and the foot of Lebanon, 10 or 12 miles long but only one or two wide, containing one of the largest olive groves in Syria; the very small plain of Tripolis, including that city and its port; and, the most extensive of all, the plain of Marathus, extending from Ark to Aratus or even beyond, including the river Ch獟is (Nahr el-Khobz). These plains furnished only a portion of the food needed by the inhabitants who were more or less dependent on their neighbors for it (1 K 5:11; Acts 12:20).

The rivers of P. are comparatively short and small; the Litani rises in the Buka', between Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon, and finds its way in a deep and narrow gorge between Lebanon and Mt. Her-
mon to the S. and finally turns westward and reaches the sea a few miles N. of Tyre, where it is called the Kasantikeh. About 12 miles N. of Beirut is the Dog River (Lycus), a very short stream but noted for the famous pass at its mouth, where Egypt, Assyra and Bab kings engraved their monuments; and on its north bank is the Oasis of the Adonis (Nahr Ibrāhīm), which comes down from 'Ajlūn (Ahecheh, Josh 13 4), noted for the rites of Venus and Adonis (see TAMMUZ), and the Eleusis, already mentioned, which runs through the valley between Baryulus and Lebanon and provides these two mountains with water within the desert. The other rivers are very short, but furnish a perennial water-supply to the coast dwellers.

The products of the land, as well as the climate, are very varied on account of the difference in elevation of the tracts suitable to culture, ranging in temperature from the semi-tropical to Alpine. How far the ancients cultivated the mountain sides we do not know, but they certainly profited largely by the forests of cedar and pine, esp. the former, which was the material for ship-building and architectural purposes and was highly prized, not only by the Phoenicians, but by Egyptians, Assyrians and Babylonians, who transported it to their own countries for buildings. The mineral products are found in abundance, and the Phoenicians are credited with the colonies and other lands for what they needed of these.

The narrowness of the land and the difficulty of expansion on account of the lofty mountain ranges and the continuance of the tribes throughout the interior led the Phoenicians to turn seaward for an outlet to their increasing population. We have only one instance of their attempt to colonize the Hinterland, and that ended in disaster (c. 1250 B.C.). Tyre, was not pleased with Solomon's gift of 20 cities in Galilee, probably not desiring to assume responsibility for their defense. It is likely that they founded colonies and the dominion of the sea was more inviting to them, and they found room for expansion in the islands and on the coast of the Mediterranean, where they established colonies far and wide. Their first over-sea possessions were in Cyprus, the coast of which they occupied in the 2nd millennium B.C. probably about 1500. On the southern coast they planted various colonies, such as Cyrtum, Idalium, Phoebus, and on the eastern, Salmis, Anmacha and Sidon, and, in the interior, Tharros, Elusa, Phocas, and on the southern coast of Cretica, and most of the islands of the Aegean. Their presence is recorded by Homer, and it was a Phoenician legend that records travels with the person of Cadmus, the reputed son of Agenor, king ofthumbs, Phoenicia. But it is doubtful whether they really colonized the mainland of Greece. They were more attracted by the lands farther to the W.

The greatest of their colonies was in Africa. They occupied Utica first, probably in the 12th cent. B.C., and others in the same year, until in the 9th cent. Great Carthage was founded, which was destined to become the richest and most powerful of all the great rival cities of the Mediterranean. The Phoenician colonies and the story of the city of Elusa, or Dido, the reputed Tyrian queen who led her followers to found what is perhaps the most romantic of all the legendary colonies, among which Baal is conspicuous. Other points along the coast were occupied, such as the island of Sicily, where Phoenician colonies were established on the south coast of Crete, and most of the islands of the Aegean. Their presence is recorded by Homer, and it was a Phoenician legend that records travels with the person of Cadmus, the reputed son of Agenor, the kingdom of the Thracians. Phoenicia was a place of trade as well as of culture; and the Phoenicians had sailed beyond the Pillars of Hercules into the ocean. But in their commercial dealings they were often unscrupulous, and their greed of gain often led them to take unfair advantage of the barbarous races with whom they traded. Their commerce was often as large as that of the Greek empire of the 4th and 3rd centuries B.C., and they were among the articles of commerce which furnished the materials of their extended commerce. They exhibited a boldness and audacity in braving the perils of the sea in their little ships, which, for the age, demands our admiration. They were the first who dared to sail out of sight of land, and it is probably that they were the first who crossed the Atlantic Ocean and reached the coast of America, as is stated in the Old Testament.

Their colonies were mostly factories for the exchange of their manufactured articles for the products of the lands they visited. They cared little about building up new states or for founding their colonies as a base of barbarous tribes and imparting to them culture. In this they were far surpassed by the Phoenicians, who profoundly modified the peoples and lands with which they came in contact.

The Phoenicians were the same as the Canaanites, under which name they are known in the OT, as well as by Sidonians (Gen 10 19; Nu 13 29). They were Semites if we may judge by their language and characteristics. It is true that, in Gen 10 6 Canaan is called a son of Ham, but it is also true that the language of Canaan is identified with Hebr. (Ish 19 18). If the early Phoenicians spoke a different tongue, they entirely lost it before their contact with the Hebrews. Their writings and all the references to them in ancient authorities show that their language was purely Sem. As to their origin and the time of their migration to the Syrian coast, it is more difficult to determine. Herodotus (i.2; vii.89) says that they lived at first on the Erythraean Sea, which is identified with the Pers Gulf, and modern authorities have not found evidence to support the statement that they were not the aborigines of the country, and must have come in with some of the various migrations from the E., which we know, from Egypt and Bab monuments, occurred in the 3d, perhaps in the 4th, millennium B.C. Some of them appear in Syria as early as the 1Vth Egyptian Dynasty, about 3000 B.C., and we may fairly conjecture that the Canaanites were in possession of the seacoast as early as 2500 B.C. It is possible that they were among the Hyksos invaders of Egypt after 1700 B.C.

That the Phoenicians took to the sea at a very early date and became the most skillful mariners of the ancient world is certain. Their enterprise in this direction is attested by classic writers, and the references to it in the OT are numerous. This was coupled with great industry and skill in the manufacture of the various articles which furnished the materials of their extended commerce. They exhibited a boldness and audacity in braving the perils of the sea in their little ships, which, for the age, demands our admiration. They were the first who dared to sail out of sight of land, and it is probably that they were the first who crossed the Atlantic Ocean and reached the coast of America, as is stated in the Old Testament.
position for their enterprise and skill in carrying on their trade, and in being the pioneers of civilization in many of the Mediterranean lands, esp. by their introduction of alphabetical writing, which was adaptable by all for its contributions to the culture of the ancient world.

(1) The Phoenicians were celebrated for their textile fabrics of silk, wool, linen and cotton. The materials of the last three were obtained from Syria and Egypt, but the silk came from the East. The Phoenicians, who were acquainted with the East, had obtained the silk stuff valuable for its fineness and beauty, and the dyers of these fabrics by a process invented by the Phoenicians, and the madder and dyes of the ancient world were unequalled by the dyers of the Tyrian purple famous throughout the world. The finer qualities of these fabrics were so precious that only the wealthy, or kings and princes, could obtain it, and it became at last a synonym of royalty. This dye was obtained from the shell-fish which was abundant in the Mediterranean, esp. along the Phoenician coast, species of the Murex and the Bucinum. The mode of manufacture is not definitely known and was probably kept a secret by the Phoenicians. At least they had a monopoly of the dye, which was exported from Tyre.

(2) Glass was another well-known product of the country, and although not invented by the Phoenicians as formerly supposed, it was made in large quantities and exported to all countries about the Mediterranean, by the Phoenicians.

(3) Pottery was also an article of manufacture and export, and some of the examples of their work found in Cyprus show considerable skill in the art of decoration as well as making. In this, however, they were far surpassed by the Greeks.

(4) Bronze was a specialty of the Phoenicians, and they were the first to introduce the use of tin, which they controlled the sources of supply of the copper and tin used in its manufacture. The remains of bronze manufactures are numerous, such as arms for offence and defence, knives, toilet articles, axes, sickles, cups, patrons, and various other household utensils. Articles for artistic purposes are not of high value, although the pillars named Jachin and Boaz, the molten sea, the bases, lavers and other articles cast by Hiram of Tyre for the temple of Solomon are the finest specimens of Phoenician metal, but some of the minor artifacts exhibited considerable artistic merit.

The range of their trade was much wider than is indicated by Ezekiel. We know they reached the Scilly Isles in Britain, and probably the Baltic, whither they went for amber, though this might have been brought overland to the Adriatic and received into the West by ships that sailed along the western coast of Africa as far as Cape Non, and perhaps farther. The Phoenicians expanded their activities throughout the Mediterranean and the Red Sea.

The ships in which the Phoenicians made these voyages were small as compared with the great vessels of the present day, but the largest known in their age, as we may infer from the long voyages they made. Their superior vessels were known to classical writers. In the famous poem of Xerxes to Greece the Phoenician ships exceeded all others in speed, and they were no less skilful than we know from illustrations upon the coins.

The ancients attributed the invention of the alphabet to the Phoenicians. This is now regarded as doubtful, and there are no reliable data for determining what people first analyzed speech to its ultimate elements, but to the Phoenicians belongs...
the merit of bringing the invention to the knowledge of the western world. It is quite certain that the alphabets of Western Asia, and those of Europe were derived from the Phoenician and these characters. This is what we should have expected from their wide commercial relations. The alphabetic writing was in fact one of their chief and most important of all. The world owes a great debt to this people for this invaluable aid to literature, science and culture (see ALPHABET).

The Phoenician alphabet comprises 22 letters and is deficient in vowels, which were left to the reader supplied by the reader. This defect is common to the Sem alphabets, but was soon remedied when the Greeks adopted the Phoenician. Some of the letters have to serve for two sounds, such as the letters for or $\alpha$, for example, and the signs for $\beta$, for example, are a redundant sign for the sound of $\alpha$. Also the sounds of $\omega$ and $\nu$ are unrepresented. The origin of the letters is probably to be found in the hieroglyphic signs for words and syllables used by the Egyptians and others, since the similarity of some of them to these signs is evident, but in some cases it is more likely that the Phoenicians adopted hieroglyphics of their own. Thus the first letter, aleph, which means "ox," was evidently derived from the picture of an ox's head and then reduced to a conventional form.

The Phoenician alphabet and language were common to the Canaanitish tribes and the Hebrews, as we learn from the Bible. By the Phoenician alphabet the remains of their language are very scanty, mostly inscriptions, and these generally very brief. The longest inscription in Phoenician is that in the temple of Asman, and show the Phoenician character and style in its best form. Only two works of any length are known to us by Phoenician authors. The first is the History of Sennacherib, of Nineveh, the second of which Philo of Byblus claims to have translated from the Phoenician original. This, however, is doubted, and both the story of Tyre and the account of many of the coins, as well as its symbol, the club, since he was identified with Hercules. Herodotus describes his temple at Tyre to which he attributes great antiquity, 2,900 years before his time. Dagon (תֵּאָגָן, dāghôn) seems to have been the tutelary deity of Arvad, his head appearing on the early coins of the city. He seems to have been regarded as the god of agriculture by the Phoenicians, rather than of fishing as generally supposed. Adonis (אָדָו, adôn, "lord") was regarded as the son of Cinyras, a mythic king of Gebal and the husband of Ashreth. The myth of his death by the wild bear led to the peculiar rites of celebrating it, instituted by the women of Gebal at Apheca and on the river named after him (see TAMMUZ). Esmin (אֶסֶמִּין, esmîn) one of the sons of Siddik, the father of the Cabir, was esp. honored at Sidon and Beirut. At Sidon a great temple was built in his honor, the ruins of which have been recently explored and various inscriptions found dedicating it to him. His name signifies "the eighth," i.e. the eighth son of Siddik, the others being the Cabir, or Great Ones, who were regarded as presiding over ships and navigation, and as such were worshipped in many places, although their special seat was Beirut. Although they were called "Great" they are represented as dwarfs, and an image of one of them was placed on the prow, or

"lord" or "master"; Baal-samin, "lord of heaven"; Elun, "supreme"; &c. These terms imply either one God or one who is supreme among the gods and their ruler. But this belief was changed before the Phoenicians came into contact with the Hebrews, and polytheism took its place, though their gods were less numerous than among most polytheistic peoples. One of the most important of them all was Baal, who was regarded as the God of the gods and their ruler.

Baal (Phoen. בָּאַל, ba'al) was the chief deity and was universally worshipped, being usually designated by the title in each place: Baal of Tyre or Baal-Tarq, Baal-Sidon, Baal-Tars (Tarsus), Baal-bek, etc. He was regarded as the god of the generative principle in Nature, and his statues were sometimes flanked by bulls. He was identified with Zeus, and appears on the coins under the Greek type of Zeus, seated on a throne, holding an eagle in the outstretched right hand and a scepter in the left. Sometimes his head is encircled with rays showing him to be the sun-god.

Ashreth (Phoen. אֲשַׁרְתָּה, ashërôth) was the great Nature-goddess, the Magna Mater, queen of heaven (see GEN 14:18). She was a Canaanite deity, so she was often represented under the lunar aspect, Ashreth-karnaim, "Ashreth of the two horns" (Gen 14:5). Sometimes she is represented holding the dove, the symbol of fecundity, of which she was the goddess. She was commonly identified with Aphrodite or Venus. She, like Baal, had temples everywhere, and kings were sometimes her high priests, and her worship was too often accompanied with orgies of the most corrupt kind, as at Apheca (see ASHTORETH).

Among the other gods we may mention: El, or Elohim (אֵל, 'el), originally the designation of the supreme God, but afterward a subordinate deity who became the special deity of Byblus (Gebal), and was regarded by the Greeks as the same as Kronos.

Melkarth (fil, melkarth, "king of the city") originally was the same as Baal, representing one aspect of that god, but later a separate deity, the patron god of Tyre. He was identified on many of its coins, as well as his symbol, the club, since he was identified with Hercules. Herodotus describes his temple at Tyre to which he attributes great antiquity, 2,900 years before his time. Dagon (תֵּאָגָן, dāghôn) seems to have been the tutelary deity of Arvad, his head appearing on the early coins of the city. He seems to have been regarded as the god of agriculture by the Phoenicians, rather than of fishing as generally supposed. Adonis (אָדָו, adôn, "lord") was regarded as the son of Cinyras, a mythic king of Gebal and the husband of Ashreth. The myth of his death by the wild bear led to the peculiar rites of celebrating it, instituted by the women of Gebal at Apheca and on the river named after him (see TAMMUZ). Esmin (אֶסֶמִּין, esmîn) one of the sons of Siddik, the father of the Cabir, was esp. honored at Sidon and Beirut. At Sidon a great temple was built in his honor, the ruins of which have been recently explored and various inscriptions found dedicating it to him. His name signifies "the eighth," i.e. the eighth son of Siddik, the others being the Cabir, or Great Ones, who were regarded as presiding over ships and navigation, and as such were worshipped in many places, although their special seat was Beirut. Although they were called "Great" they are represented as dwarfs, and an image of one of them was placed on the prow, or
stern, of each Phoen galley. The goddess Tanith (Tyche, tanith) occupied a lofty place in the pantheon, since in inscriptions she takes the precedence over Baal when the two names occur together. She, esp. honored at Carthage and to her was ascribed the excites mariners, such as "the highest of the gods"; "the mistress of the elements," etc. Besides some other gods of less note originally worshipped by the Phoenicians, they introduced some foreign deities into their pantheon. Thus Poseidon appears frequently in the coins of Beirut and became its patron deity in Rom times; Isis and her temple at Gebal are likewise represented on its coins, the Dioscuri or their symbols on those of Tripolis and Beirut, etc.

The corrupt nature of the Phoen worship has been referred to. It was also cruel, the custom of human sacrifices being common and carried to an extent unheard of among other peoples, such as the horrible sacrifice of 200 noble youths at Carthage when besieged by Agathocles. The sacrifice was by burning, the victim being placed in the arms of the statue of the god, heated for the purpose. In P. this god was Melkarth, or Molech, and the custom is denounced in the OT (Lev 20:2-5), but other gods were worshiped in this way. The letter of one of the Phoenicians was undoubtedly deep, but was corrupt and depraved.

The political history of P. is that of the towns and cities belonging to it. The country as a whole had no centralized government, but the city states formed federations and leagues of varying size, with the land as a political unit, which it never was.

The cities first came into notice in the period of the Judges, before the 10th cent. BC under Thothmes III. This king subdued most of the Phoen cities, or received their submission, in his numerous campaigns to Syria, and the Egypt rule continued with more or less interruption until the end of the 19th Dynasty, or about 300 years. During this time Arvad seems to have exercised the hegemony in the N., and Sidon in the S., with Gebal controlling the middle region. The Am Tab reveals many facts concerning the condition of things while the Egypt power was declining in the latter part of the XVIIIth Dynasty, esp. in the reign of Amenhotep IV (Ikhnaton). The rise of the Amorite and Hittite power in the N. threatened these cities, which were under Egypt governors, and the latter were called upon their suzerain for aid, which was not given, and they fell, one after another, into the hands of the enemy. Rameses II restored Egypt rule, but his successors of the XXth Dynasty could not maintain it, and the invasion of tribes from the W. and N., called the Paleset, or Philis, by land and sea, though repelled by Rameses III, continued to increase until the Egypt domination was broken, and the coast towns resumed their independence about the middle of the 12th cent. BC. Sidon came to the front among the chief cities of P., and is referred to by Joshua as "Great Sidon" (Jos 11:8).

Homer also mentions Sidon frequently, but makes no reference to Tyre. The latter city was certainly in existence in his day, but had not come to the front as the leading city in the mind of the Greeks. Yet it was a fortified city in the time of Joshua (19:29), and the king of Tyre is among the correspondents mentioned in the Am Tab. It seems to have taken precedence of Sidon when the latter was attacked by the Phlias of Askelon, and the inhabitants were compelled to flee. In all events Tyre exercised the hegemony in P. by the time David came to the throne, and had probably obtained it a century or two before, and held it until P. became subject to Assyria in the 9th cent. BC. Assur-nazir-pal first came into contact with P., which submitted to tribute, between 877 and 860 BC, and this subjection continued until the downfall of Assyria in the latter part of the 7th cent. BC. The subjection was nominal only for more than a century, the cities retaining their kings and managing their own affairs with no interference from the Assyrians as long as they paid the tribute. But with the advent of Tiglath-pileser in Syria, about 740 BC, conditions changed, and the Phoen towns were subjected to severe treatment, and some of the dynasts were driven from their cities and Assy governors appointed in their places. Their oppression caused revolts, and Elulaeus of Tyre united Sidon and the cities to the S. in a league to resist the encroachments of Tiglath-pileser and his successor Sargon. While the latter resisted, although the Assyrian gained over to his side Sidon, Acre, and some other towns and had the assistance of their fleets to make an attack upon the island city. The attack failed completely, and Shalmaneser III, in his report which he maintained for a quarter of a century, regaining control of the towns that had fallen away and also of Cyprus. Sargon (722-705 BC) let P. alone, but Sennacherib (705-681) determined to punish the king of Tyre and prepared an army of 200,000 men for the war with P. Elulaeus was afraid and fled to Cyprus, but his towns dared to resist and Sennacherib had to reduce them one after another, but did not succeed in taking Tyre itself. He set over the conquered territory a certain Tubaal, probably a Phoen, who paid him tribute. He also took tribute from Gebal and Aradus, which indicates that all of P. was subject to him, as these two cities probably controlled all that was not under Tyre. In the time of Esarhaddon (681-680) Sidon revolted under Abd-Melkarth, who was caught and beheaded, the city sacked, and the inhabitants either killed or carried into captivity, and it was repeopled by captives from the E. At a later date (672), when Asshur-nazir-pal set out for Egypt, Baal, the vassal king of Tyre, revolted and refused to aid him, but afterward submitted either to Esarhaddon or to his son Asshur-bani-pal and assisted the latter in his invasion of Egypt, 605 BC. Four years later, however, we find the Assy king besieging Tyre and punishing Baal by making him give his daughter to be a member of the Assyrian's harem. Baal himself was left on his throne. The same fate was the lot of the king of Aradus, and Ascho (Acre) was also punished.

The frequent rebellions of the Phoen towns show their love of independence and a sturdy resistance to oppression. They became freed from the yoke of Assyria probably about 630 BC, when the Medes attacked Nineveh and the Scythian hordes overran all Western Asia. The Phoen cities were fortified and did not suffer very much from the barbarian invasion, and, as Assyria was broken, they resumed their independence. In the struggle which followed between Egypt and Babylon for the mastery of Asia, P. fell to Babylon, a time, on the road of Egypt, but was not oppressed, and her towns prospered, and it was in this period that Tyre attained great wealth and renown as reflected in the Book of Ezek.
although the town on the mainland was destroyed, it is doubtful whether the king of Babylon took the island, for it must be stated that it was a subject of the Persian Empire. P. remained subject to Babylon until empire fell into the hands of the Persians (538), and then accepted the yoke of the latter in the days of Cambyses, if not earlier, but the Pers king does not seem to have used force to gain the adherence of the Phoen cities. P. must have needed their fleets to assist in the attack upon Egypt and secured them without difficulty. They aided him in the conquest of Egypt, but when he asked to proceed against Carthage they refused, and he had to desist. It was too necessary for him to run any risk of alienating it.

This navy was the strongest sea power of the Persians in all their coming wars with Greece. Without its assistance Darius and his successors could with difficulty have invaded that country or held in subjection the western coast of Asia Minor. P. remained faithful to her Persian rulers about 150 years, but when the general revolt of the western satrapies occurred in 302 BC, P. seems to have favored them, but no open rebellion broke out until 351, when Sidon and Tyre joined Tathit II (Ptolemies), both declared her independence and induced most of the Phoen cities to do the same. The Pers garrisons were massacred or driven out. Ochus, the king of Persia, marched with an army of 300,000 infantry and cavalry, the rebel kings, and Tabnit and Sidon in cowardly alarm, betrayed Sidon into his hands, but the citizens set fire to the city and destroyed themselves rather than fall into the hands of Ochus, who, as treacherous as Tabnit, slew the traitors (see Sidon). The other cities were submitted, and P. remained subject to Persia until the time of Alexander the Great. When this conqueror invaded the dominions of Persia and had defeated Darius at Issus, 333 BC, he demanded the submission of the Phoen cities, and all yielded save Tyre. Alexander was obliged to lay siege to it, which cost him 7 months of the severest labor, such was the valor and skill of the Tyrians. The capture of Tyre is reckoned as one of the greatest exploits of this mighty conqueror who stained his record by his cruel treatment of the brave defenders. He massacred the male prisoners and sold the remainder of the inhabitants, to the number of 30,000, into slavery (see Tyre). After the death of Alexander the Phoen cities were subject to Egypt and the Seleucids of Syria, the latter finally obtaining control of all by the victory of Antiochus III over Scopas in 198 BC. From this time on P. formed a part of the Seleucid kingdom until it passed, together with Syria and Pal, into the hands of the Romans. Its cities became the home of many Greeks and its language became largely Gr, as inscriptions and coins testify. The Romans had also much to do in modifying the character of the people, and some towns, Berytus, esp., became largely Roman. P. can hardly be said to have had a separate existence after the Gr invasion.

LITERATURE.—Rawlinson, Hist of Phoenicia; Kenrick, Phoenicia; Movers, Phoeniz; Brested, Hist of Egypt, and Ancient Records; Hughes, Hist of Egypt; Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies; Rogers, Babylon and Assyria; Bever, House of Seleucus; Am Tab; Perrot and Chipiez, Art in Phoenicia.

H. Porter

PHOENIX, fem. of Phoenix (see Phoeniz., AV Phoenix); A harbor in Crete (Acts 27:11). The Acts passage mentions the ship carrying St. Paul and the author of Acts, after it left Myra in Lycia, was prevented by adverse winds from holding a straight course to Italy, and sailed under the lee of Crete, off the promontory of Salamine (κατά Σάλαμον) The ship was then able to make her way along the S. shore of Crete to a harbor called Fair Havens (Kαλός Αὐτέρων, Kalós Limímenes), near a city Lassea (Lasæa, Lasæta). Thence, in spite of St. Paul's wish to winter in Fair Havens, it was decided to sail to Phoenix (Νησὺς Πύθος, Nēsûs Pythos) because it was inhabited by a people who had the same religious origin as the Phoenicians. The name Phoenix is given to at least two places, one on the E. coast of Crete, and the other on the S. coast of Crete. The former is mentioned in Acts 27:11. It is the site of the ancient city of Lissos, which was the chief town of Crete. The latter Phoenix is not referred to in the New Testament, but is mentioned by Ptolemy (538), and is probably the same as Leusa, a town mentioned in Acts 27:11.

H. Porter

POIYNIK, f. Phoii, Poii, Phoenix (AV Phoenix); A harbor in Crete (Acts 27:11). The Acts passage mentions the ship carrying St. Paul and the author of Acts, after it left Myra in Lycia, was prevented by adverse winds from holding a straight course to Italy, and sailed under the lee of Crete, off the promontory of Salamine (κατά Σάλαμον). The ship was then able to make her way along the S. shore of Crete to a harbor called Fair Havens (Kαλός Αὐτέρων, Kalós Limímenes), near a city Lassea (Lasæa, Lasæta). Thence, in spite of St. Paul's wish to winter in Fair Havens, it was decided to sail to Phoenix (Νησὺς Πύθος, Nēsûs Pythos) because it was inhabited by a people who had the same religious origin as the Phoenicians. The name Phoenix is given to at least two places, one on the E. coast of Crete, and the other on the S. coast of Crete. The former is mentioned in Acts 27:11. It is the site of the ancient city of Lissos, which was the chief town of Crete. The latter Phoenix is not referred to in the New Testament, but is mentioned by Ptolemy (538), and is probably the same as Leusa, a town mentioned in Acts 27:11.
stands. But this resort is not a suitable place for wintering in, and it is better either to take the words to mean, in sailor's language, "looking down the S.W. and N.W. winds"—a description which exactly fits the harbor at Loutro—or to assume that the reporter of the discussion referred to in Acts 27 10-12 or the writer of Acts made a mistake in describing a place which he had never seen. An inscription belonging to the reign of Trajan found at Tarsus shows that Egypt corn was not sent to lie up there for the winter.

W. M. CALDER

PHOROS, fō'ros (Φόρος, Phorós, B. Svetel), Phōros, Phorēs [1 Esd 8:30, where AV Pharez]: Name of one of the families, part of whom went up from the exile with Zerubbabel (1 Esd 8:9) and part with Ezra (8:30 RV) = "Parosh" of Ezr 2:3; 8:3, and some members of whom had "taken strange wives" (1 Esd 9:20).

PHURAI, frū'ti, frū'ta-i (Φυραί, Phurai; al. in Ν and A. Φυραία, Phuraria, and Φυρύπι, Phurim; AV Phurim): In Ad Est 11:1, "the ep. of Phurah" means the preceding Book of Est. See Purim.

PHRYGIA, firi-ja (Φρυγία, Phrygia): A large ancient country of Central Asia Minor, very mountainous and with table-lands reaching 4,000 ft. in height, and watered by the rivers Guaramus, a tributary of the Trahe, which in early times invaded the country and drove out or absorbed the earlier Asiatic inhabitants, among whom were the Hittites. Thus the Phrygians borrowed much of oriental civilization, esp. of art and mythology which they transferred to Europe. To define the boundaries of Phrygia would be exceedingly difficult, for as in the case of other Asia Minor countries, they were always vague and they shifted with nearly every age. The entire country abounds with ruins of former cities, and with almost countless rock-hewn tombs, some of which are of very great antiquity. Among the most interesting of the rock sculptures are the beautiful tombs of the kings bearing the names Midas and Gordius, with which classical tradition has made us familiar. It seems that at one period the country may have extended to the Hespaspont, even including Troy, but later the Phrygians were driven toward the interior. In Roman times, however, when Paul was there, the country was divided into two parts, one of which was known as Galatian Phrygia, and the other as Asian Phrygia, because it was a part of the Roman province of Asia, but the line between them was never sharply drawn. The Asian Phrygia was the larger of the two divisions, including the greater part of the older country; Galatian Phrygia was small, extending along the Pasidian Mountains, but among its important cities were Antioch, Iconium and Apollonia. And the province of Asia was no longer kept together, its different parts were known as Phrygina Prima and Phrygia Secunda. That part of Asia Minor is now ruled by a Turkish wali or governor whose residence is in Konia, the ancient Iconium. The population consists not only of Turks, but of Greeks, Armenians, Jews, Kurds and many small tribes of uncertain ancestry, and of peculiar customs and religious practices. The people live mostly in small villages which are scattered throughout the picturesque country, and goat raising are the leading industries; brigandage is common. According to Acts 2:10, Jews from Phrygia went to Jerusalem, and in Acts 18:23 we learn that many of them were influential and perhaps fanatical. According to Acts 16:6, Paul traveled through his home country from Lystra to Iconium and Antioch in Galatian Phrygia.

Twice he entered Phrygia in Asia, but on his 2d journey he was forbidden to preach there. Christianity was introduced into Phrygia by Paul and Barnabas, Acts 16:1-4; 18:1-23, yet it did not spread there rapidly. Churches were later founded, perhaps by Timothy or by John, at Colossae, Laodicea and Hierapolis.

PHURAH, fu'ra (Φύρα, frurab, "branch"). See Purah.

PHUT, fut (Φοῦτη, frul): See Put.

PHUVAH, fu'va. See Purah.

PHYGELUS, fi-je'lus (Φυγέλος, Phugelos; Tischendorf and WH, with others, read Φυγέλος, Phugelos, Phygellus or Phygelus [2 Tim 1:15]; AV Phygellus, fi-je'lus): One of the Christians who deserted Paul at the time of his 2d imprisonment at Rome. Paul mentions him, along with Hermogenes, as being among those "that are in Asia," who turned away from him then. What is meant may be that Phygellus and Hermogenes, along with other native Christians from Asia, were born in Rome when he was brought before the emperor's tribunal the second time, and that they had not merely taken no measures to stand by and support him, but that they had deserted him.

The meaning, however, may be that the turning away of Phygellus and Hermogenes from Paul took place, not in Rome, but in Asia itself.

The times during and immediately following the Neroonic persecution were more dreadful than can easily be conceived, especially the attempt to force the Christian name, and to do so in a wholesale fashion. A great community like the Christian church in Ephesus or in Rome was the terrible premonition of those times, when for a mere word—a word, however, denying the Lord that bought them—men were once set free from persecution, from the loss of property or of home, and from death. 1 Pet records how the aftermath of the Neroonic persecution had extended far indeed from Rome, where it had originated. Peter asks the Christians not to give way under "the fiery trial" which is trying them (1 Pet 4:12), and those whom he thus addresses were the members of the church throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia (1 Pet 1:1). The ep. to the seven churches in Asia in the Apocalypse also show how sore persecution had raged throughout that province. See Persecution.

But in addition to the temptation to deny Christ's name and to shrink to hear his name or to judge him false there was also another which pressed upon some of the churches, the temptation to repudiate the authority of Paul. Many passages in the NT suggest that Paul was sometimes very lightly esteemed, and how his authority was sometimes ridiculed, e.g. by persons in Corinth, and in the churches of Galatia.

What is said here is, that among the Christians of proconsular Asia, i.e. of Ephesus and the churches in the valley of the Cayster, there was a widespread defection from that loyalty to Paul which was to be expected from those who owed to him all that they possessed of the knowledge of Christ's salvation. "All that are in Asia turned away from me; of whom are Phygellus and Hermogenes." On the whole, all the necessary conditions of these words are satisfied by a reference to Rome and to Paul's environment there, and perhaps this is the more probable meaning. See Hermogenes.

JOHN RUTHERFORD}

PHYLACTERY, fi-lak'ter-i (φυλακτήριον, phyalakteiron, "guard"): This word is found only in Mt 23:5 in Our Lord's denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees, who, in order that their references works might "be seen of men," and in their zeal for the forms of religion, "make broad their phylacteries and enlarge the borders of their garments." The corresponding word in the OT, ἰδαφοῦς (Kodany in HDB suggests pointing as the segalote fem. sing,
Phoros

Physician

(tepheth), is found in three passages (Ex 13:16; Dt 6:8; 11:18), where it is tr4 "frontlets." This rendering, however, is not at all certain, and may have been read into the text from its later interpretation. In Ex 13:9 the corresponding word to the tepheth of ver 16 is zikkārōn, "memorial" or "reminder"; and in the || clauses of both verses the corresponding word is "a sign," "a sign" upon the hand, also used for the "sign" which Jeh appointed for Cain (Gen 4:15). It may be rendered then as a mark or ornament or jewel, and used figuratively of Jeh's Law as an ornament or jewel to the forehead of the Israelite, a reference to the charm or amulet worn by the pagans. The word used in the Talm for the phylactery is Tefērē, T'phillah, "prayer," or "prayer-band" (pl. T'phillim), indicating its use theoretically as a reminder of the Law, although practically it might be esteemed as an automatic and ever-present charm against evil: an aid within toward the keeping of the Law, a guard without against the approach of evil; a degradation of an OT figurative and didactic phrase to the materialistic and superstitious practices of the pagans.

The phylactery was a leather box, cube shaped, closed with an attached flap and bound to the person by a leather band. There were two kinds: (1) one to be bound to the inner side of the left arm, and near the elbow, so that with the bending of the arm it would rest over the heart, the knot fastening it to the arm being in the form of the letter yodh (י), and the end of the string, or band, finally wound around the middle finger of the hand, "a sign upon thy hand" (Dt 6:8). This box had one compartment containing one or all of the four passages given above. The writer in his youth found one of these in a comparatively remote locality, evidently lost by a Jewish peddler, which contained only the 21 text (Ex 13:11-16) in unpointed Heb. (2) Another was to be bound in the center of the forehead, "between thine eyes" (Dt 6:8), the knot of the band being in the form of the letter dālēth (ד), with the letter shin (ש) upon each end of the box, which was divided into four compartments with one of the four passages in each. These two Heb letters, with the ג of the arm-phylactery (see [1] above), formed the Divine name שד, shadday, "Almighty." Quite elaborate ceremonial accompanied the "laying" on of the phylactery, that of the arm being bound on first, and that of the head next, quotations from Scripture or Talm being repeated at each stage of the binding. They were to be worn by every male over 13 years old at the time of morning prayer, except on Sabbaths and festival days, such days being in themselves sufficient reminders of "the commandment, the statutes, and the ordinances" of Jeh (Dt 6:1).

The passages on which the wearing of the phylactery is based are as follows: "It [i.e. the feast of unleavened bread] shall be for a sign unto thee upon thy hand, and for a memorial between thine eyes, that the law of Jeh may be in thy mouth" (Ex 13:9); "And it [i.e. sacrifice of the firstborn] shall be for a sign upon thy hand, and for a memorial between thine eyes" (Ex 13:16); "thou shalt bind them [i.e. the words passages of Jeh] for a sign upon thy hand, and they shall be for frontlets between thine eyes" (Dt 6:8); "therefore shall ye lay up these my words in your heart and in your soul; and ye shall bind them for a sign upon your hand, and they shall be for frontlets between your eyes" (11:18). It is evident that the words in Ex are beyond all question used figuratively; a careful reading of the verses in Dt in close relation to their contexts, in which are other figures of speech not to be taken literally, is sufficient proof of their purely figurative intention also. Only the formalism of later ages could distort these figures into the gross and materialistic practice of the phylactery. Just when this practice began cannot accurately be determined. While the Talm attempts to trace it back to the primitive, even Mosaic, times, it probably did not long antedate the birth of Christ. In conservative Jewish circles it had been maintained that the custom originated in the days of Ezekiel, and at present is faithfully followed by orthodox Judaism. Every male, who at the age of 13 becomes a "son of the Law" (bar mitzvah), must wear the phylactery and perform the accompanying ceremony.

In the NT passage (Mt 23:5) Our Lord rebukes the Pharisees, who made more pronounced the unscriptural formalism and the crude literalism of the phylactery by making them excessively large, as also that they seek notoriety for their religiousness by the enlarged fringes, or "borders." See phylacteries; Frontlets; Pharisees.

LITERATURE.—The various comm's. on Ex and Dt; tractate Tefilin; the comprehensive art. by A. R. S. Kennedy in RB; arts. in EB and JEw Enc.

EDWARD MACK

PHYLARCH, φιλαρ'κης, philarchēs: Given in AV of 2 Mac 8:32 as a proper name "Phylarches; but in RV the phylarch of Timotheus's force"; "probably the captain of an irregular auxiliary force" (RVM), rather than a cavalry officer.

PHYLARChES, φιλαρ'κης (AV Philarches). See Phylarches.

PHYSICIAN, φίλισθ'αν (NEB), rôph'; latróps, iatrōs: To the pious Jew at all times God was the healer (Dt 32:39): "It was neither herb nor mollifying plaster that cured them, but thy word, O Lord, which healeth all things" (Wisd 16:12). The first physicians mentioned in Scripture are those of Egypt. Long before the sojourn of the Hebrews in that land, Egypt had a priestly class of physicians (aars) and a school for healers (Jehud). From the ancient medical papyri which have been preserved, the largest of which is the Papyrus Ebers, we know that the medical knowledge of these physicians was purely empirical, largely magical and wholly unscientific. In spite of their ample opportunities they knew next to nothing of human anatomy, their descriptions of diseases are hopelessly crude, and three-fourths of the hundreds of prescriptions in the papyri are wholly inert. Even their art of embalming was so imperfect that few of their mummies have remained in any other climate than that of Egypt. Physicians of this kind who were Joseph's servants embalmed Jacob (Gen 50:2) and Joseph (ver 26). It was not until the foundation of the School of Alexandria, which was purely Greek, that Egypt became a place of medical education and research.
There is no evidence that at any time the priests of Israel were reputed to be the possessors of medical knowledge or tradition. In the ceremonial law they had explicit instructions as to the isolation of those suffering from skin eruptions, so that they might recognize certain obscene and infectious forms. There was, however, no formal professional training, but with this duty as sanitary police their function ended, and they used no means to cure these diseases.

There is, as far as I know, no record or tradition of a priest-physician in Bible times. The records of cure by the prophets, esp. Elisha, are mostly recorded in personal and ceremonial uncleanliness, but with this duty as sanitary police their function ended, and they used no means to cure these diseases.

In the NT Our Lord’s saying, “They are who have no need of a physician,” etc., shows that there were physicians in Galilee (Mt 9 12; Mk 2 17; Lk 5 43). In Nazareth He quotes what seems to have been a proverb: “Physician, heal thyself” (Lk 4 23). There were physicians in Galilee who received fees from the woman of Caesarea Philippi who had the issue of blood (Mk 5 26; Lk 8 44). Of her there is a curious story told in Eusebius (VII, 18).

There are several Talmudic references to physicians; in Serḥalim 6 1, it is said that there was a physician at the temple to attend to the priests. A physician was appointed in every city (Gittin 129), who was to be the policeman for the local authorities (Babba’ bath Rabra’ 21a). The familiar passage in Eccles 38 1–15 RV in praise of the physician gives him but limited credit for his skill: “There is a time when in their very hands is the issue for good,” and later, “He that smiteth before his Maker, Let him fall into the hands of the physician.”

Luke, called “the beloved physician” in Col 4 14, is said by Eusebius to have been a native of Antioch and a physician by profession. According to Origen he was the unnamed “brother whose praise in the gospel is spread through all the churches” (2 Cor 8 18). There are evidences of his professional studies in the language of his writings, though of this probably more has been made by Hobart and others than it really merits. Had we not known of his profession it is doubtful whether it could have been conjectured from his choice of words. Sir W. Ramsay calls attention to the two words used for a physician in Acts 28 10–11; for the cure of Publius’ father, the word used is ἁθά, but for the healing of those who came later it is ἀθεραπεύω, which he renders “received medical treatment.” From this he infers that Luke helped Paul with these (Ramsay, Luke the Physician, 1905).

PI-BESETH, pi-bē’seth (πι-βηθ), pi-bheseth; LXX Βουβαστος, Bubastos; Eph. Pi-BAšt, “the house of Bašt,” the cat-headed goddess; the Egyptian form is usually ḫa-Bašt; it is doubtful if the form Pi-BAšt has yet been found; A city of ancient Egypt. The only occurrence of the name of this place in the OT is in Ezk 30 17, where it is coupled with Aven, i.e., On (Helipolis).

Pi-beseth was on the western bank of the Pelusiac branch of the Nile, about 40 miles N. of Memphis, about 15 miles N.E. of On. Herod. otus found the city of Bubastis very similar to his day. The annual festival of the goddess, Bašt, was celebrated here with revolting license, similar to that of the festival of Syryd ol-Bedawer now kept in Tańta.

Pi-beseth was explored by Professor Naville under the Egyptian Exploration Society in 1887–80. There were uncovered ruins of Egypt from the 4th Dynasty of the Old Empire, the Middle Empire, an important Hyksos settlement, and ruins from the New Empire down to the end, and even from Rom times. The area of the ancient city, one of the most unique in all Egypt, is the cemetery of cats. These cats, the animal sacred to Bašt, were mummified at other places in Egypt, but at Pi-beseth they were burned and the ashes and bones gathered and buried in great pits lined with brick or hardened clay. Bones of the ichneumon were also found mixed with those of the cats in these pits (Egypt Exploration Fund Report, 1891).

PICTURE, pik’tár: This word is used 3 t in AV, viz. Nu 33 52; Isa 2 16; Prov 25 11. In Nu and Prov “pictures” represents the Heb word יִתְנָן, maskith, “showpiece,” “figure.” The context in Nu suggests that the “pictures” or “carved figures” (RV “figured stones”) which the Israelites were to destroy were symbols of Can. worship and therefore foreign to the religion of Jeh. In Prov for “pictures of silver,” ERV has “baskets [AV ‘network’] of silver,” but a more probable tr is “carvings of silver.” “Pictures” stands for a slightly different word (but from the same root) in Ezra, viz. יִתְנָן, ṣḥkith; RV renders “imagery” (in Dan “watchtowers”) of carved stones (of gods in animal or human shapes) on the pows of vessels.

PIECE, pik: In AV the word (sing. and pl.) represents a large number of different Heb words, many of which have more or less the same significance, e.g. piece of meat or flesh (Gen 16 10; 2 S 6 10; Ezk 24 4); of bread or cake (1 S 2 36; 30 12; Jer 37 21); of ground or land (2 S 23 11); of wall (Neh 3 11 19 5); of an ear (Am 3 12); of cloth or garment (1 K 11 30); of milstone (Jgs 9 53). It is used frequently in paraphrastic renderings of various Heb vbs.: “break,” “tear,” “cut,” etc, in pieces (Gen 44 28, etc).

In the NT “piece” renders ἐθάνατον, ἐπιθάνομαι, “piece” or “part of the cloth” (Mt 9 16; Mk 2 21; Lk 5 36). It is also found in paraphrastic renderings—broken in pieces (Mk 5 4), pulled in pieces (Acts 23 10).

PIECE OF GOLD: The word “pieces” is supplied in 2 K 5 8 (story of Naaman), “6,000 pieces of gold,” where RV reads more correctly suggests “shekels” (cf 1 K 10 16). See Money.

PIECE OF MONEY: Two words are thus rendered in AV ἄθηραπεύω, k-sחלק; παρεύρισκ, satér. RV gives only the first this rendering (Job 42 11).
The rich provided large and expensive cotes of moulded pottery for their birds, each section big enough for a single dove. The rows of openings resembling lattice work, so that Isaiah refers to them as "windows" (60:8). LXX reads σωροσ, σων νοσολης, lit. "with young" or "fledglings" (see below). The middle classes modeled cotes of oven-baked clay, and the very poor cut holes in the walls, the doors, and allowed the birds to enter and live with the family.

In wild estate, rock and wood pigeons swarmed in countless numbers through rocky caves and ravens and over the plains of Gennesaret, the forests of Giland and the woodlands itself. They remained throughout the season, breeding at all times. The doves were migratory, and were kept in confinement only as caged pets or to be held for sale for sacrifice. For these purposes, it appears that the dove was slightly preferred. When only one bird was to be used, a dove is always specified; where two, almost in every case the dove is mentioned first. Where one or the other will suffice, the dove seems to have been given preference. This may have been because it required more expense to procure a dove, and so it was considered a greater sacrifice. Everyone having a home of any sort had pigeons they could use, or they could be taken wild at any time. The dove is first mentioned in Gen 15:9: "And he said unto his servant, Take three years old, and a she-goat three years old, and a ram three years old, and a turtle-dove, and a young pigeon."

It will be observed that the dove is mentioned first, and it is specified that the pigeon was inadmissible, the reason being that the people protected their domesticated pigeons by using the wild for sacrifice, whenever possible. Young birds could be snared from a nest at almost any time of the year. The old birds, among the wild, were shy creatures, and much more difficult to capture in nets or snares than doves that came close to cities and villages to live, and exhibited much less fear of man than the wild pigeons. The next reference is in Lev 5:7; "And when his means sufficeth not for a lamb, then shall he bring his trespass-offering for that wherein he hath sinned, two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, unto Jeh; one for a sin-offering, and the other for a burnt-offering." Here two birds of each kind were to be offered, if the person making the sacrifice could not afford a lamb. Again in Lev 12:6: "And when the days of her purification are fulfilled, for a son, or for a daughter, she shall bring a lamb a year old for a burnt-offering, and a young pigeon, or a turtle-dove, for a sin-offering, unto the door of the tent of meeting, unto the priest." Here is a rare instance where the text or the translators place the pigeon first.

"And on the eighth day he shall bring two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, to the priest, to the door of the tent of meeting" (Nu 6:10). In Cant 2:14:

"O my dove, that art in the covert of the rook, In the covert of the steep place, Let me see thy comeliness, Let me hear thy voice; For sweet is thy voice, and thy countenance is lovely."

Here the text reads "dove," but the description of the location and the implication of the text prove the bird to have been a rock pigeon—a tender, loving thing, yet shy and timid, that peeps with eyes of bright concern over the rocks of its chosen home, down near the little indweller. "Who are these that fly as a cloud, and as the doves to their windows?" Here is another place where the wrong bird is used. Doves were wild and migratory. They had no "windows." But the tile pots massed in rows and complete domestication, that they flew free, yet homed and bred in places provided by man at the time of the very first attempts to keep records of history. At the time the earliest Bib. accounts were written, pigeons were so domesticated that in all known countries of the East they were reckoned when an estimate was made of a man's wealth.
which is said in the law of the Lord, A pair of turtledoves, or two young pigeons." This describes the sacrifice offered in the temple by Mary following the birth of Jesus. Gene Stratton-Porter

PI-HAIROTH, pl-ḥa-ḥı’roth (πιθανωροθ), pl’-h’a-hı’roth [Ex 14 2–9; Nu 33 7–8]: Nothing is known of the meaning of the name 1. Meaning Pi-H. Some attempts toward an Of Name Egyptian etymology for it have been made, but without much success. Since the meaning of the name is unknown and no description of the place or its use is given, it is impossible to determine anything concerning the character of Pi-H., whether a city, a sanctuary, a fortress, or some natural feature of the landscape. Neither Pi-H. nor any other place mentioned with it can be exactly located. A recent discovery of manuscripts in Egypt furnishes a nothing connected to the account in the Bible itself. If any one of the places is located in connection with the crossing of the Red Sea could be located approximately, all the others could, also, be similarly located by the description given in the account in Ex. The route beyond the Sea has been marked with almost positive certainty. A journey along the way is so convincing that hardly anything can shake the conviction which it produces. This identification of the route of the exodus beyond the Sea required the place of the crossing to be within 3 days’ journey of Marah, which puts it somewhere near the modern Suez. It may be anywhere within 10 miles of that point. This approximately locates all the other places mentioned in connection with the crossing: Migdol must be Ras `Atak, or some other high point in the mountains of the western deserts, where might be placed a watch-tower. Pi-H. is between this point and the Sea and Baal-zephon near the opposite eastern shore. This puts Pi-H. at some point along the old shore line of the Sea within 10 miles of the site of modern Suez.

M. G. Kyle


Pilate, pl’lat, pl’lat, PONTIUS, pon’shı’us (Πάντος Πάλαιτος, Pontios Pilatos):

1. Name and Office
2. Pilate’s Procuratorship
3. Pilate and Jesus Christ
4. Pilate in Tradition and Legend
5. Character of Pilate

Literature

The name Pontius indicates the stock from which Pilate was descended. It was one of the most famous of Sannite names; it was a

1. Name Pontius who inflected on a Rom army and Office the disgrace of the Caudine Forks. The name is often met with in Rom history after the Hannibalian wars were conquered and absorbed. Lucius Pontius Aquila was a friend of Cicero and one of the assassins of Julius Caesar. The cognomen Pilatus indicates the family, or branch of the gens Pontius, to which Pilate belonged. It has been derived from pilum, the cap worn by freemen; this is improbable, as Pilate was of equestrian rank. It has also been derived from pilum, a spear. Probably the name was one that had descended to Pilate from his ancestors, and hence not mentioned in the book nowhere mentioned. Pilate was 5th procurator of Judea. The province of Judea had formerly been the kingdom of Archelaus, and was formed when he was deposed (6 AD). Speaking roughly, it took in the southern half of Pal, including Sa- maria. Being an imperial province (i.e. under the direct control of the emperor), it was governed by a procurator (see Procurator; Province). The procurator was the personal servant of the emperor, directly responsible to him, and he seemed with finance. But the powers of procurators varied according to the appointment of the emperor. Pilate was a procurator cum potestate, i.e. he possessed civil, military, and criminal jurisdiction. The procurator of Judea was in some way subordinate to the legate of Syria, but the exact character of the subordination is not known. As a rule a procurator must be of equestrian rank and a man of certain military experience. Under his rule, the Jews were allowed as much self-government as was consistent with the maintenance of imperial authority. The Sanhedrin was allowed to exercise judicial functions, but if they desired to inflict the penalty of death, the sentence had to be confirmed by the procurator.

We have no certain knowledge of Pilate except in connection with his time of rule in Judea. We know nothing of his birth, his origin, or his earlier years. Tacitus, when speaking of the cruel punishments inflicted upon the Jews by Nero upon the story that Christ, from whom the name “Christian” was derived, was put to death when Tiberius was emperor by the procurator Pontius Pilate (Annals xv.44). Apart from this reference and what is told us in the NT, all our knowledge of him is derived from two Jewish writers, Jos the historian and Philo of Alexandria.

Pilate was procurator of Judea, in succession to Gratus, and he held office for 10 years. Jos tells (Ant, xviii, 842) that he ruled for 10 years, that he was removed from office by Vitellius, the legate of Syria, and traveled in haste to Rome to defend himself before Tiberius against certain complaints. Before he reached Rome the emperor had passed away. Jos adds that Vitellius came in the year 39 AD to Judea to be present at Jesus at the time of the Passover. It has been assumed by most authorities (so HDB and EB) that Pilate had departed before this visit of Vitellius. They accordingly date the procuratorship of Pilate as lasting from 26 to 36 AD. As against this view, von Dobschütz points out (EB s.v. “Pilate”) that by this reckoning Pilate must have taken at least a year to get to Rome; for Tiberius died on March 16, 37 AD. Such a delay is inconsistent with the circumstances; hence von Dobschütz rightly dates the period of his procuratorship 27–37 AD. The procurator of Judea had no easy task, nor did Pilate make the task easier by his actions. He was not careful to conciliate the religious prejudices of the Jews, and at times this attitude of his led to violent collisions between ruler and ruled. On one occasion, when the soldiers under his command came to Jerusalem, he caused them to bring with them their ensigns, upon which were the usual images of the emperor. The ensigns were brought in privity by night, but their disposal was soon discovered. Multitudes of excited Jews hastened to Caesarea to petition him for the removal of the obnoxious ensigns. For five days he kept them seated to hear them. He took his place on the judgment seat, and when the Jews who were admitted he had them surrounded with soldiers and threatened them with instant death unless they ceased to trouble him with the matter. The Jews thereupon flung themselves on the ground and bared their necks, declaring that they preferred death to the violation of their ensigns. Two Pilate, unequipped with soldiers, were slain in this manner, yielded the point and removed the ensigns (Jos, Ant, xviii, iii, 1; BJ, ii, 2, 3).

At another time he was asked by the sacred treasure of the temple, called corban (κορβαν), to pay for bringing water into Jerusalem by means of the aqueduct. A crowd came together and clamored against him; but he had caused soldiers dressed as civilians to mingle with the multitude, and a given signal they fell upon the rioters. Immediately so severely with staves that the riot was quelled (Jos, Ant, xviii, iii, 2; BJ, ii, 4, 4).
Philip tells us (Logia ad Caïum, xxxvii) that on another occasion he dedicated some gift shields in the palace of Herod in honor of the emperor Tiberius. There was no representation of any forbidden thing, but simply the name of the donor and of him in whose honor they were set up. The Jews petitioned him to have them removed; when he refused, they appealed to Philip, who sent an order that they should be removed to Caesarea.

Of the incident, mentioned in Lk 13.1, of the Galileans whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices, nothing further is known.

Jos (Ant, XVIII, iv, 1,2) gives an account of the incident which follows in Lk, mentioning that a pretender arose in Samaria who promised the Samaritans that if they would assemble at Mt. Gerizim, he would show them the sacred vessels which Moses had hidden there. A great multitude assembled in readiness to ascend the mountain, but before they could accomplish their aim they were attacked by Pilate’s cavalry, and many of them were slain. The Samaritans thereupon sent an embassy to Vitellius, the legate of Syria, to accuse Pilate of the murder of those who had been slain. Vitellius, who desired to stand well with the Jews, deposed Pilate and appointed Flavius in his place, and ordered Pilate to go to Rome and answer the charges made against him before the emperor. Pilate set out for Rome, but, before he could reach it, Tiberius had died; and it is probable that, in the interval, Vitellius realized that Pilate had escaped the inquisition with which he was threatened. From this point onward history knows nothing more of Pilate.

The shortest and simplest account of Pilate’s dealings with Jesus Christ is given in the Gospel of Mk.

3. Pilate delivered to Pilate: that Pilate asked Jesus Christ receiving an affirmative answer; that, to Pilate’s surprise, Jesus answered nothing to the accusations of the chief priests; that Pilate tried to release Jesus according to an ancient custom; that the multitude, in spite of the protest of Pilate, demanded the release of Barabbas, and cried out that Jesus should be crucified; that Pilate, believing himself to be obliged to comply, and that Jesus, when He had been scourged and mocked, was led away to be crucified. Mk tells further how Joseph of Arimathaea begged of Pilate the body of Jesus. Pilate was surprised that Jesus died so quickly, and questioned the reason why. It is Pilate’s surprise and question are peculiar to Mk. Being satisfied on this point, Pilate granted the body to Joseph. Mt adds the dream and message of Pilate’s wife (27.19); it also tells how Pilate washed his hands before the people, disclaiming responsibility for the death of Jesus, and how the people accepted the responsibility (27.24); also how Pilate granted a guard for the tomb (27.62–66).

Lk alone narrates the sending of Jesus to Herod (23.6–12), and reports Pilate’s three times repeated assurance that he found no fault in Jesus (23.4–14.22). Jn gives by far the fullest narrative, which forms a framework into which the more fragmentary accounts of the Synoptics can be fitted with perfect ease. Some critics, holding that Mk alone is trustworthy, deny that the additional incidents given in Mt and Lk as apologetic amplifications; and many dismiss the narrative of Jn as wholly unworthy of credence. Such theories are based on preconceived opinions as to the date, authorship and reliability of the various Gospels. The critic who holds all the Gospels to be, in the main, authentic and trustworthy, will have no difficulty in perceiving that all four narratives, when taken together, present a story consistent in all its details and free from all difficulty.

See Gospels. It should be noted that John evidently had special opportunities of obtaining exacter knowledge than that possessed by the others, as he was present at every stage of the trial; and that his narrative makes clear what is obscure in the accounts of the Synoptics.

The parts may be fitted together thus: Jesus is brought to Pilate (Mt 27.2; Mk 15.1; Lk 23.1; Jn 18.28). Pilate asks Jesus a specific question (Mt 27.16–26; Mk 15.6–10; Lk 23.39). Pilate enters the praetorium, questions Jesus about His alleged kingship, and receives the answer that He rules over the kingdom of truth, and that no one can take the kingdom from Him. Pilate acknowledges the truth. Pilate asks: "What is truth?" (so interpreted in Mt) (Acts 17.38–39). Pilate sends the praetorium again to Jesus, and with more detail (Jn 18.38–39). Pilate brings Jesus forth (this is the only detail that needs to be supplied in order to make the harmonization correct, and in itself it is probably enough), and many accusations are made against Him, to which, to Pilate’s surprise, He makes reply. (Mt 27.12–14; Mk 15.1–2; Lk 23.2–4; Jn 18.39). Pilate offers to release Jesus, a suggestion whose reception is described in different forms (Mt 27.15–18; Mk 15.6–10; Jn 18.39). Pilate’s wife sends him a message warning him not to harm Jesus, because Jesus is mentioned as the Son of God. Pilate is compelled to drink a cup of poison (Mt 27.19). The people, persuaded thereto by the chief priests, cry out that they want Jesus to die. In spite of the repeated protests of Pilate, demand that Jesus shall be crucified (Mt 27.20–23; Mk 15.11–14; Lk 23.18–25; Jn 18.39). Pilate sends the soldiers before the people, and they take the demand of the people with them. Then Pilate releases Barabbas and orders Jesus to be scourged (Mt 27.26; Mk 15.15; Lk 23.24). Jesus is scourged and mocked, mocked and spat upon (Mt 27.26; Lk 23.30; Jn 19.1–3). Pilate again declares the innocence of Jesus, brings Him out again, and says: "Behold the man!" The chief priests and officers cry out: "Crucify him!" They accuse Him of making Himself the Son of God, and demand that Pilate should make it known by His own saying, that the people were sacrificing to Him the blood of the prince of the kings of this world. Pilate, in order to save his own position, tries to release Jesus, not as a king, but as a proselyte (Mt 27.22). Pilate sends the people to the judgment seat (see GABBASA, and says: "Behold, your King!" Again the cry goes up: "Away with Him, crucify Him!" Pilate says: "Shall I crucify your King?" (Mt 27.22). The chief priests answered with a loud renunciation of all that God had given them, saying: "We have no king but Caesar" (Jn 19.14–15). Pilate sentences Jesus and gives Him up to be crucified, and He is led away (Mt 27.31; Lk 23.20; Lk 23.24a; Jn 19.16). Pilate writes, and sends for the chief priests and officers to alter it (Jn 19.19–22). The Jews ask of Pilate that the body of the three who were crucified might be broken (Jn 19.23). Joseph of Arimathaea, who had previously asked from Pilate (Mt 27.57.58a; Mk 15.42; Lk 23.50–52; Jn 19.38a), Pilate is surprised that Jesus has died so soon, and demands the consent of the soldiers before he gives up to Joseph the body of Jesus (Mt 27.58b; Mk 15.45; Lk 23.56; Jn 19.38b). Pilate obtains permission from Pilate to take precautions against any theft of the body of Jesus (Mt 27.62–66).

Pilate is mentioned three times in Acts: in a speech of Peter (3.13), in a thanksgiving of the church (4.27), and in a speech of Paul (13.28). He is also mentioned in 1 Tim (6.13) as the one before whom Christ Jesus witnessed the good confession.

Eusebius, who lived in the 4th cent., tells us (HE, II) on the authority of certain Gr historians that Pilate fell into such crimes that he committed suicide. Various in Tradition apocryphal writings have come down and Legend to us, written from the 3d to the 5th cents., with others of a later date, in which legends and details are given. In all these a favorable view is taken of his character; hence the Coptic church came to believe that he became a Christian, and enrolled him among the number of its saints. His wife, to whom tradition gives the name of Claudia, is said to have been a Jewish proselyte at the time of the death of Jesus, and afterward to have become a Christian. Her name is honored along with Pilate’s in the Coptic church, and in the calendar of saints honored by the Gr church her name is found after the date October 27.
We find not unkindly references to Pilate in the recently discovered fragment of the Gospel of Peter, which was found in 1978, which places Jesus before 32 AD. In the so-called Gospel of Nicodemus, which belongs to the 1st or 2nd century, we find in the first part, called the Acts of Pilate, a long and vivid description of the trial of Christ, in the hall of judgment bowed down before Jesus, in spite of the efforts of the standard-bearers, and others who appeared to oppose him. In the standard account of the Gospel according to Peter, vol IX of the same series. Orr, *NT Apocryphal Texts*, vol IV, 1891, and also the various articles on Pilate in books of reference on the NT, notably BE (von den Steinitz), DBB (G. T. Fyfe), BAG (A. Scourby), and RE (J. S. Singley). For a later discussion of the NT, see vol. V, 1917. For the apocryphal Gospels, see art. *Apocryphal Gospels*, in the Supplement volume of the Gospels. For the trial of Jesus, see art. *Jesus*, in vol. II, 1901, p. 341. The truth of the facts is also founded in the New Testament, where, in the case of Our Lord, we find no such account. In the Apocrypha, we find Pilate in the notable (Don Schur). DBB (G. T. Fyfe), BAG (A. Scourby), and RE (J. S. Singley). For the apocryphal Gospels, see art. *Apocryphal Gospels*, in the Supplement volume of the Gospels. For the trial of Jesus, see art. *Jesus*, in vol. II, 1901, p. 341. The truth of the facts is also founded in the New Testament, where, in the case of Our Lord, we find no such account. In the Apocrypha, we find Pilate in the notable (Don Schur). DBB (G. T. Fyfe), BAG (A. Scourby), and RE (J. S. Singley). For the apocryphal Gospels, see art. *Apocryphal Gospels*, in the Supplement volume of the Gospels. For the trial of Jesus, see art. *Jesus*, in vol. II, 1901, p. 341. The truth of the facts is also founded in the New Testament, where, in the case of Our Lord, we find no such account. In the Apocrypha, we find Pilate in the notable (Don Schur). DBB (G. T. Fyfe), BAG (A. Scourby), and RE (J. S. Singley).
“pillars” of heaven, of earth (Job 9:6; 36:11; Ps 75:3; 99:7). In the few instances of the word in the NT, the use is figurative. James, Cephas and John were reputed to be pillars of the church at Jerusalem (Gal 2:9); the church is “the pillar and ground of the truth” (1 Tim 3:15); he that overcomes is made a pillar in the temple of God (Rev 3:12); a strong angel had feet “as pillars of fire” (10:1).

**Pillar of Cloud and Fire:** The visible manifestation of the divine presence in the journeyings of Israel at the time of the Exodus. The pillar of cloud, as narrated, went before the people “by day in a pillar of cloud, to lead them the way, and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light.” The pillar of cloud by day, and the pillar of fire by night, depersonalized the deity before the people. (Ex 13:21-22; cf. 14:19-24; Nu 14:14). When the congregation was at rest, the cloud abode over the tabernacle (Ex 40:36; Nu 9:17; 14:14). When Jehovah wished to communicate His will to Moses, the pillar descended to the door of the Tent of Meeting (Ex 33:9-11; Nu 12:5; Dt 31:15). These descriptions are not to be rationalistically explained; what is depicted is a true theophany. Critical has sought to establish discrepancies, or inconsistencies, in the allusions to the cloud in the JE and the P parts of the narrative, but these are not made without scrupling: e.g. it is not the case that JE alone represents Jehovah as speaking with Moses in the cloud at the door of the tabernacle. The same representation is found in Ex 29:42.43, ascribed to P. An acute discussion of the alleged discrepancies may be seen in H. M. Wiener, Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism, 82 ff.

JAMES ORR

**PILLAR OF SALT.** See SLIME; LOT.

**PILLAR, PLAIN OF.** See PLAIN OF THE PILLAR.

**PILLARS OF THE EARTH.** See ASTRONOMY, III, 2.

**PILOWS, PILLOWS.** See BOLSTERS; CUSHIONS.

**PILOT, PILOTS.** See SHIPS AND BOATS.

**PILTÀI, pilťa‘, pil-tā‘ (‘pîl-tā‘, probably “Jeh’s deliverers”): One of the priests, described as “the chiefs of the fathers,” in the days of Joakim (Neh 12:17).

**PIN (‘pîn), yāḥāḏ; from yāḥāḏ, “to drive in a peg”?): A cylindrical piece of wood or metal (e.g. brass, Ex 27:19) such as that used by weavers in beating up the woof in the loom (Jgs 16:14, where Delilah fastened Samson’s hair with the “pin”); or as a peg for hanging (Ex 16:3; cf. Isa 22:23; 1 Chr 23:8); or, as a tent-pin, such as those used in the tabernacle (Ex 27:19; 35:18; 38:20, 31; 39:40; Nu 3:37; 4:32; Jgs 4:21, where AV translates “nailed,” RV “tent-pin”); cf. 5:26, where Heb has the same word, RV “nailed”). The tent-pin, like that of today, was probably sharpened at one end (Jgs 4:21) and shaped at the other as to permit the attaching of the cords so frequently mentioned in the same connection (Ex 38:20; 39:40; Nu 3:57; 4:32; cf. Isa 33:20). From the acts of driving in the tent-pin (pil‘ā‘) and pulling it out (nā‘ād) are derived the technical Heb terms for pitching a tent and for breaking camp. See also CIRCUISING PIN (Isa 3:22, RV “sethchel”); S'TIKE.

NATHAN ISAACS

**PINE, PINES.** See PINING SICKNESS.

**PINE TREE, PINES, PINE TREES.** (1) 7777, ‘ez shemen, tr‘; (2) ‘7777, ‘ez shemen, tr‘; (3) ‘7777, ‘ez shemen, tr‘; (4) ‘7777, ‘ez shemen, tr‘. (K 6 23:31-33). See OIL TREE. (2) W. B. M. Friday, Thdhr (AS 1:19) m. ‘plane’, 60:13; ‘yāḥāḏ, pil‘ā‘, “fir.” Lagarde, from similarity of thdhrāb to the Syr dēdrāb, usually the “elm,” considers this the best tr. Symmachus also tr‘ thdhrāb (Isa 41:19) by ‘rekhāa, piteka, the “elm.” The elm, Ulmus campestris, is rare in Pal and the Lebanon, though it is found today N. of Aleppo. Post (HDB, III, 592-93) considers that (1) should be tr‘ “pine,” which he describes as a “fat wood tree”; it is perhaps as probably a correct tr for (2), but great uncertainty remains. Two species of pine are plentiful in the Lebanon and flourish in most parts of Pal when given a chance. These are the stone pine, Pinus pinea, and the Aleppo pine, P. halepensis; all the highlands looking toward the sea are suited to their growth.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

**PINING, PINE, SICKNESS, SICKNESS: In the account of the epileptic boy in Mk 9:18 it is said that "he pineth away." The vb. used here (σκίνειν, xéraino) means "to dry up," and is the same which is used of the withering of plants, but seldom used in this metaphorical sense. The Eng. word is from the AS pinian and is often found in the Elizabethan literature, occurring 13 t in Shakespeare. In the OT it is found in Lev 26:39 (bir) and in Ezek 24:23 and 33:10. In RV it replaces "consumption" in Ezek 4:17. In all these passages it is the rendering of the Heb mōkkāb, and means expressly being wasted on account of sin. In Lev 26:16 "pine away" is used in RV to replace "cause sorrow of heart," and is the tr. of the Heb dāḇāh; and in Dt 28:65 "sorrow of soul" is also replaced in RV by "pinning of soul," the word so rendered being dāḇaḥon, which in these two passages is expressive of homesickness. In Isa 24:16 the recurred exclamatory, "my leanness," of AV is changed into "I pine away," the word being ráḏ. The starving people in Lmt 4:9 are said to pine away, the word so tr‘ being zāḇāh. All these Heb words have a general meaning of to dry or to waste or wear away, or to be exhausted by morbid discharges.

Pining sickness in Isa 38:12 AV is a mistranslation, the word so rendered, dešāh, meaning here the thorium by which the web is tied to the loom. The figure in the verse is that Hezekiah’s life is being removed from the earth by his sickness as the web is removed from the loom by having the thums cut, and being then rolled up. Both AVm and RVm have the correct reading, "from the thorium." LXX has εἰρήθη ἑγγίζωσα εἶκεντες, κριθὸν ἐγγίζωσα ἑκέμειν, and Vulg dum adipio ordinaverit, sweadebit me. The other rendering is due to another interpretation of the word which in a few passages, as Jer 65:15, like its ἀ‘ do, means something small, poor, and decaying or weak, such as the lean kine of Pharaoh’s dream (Gen 41:19).

ALEX. MACALISTER
PINION, pin'yun (πισιόν, 'πίσιόν, 'πίσιόν, 'πισθῶν): RV has tr² these Heb words uniformly by "pinion," where AV needs either "wing" or "feathers," with which words they stand in parallelism in all passages. The shorter Heb word is found only once, in Jeh's parable to Ezekiel: "A great eagle with great wings and long pinions [AV "longwinged"], full of feathers, which had divers colors, came unto Lebanon, and took the top of the cedar." (Ezk 17:3) The term (πισθῶν) is used of the wings of the dove (Ps 68:13), of the ostrich (Job 39:13) and of the eagle (Dt 32:11). Once (Ps 91:4) it stands in a figurative expression for the protective care of Jeh, which is bestowed on those that trust in Him.

H. L. E. LURRING

PINNACLE, pin'a-k'l (πίνακας, πίνακας, "darkness"): One of the "chiefs of Edom" (Gen 36:41; 1 Ch 1:52).

PIPE, pip. See Candlestick; Lamp; Music.

PIRA, pîra (ὁ Πιρα, ὡς ἐκ Πειρᾶ, ήκ Πειρᾶς [1 Esd 5:19]): Thought to be a repetition of CapHira (cf. q.v.) earlier in the verse.

PIRAM, pîraman (Παράμενος, παράμενον, "indomitable"): King of Jarmuth, one of the five Amorite kings who leagued themselves against Joshua's invasion (Josh 10:3 ff).

PIRATHON, pîr'a-thon, PIRATHONITE, pîr'a-thon-ite (Πιραθών, πιραθών, Πιράθων, πιράθων): The home of Abdon the son of Hillel the Pirathonite (Jgs 13:18 AV), where also he was buried, "in the land of Ephraim in the mount of the Amalekites." The latter name may have clung to a district which at some former time had been held by the Amalekites. From this town also came Benamia, one of David's chief captains (2 S 23:30; 1 Ch 11:31; 27:14). It is probable to be identified with Per'ath, about 6 miles WSW of Nablus. A possible rival is Fir'on, 15 miles W. of Nablus. G.A. Smith suggests a position at the head of Wady Far'ah (HGHL, 555). Moore thinks it may have been in Benjamin, Abdon being a Benjaminite family (1 Ch 8:23;30; 9:36). It is just possible that the place may be identical with Pharathon, one of the towns fortified by Bachchides (1 Macc 9:50).

W. EWING

PISIDIA, pîsid'i-a (ἡ Πισιδία, τῆς Πισιδίας, τὸς Πισιδίαν): A river of Eden (q.v.), said to compass the whole land of Havilah where there is gold, balsamum and the rock stone (Gen 2:11), most probably identified with the Kurun River which comes down from the mountains of Media and formerly emptied into the Pers Gulf.

W. EWING

PISHON, pîsh'on (Πίσθων, πίσθων; AV Pison, p'son): A river of Eden (q.v.), said to compass the whole land of Havilah where there is gold, balsamum and the rock stone (Gen 2:11), most probably identified with the Kurun River which comes down from the mountains of Media and formerly emptied into the Pers Gulf.

1. Situation range where the latter overlooked the

PISIDIAN, pîsî'di-a (ἡ Πισιδία, τῆς Πισιδίας, τὸς Πισιδίαν): A river of Eden (q.v.), said to compass the whole land of Havilah where there is gold, balsamum and the rock stone (Gen 2:11), most probably identified with the Kurun River which comes down from the mountains of Media and formerly emptied into the Pers Gulf.

1. Situation range where the latter overlooked the

and History Pamphylia coastland, to the valleys

which connected Apamia with Antioc, and Antioc with Iconium. It was bounded by Lydia on the W., by the Phrygian country on the N., and by Isauria on the E.; but there is no natural boundary between Pisidia and Isauria, and the frontier was never strictly drawn. The name is used in its geographical sense in the Anabasis of Xenophon, who informs us that the Pisidians were independent of the king of Persia at the end of the 5th century BC. Alexander the Great had difficulty in reducing the Pisidian cities, and throughout ancient history we find the Pisidian mountains described as the home of a turbulent and warlike people, given to robbery and pillage. The task of subjugating them was intrusted by the Romans to the Galatian king Amyntas, and, at his death in 25 BC, Pisidia passed with the rest of Galatia into the Rom province Galatia. Augustus now took seriously in hand the pacification of Pisidia and the Isaurian mountains on the E. Five military colonies were founded in Pisidia and the eastern mountains—Corumana, Comana, Olobasa, Parlais and Lystra—and all were connected by military roads with the main garrison city Antioc, which lay in Galatian Phrygia, near the northern border of Moab plateau terminates to the W., the "top" or "head" of Pisgah being the point in which the ridge running out westward from the main mass culminates. The summit commands a wide view, and looks down upon the desert. The identification is made sure by the name Tac'tat ek-šuva found here, which seems to correspond with the field of Zophim.

Ashdod is the constr. pl. of 'aššūdāh (sing. form not found), from 'ešhadh, "foundation," "bottom," "lower part" (slope); of Assyry, "foundation." Some would derive it from Aram, "to pour," whereas "fall" or "slope" (OhL, s.v.). Ashdoth-pisgah overlooked the Dead Sea from the E. (Dt 3:17; 4:49; Josh 13:12; 13:20). There can be no reasonable doubt that Ashdoth-pisgah signifies the steep slopes of the mountain descending into the contiguous valleys.

It is worthy of note that LXX does not uniformly render Pisgah by a proper name, but sometimes by a derivative of lαζευόμαι, "to hew," but "to dress stone" (Nu 21:20; 23:14; Dt 3:27; 4:49). Jerome (Onom, s.v. Aṣḥadh) gives Abha, or as the LXX equivalent of Fasga. He derives Pisgah from pασγα, which, in new Heb, means "to split," "to cut off." This suggests a mountain the steep sides of which give it the appearance of having been "cut out." This description which applies perfectly to Jebel Nebā as viewed from the Dead Sea.

W. EWING
Psidia. An inscription discovered in 1912 shows that Quirinus, who is mentioned in Lk 2 2 as governor of Syria of Christ’s birth, was an honorary magistrate of the colony of Antioch; his connection with Antioch dates from his campaign against the Homonades—who had resisted and killed Amyntas—about 8 BC (see Ramsay in Expos., November, 1912, 385 ff., 406). The military system set up by Antiochus as a matter of course on that of Antioch, and from this fact, and from its proximity to Pisidia, Antioch derived its title “the Pisidian,” which served to distinguish it from the other cities called Antioch. It is by a mistake arising from confusion with a later political arrangement that Antioch, and designated “of Pisidia” in the majority of the MSS.

Psidia remained part of the province Galatia till 74 AD, when the greater (southern) part of it was assigned to the new double province Lycia-Pamphylia, and the cities in this portion of Pisidia now ranked as Pamphylian. The northern part of Pisidia continued to belong to Galatia, until, in the time of Diocletian, the southern part of the province Galatia (including the cities of Antioch and Iconium), with parts of Lycia and Asia, were formed into a province called Pisidia, with Antioch as its capital, and it was then that it is first correctly described as a city “of Pisidia,” although there is reason to believe that the term “Pisidia” had already been extended northward in popular usage to include part at least of the Phrygian region of Galatia. This perhaps explains the reading “Antioch of Pisidia” in the Codex Bezae, whose readings usually reflect the conditions of the 2nd cent. of our era in Asia Minor. This use of the term was of course political and administrative; Antioch continued to be a city of Phrygia in the ethnical sense and a recently discovered inscription proves that the Phrygian language was spoken in the neighborhood of Antioch as late as the 3rd cent. of our era (see also Calder in Journal of Rom Studies, 1912, 84).

St. Paul crossed Pisidia on the journey from Perga to Antioch referred to in Acts 13 14, and again on the return journey, Acts 14 24. Of 2. St. Paul those journeys no details are recorded in Pisidia in Acts, but it has been suggested by Hellenic and Howard that the “perils of rivers” and “perils of robbers” mentioned by St. Paul in 2 Cor 11 26 refer to his journeys across Pisidia, and Ramsay has pointed out in confirmation of this view that a considerable number of inscriptions in the region bears the name of Paul the hermaphroditic soldiers and robbers who kept the peace in this region, whereas others refer to a conflict with robbers, or to an escape from drowning in a river (The Church in the Rom Empire, 23 f.; cf. Journal of Rom Studies, 1912, 82 f.). Aciada, a city on St. Paul’s route from Perga to Antioch, is called by the Turks Kara Baulou; “Baulou” is the Turkish pronunciation of “Paulos,” and the name is doubtless reminiscent of an early tradition connecting the city with St. Paul. Pisidia had remained unaffected by Hellenic civilization and the Roman occupation at the time of St. Paul was purely military. It is therefore unlikely that St. Paul preached in Pisidia. Except on the extreme N.W., none of the Christian inscriptions of Pisidia—in glaring contrast with those of Phrygia—date before the legal recognition of Christianity under Constantine.

LITERATURE.—Murray, Handbook of Asia Minor, 150 ff. Ramsay, The Church in the Rom Empire, 18 ff.; Lamprophylus and Pisidians; St. Gerott, Epigraphical Journey and Wolfe Expedition. A few inscriptions containing Pisidian names with native and Hellenic names have been published by Ramsey in Revue des universités du monde, 1905, 335 ff.

W. M. CALDER

PISON, pis’ən. See PISHER.

PISPAS, pis’pəs (πίσπας, pis’pa’, “dispersion.” AV Pispah): A son of Jether, an Asherite (1 Ch 7 38).

PIT: The word translates different Heb words of which the most important are: (1) פִּתּ (pît), “pit” or “cistern,” made by digging (Gen 37 20); hence “dungeon” (Jer 38 6, m. “pit”); (2) פֶּתַח (pē’takh, “pit” or “well” made by digging (Gen 21 25); (3) פִּיתָה (pē’tah, generally rendered “hell” in AV (see HELL); (4) פִּיתָא (pē’tā), “a pit in the ground” to catch wild animals. (1), (2), and (4) above are used metaphorically of the pit of the “grave” or of Sheol (Ex 23 15; 30 3; Job 23 24). AV sometimes incorrectly renders (4) by “corruption.” (5) פִּיתָה (pē’tah), “pit,” literally (2 S 17 9), and figuratively (Jer 49 43). In the NT “pit” renders βόθων, bôthous (Mt 16 14), which means any kind of hole in the ground. In the corresponding passage Lk 16 24 (N.A.V.) has διστασμόν, “a bottomless pit” (Rev 20 1, AV, etc. see Anayas). T. LEWIS

PITCH, pi’th (נֵפָה, nēfāh, kēphār, kēramôn): The word is found chiefly in the OT in the sense of an open space, a strong place, a city. It is used of such places as were the ordinary stations for the shepherds, their “cover,” i.e., the place where they pitched their tents. It is rendered in such cases by AV, “pitch,” and in others by “set.” In Jer 49 43 it is translated “well,” and in Matt 16 14 “hole.” It is used of the place where the wheat germ was placed in the process of preservation (Ps 34 7). In such cases the word is translated “well,” and in others “hole.” It is also used of a walled place, the name being the same as (2) above. For “bottomless pit” (Rev 20 1, AV, etc. see Anayas).

PITON, pi’ton (πιθόν, pithón; Πειθό, Peithó [Ex 1 11]): Champollion (Geogr. Læx., s.v.) considered this name to mean “a narrow place” in Coptie, but it is generally of Name explained to be the Egyptian Pa-tum, or “city of the setting sun.” It was one of the cities built by the Hebrews (see RAAMSSES), and according to Wessel was the Theba of the Antonine Itinerary.

Brugsch (Hist Egypt. 1879, II, 343) says that it was identical with “Heracleopolis Parva, the capital of the Sthorotic nome in the age of the Greeks and Romans; half-way on the great road from Pelusium to Tanis (Zean), and this indication given on the authority of the itineraries furnishes the sole means of fixing its position.” This is, however, disputed. Tan was supposed to have been at Thebes, at Zebu and later at Pelusium (Brugsch, Geogr. I, 345) was also called Pa-tum.

There were apparently several places of the name; and Herodotus (II 158) says that the City of Darius began a little above Bubastis, “near the Arabian city Patoumous,” and reached the Red Sea.

(1) Dr. Naville’s theory.—In 1855 Dr. E. Naville discovered a Roman milestone of Maximian and soldiers, proving that the “city of Peitho” at Tell el Maataf (“the walled mound”) in Wady Tamidít. The modern name he gives as Tell el
PITY, pit'ë (חֵנוֹן, hánōn, הֵנַח, hēnach; ἔλεος, eleōs): "Pity," probably contracted from "piety," is a tender feeling for others in misery or distress. It is allied to compassion (q.v.), but differs in respect to the object the tenderness of Pity is directed toward. The feeling of pity is excited chiefly by the weakness, miserable or degraded condition of the object; compassion by his uncontrollable and inevitable misfortunes: "We pity a man of weak understanding who exposes his weakness or compassion the man who is reduced to a state of beggary and want." (Crabb, English Synonyms.) Pity often becomes allied to contempt; "a pity" is something to be regretted. See PITY. In the OT "pity" is closely akin to "mercy." It is most frequently the tr of קַסּוֹל, "to pity," "to spare," e.g. in Nathan's parable of the poor man's lamb, it is said that the rich man was worthy to die because he had "no pity" (2 S 12 6).

In Jer 13 14 we have, "I will not pity nor spare, nor have mercy," RV "compassion." cf. 31 7; Lam 2 2; Ezek 5 11; 7 4, in all of which passages "pity" stands in a negative connection: we have it positively attributed to God (Gen 45 8; Ezek 38 21; Isa 55 9, RV "grace, mercy, kindness") in the name, RV "regard"; Joel 2 18; Jer, probably meaning, primarily, "to cover" or "to hide". In the time of M Hempth, son of Rameses II (Brusgh, Hist I, 128), we have a report that certain nomads from Aduma (or Edom) passed through "the Ketam" (or fort) of M hempthotep, which is now called Tell Hekte, to the borders of Egypt (or canals) of the city P(kun) of M hempthotep, which are situated in the land of T-k, in order to feed themselves and to feed their herds.

(2) Patounos of Herodotus.—These places seem to have been on the eastern borders of Egypt, but may have been close to the Bitter Lakes or farther N. (see Succoth), whereas Tell el Mahbalah is about 12 miles W. of Ismâmâ'îch, and of Lake Timsâh. The definition of the Pithon thus noticed as being that of M hempth suggests that there was more than one place so called, and the Patounos of Herodotus seems to have been about 30 miles farther W. (near Zagazig and Babastis) than the site of Heropolis, which the LXX identifies with Goshen and not with Pithon. The latter is not noticed as on the route of the Exodus, and is not identified in the OT with Succoth. In the present state of our knowledge of Egyptian topography, the popular impression that the Exodus must have happened in the time of M hempth, because Pithon was at Heropolis and was not that of the time of Rameses II, must not be regarded as very hazardous. See EXODUS. The Patounos of Herodotus may well have been the site, and may still be discovered near the head of Wady Tumadél or near Babastis. C. R. CONDER

PITHON, pit'thon (πίθων, pithôn): A grandson of Meribbaal, or Mephibosheth (1 Ch 35 9). PITYFUL, pit'i-ful: As found in Scripture, means "full of pity"; it is expressed by חֵנוֹן, hánōn, ἔλεος, eleōs, from ἐλέειν, pl. ἐλεήμονα, "bowels, "compassion" (Lam 4 10, AV, its only occurrence in the OT), "the hands of the pitiful women have sodden their own children." In Isa 5 11, we have the beautiful saying: "the Lord is very pitiful [RV "full of pity"] and of tender mercy," where "very pitiful" is the tr of πετάλωσιν, lit. "of many bowels," a word which does not occur elsewhere; it might be 1δραίόν or "tender-hearted." In Ecclus 20:13, the Lord is very pitiful (αἰκτίωσιν); εἰκαστίωσιν, "well-angered," "companionsate," "full of pity," occurs in 1 Pet 3 8, "Love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous," RV "loving as brethren, tenderhearted, humble-minded." The word is found in Fr Man 7, XII P, Zeb 8 2.

W. L. WALKER

PLACE, plâs: Normally for πόλις, makkôn, OT, and πόλεως, pólos, NT, but in AV "place" represents a great number of Heb and Gr words, often used with no difference in force (e.g. 2 Ch 35 10.15). RV has made few changes, but occasionally has attempted to specialize the meaning (Gen 40 13; Job 37 8; Acts 8 22; Jas 1 11). PLACE, BROAD. HIGH. See CITY, II, 3, 2; HIGH PLACE; OPEN PLACE.

PLOUGUE, plûg (πλῆκτος, nephos, πλάκα, makhâ, núlē, magâphôrâ; μῶστρις, mátistix, πλῆκτρον, plûktron): This word which occurs more than 120 t is applied, like pellucity, to such sudden outbursts of disease as are regarded in the light of Divine visitations. It is used in the description of leprosy about 90 t in Lev 13 and 14, as well as in Dt 24 8. In the poetical, prophetic and eschatological books it occurs about 20 t in the general sense of a punitive disaster. The Gospel references (Mt 3 10; 5 29,34; Lk 7 21) use the word as a synonym for disease. The specific disease now named "plague" has been from the earliest historic times a frequent visitant to Pal and Egypt. Indeed in the S.E. between Gaza and Babastis it has occurred so frequently that it may almost be regarded as endemic. The suddenness of its attack, the rapidity of its incubation period and the rapidity of its course give it the characteristics which of old have been associated with manifestations of Divine anger. In the early days of an epidemic it is no infrequent occurrence that 90 per cent of those attacked die within
three days. I have seen a case in which death took place ten hours after the first symptoms. In the filthy and insanitary hovels of eastern towns, the disease spreads rapidly. In a recent epidemic in one village of 534 inhabitants 311 died within 21 days, and 1 once crossed the track of a party of pilgrims to Mecca of whom two-thirds died of plague on the road. Even with modern sanitary activity, it is very difficult to root it out, as our recent experiences in Hong Kong and India have shown.

Of the Bib. outbreaks that were not improbably bubonic plague, the first recorded is the slaughter of the firstborn in Egypt—"the 10th plague." There is too little information to identify it. (Ex 11:1). The Philis, however, used the same name, neghph, for the Egypt plagues (1 S 4:8) as is used in Ex. The next outbreak was at Kibroth-hattaavah (Nu 11:33). This was synchronous with the phenomenon of plagues, and if these were, as is probable, driven by the wind from the plague-stricken Syrian region, they were equally probably the carriers of the infection. Experience in both India and China shows that animals of very diverse kind can carry germs of the disease. A third visitation fell on the spies who brought back an evil report (Nu 14:37). A fourth destroyed those who murmured at the destruction of Korah and his fellow-rebels (Nu 16:4). These may have been recurrences of the infection brought by the plagues. The fifth outbreak was that which followed the gross religious and moral detection at Baal-peor (Nu 25:9.18; 26:1; 31:16; Josh 22:17; Ps 106:29.30). Here the disease was probably conveyed by the Moabites.

A later epidemic, which was probably of bubonic plague, was that which avenged the capture of the ark (1 S 6). We read of the tumors which were probably the "plague of leprous sores," which is here connected also that at the time there was a plague of rats (6:5) —"mice," in our version, but the word is also used as the name of the rat. The cattle seem to have carried the plague to Beth-shemesh, as has been observed in modern times. The plague was in that place for nine days (6:19). Considering the three days' pestilence that followed David's census (2 S 24:15; 1 Ch 21:12), see Jos., Astr. VII. xiii. 3. The destruction of the army of Zemerdiah may have been a sudden outbreak of plague (2 K 19:35; Isa 37:36). It is perhaps worthy of note that in Hierodocus' account of the destruction of this army (ii.141) he refers to the recurrence of some of the symptoms.

One of the latest prophetic mentions of plague is Hos 13:14, where the plague (dékēh, LXX dikē) of death and the destruction (kôthbēh, LXX kēntron) of the grave are mentioned. From this passage Paul quotes his apostrophe at the end of 1 Cor 15:55, but the apostle correlates the sting (kēntron) with death, and changes the dikē into nikēs.

ALEX. MACALISTER

PLAGUES, plágēs, OF EGYPT (ပဲခူး), nighph, "wonders" from နိမ့်, pōlā, "to be separate," i.e. in a class by themselves; also called နိမ့်, neghph, "plague," from နိမ့်, naghph, "to smite" [Ex 9:14], and နိမ့်, negha, "a stroke," from နိမ့်, nagha, "to touch" [Ex 11:1; cf Josh 24:10]:
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I. NATURAL PHENOMENA

1. Turned to Blood
2. Frogs
3. Lice
4. Flies
5. Murrain
6. Boils
7. Hail
8. Locusts
9. Darkness
10. Death of the Firstborn

II. MIRACULOUS USE OF THE PHENOMENA

1. Intensification
2. Prediction
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5. Arrangement to Accomplish Divine Moral Purpose

III. DIVINE MORAL PURPOSE

1. Discouraging of the Gods of Egypt
2. Pharaoh Made to Know Jehovah Is Lord
3. Revelation of God as "Wonders"
4. Exhibition of the Divine Use of Evil

LITERATURE

The Heb words are so used as to give the name "plagues" to the "wonders" God did against Pharaoh. Thus it appears that the introduction language in the account in Ex puts forward the wondrous character of these dealings of Jehovah with Pharaoh. The account of the plagues is found in Ex 7:8-12:31; Ps 78:52-51; 105:27-35. The plagues have a devotional purpose and do not give a full historical narrative. Ps 78 omits plagues 4, 6, 9; Ps 105 omits plagues 5 and 6. Both pass change the order of the plagues. Account of the preparation which led up to the plagues is found in the narrative of the burning bush (see BURNING BUSH), the meeting of Aaron with Moses, the gathering together of the elders of Israel for instruction, and the preliminary wonders before Pharaoh (Ex 3:4). This preparation contemplated two things important to be kept in view in considering the plagues, namely, that the consummation of plagues was contemplated from the beginning (Ex 4:22-23), and that the skepticism of Israel concerning Moses' authority and power was likewise anticipated (Ex 4:1). It was thus manifestly not an age of miracles when the Israelites were expecting such "wonders" and ready to receive anything marvelous as a Divine interposition. This skepticism of Israel is a valuable help in the credibility of the account of the "wonders." The immediate occasion of the plagues was the refusal of Pharaoh to let the people have liberty for sacrifice, together with the consequent hardening of Pharaoh's heart.

No indication of any localizing of the plagues is given except in Ps 78:12-13, where the "field of Zaan" is mentioned as the scene of the contest between Jehovah and the Egyptians. But this is poetry, and "the field of Zaan" means simply the territory of the great capital Zaan. This expression might be localized in the Delta or it might extend to the whole of Egypt. Discussion of the plagues has brought out various classifications of them, some of which are philosophical, as that of Philo, others fanciful, as that of Origen. The order of the plagues for the purpose of moralizing are entirely useless for historical consideration of the plagues. The only order of any real value is the order of Nature, i.e. the order in which the plagues occurred, which will be found to be the order of the natural phenomena which were the embodiment of the plagues.

Much elaborate effort has been made to derive from the description of the plagues evidence for different documents in the narrative. It is pointed out that Moses (E) declared to Pharaoh that he would smite the waters (Ex 7:17), and then, when his words were not fulfilled, he would tell us that Aaron smote the waters (7:19-20). But this is quite in accord with the preceding statement (4:10) that Aaron would be ready to smite, and possibly to cope deal with God, Aaron with Pharaoh. Again it is noticed that some of the plagues are ascribed to the immediate agency of Jehovah, some are ascribed as coming through the mediation of Moses, and still others through the mediation of Moses and Aaron. It is possible this may be an exact statement of facts, and, if the facts were just so, the record of the facts affords no evidence of different documents.

An examination of the account of the plagues as it stands will bring them before us in a most graphic and connected story.

I. THE NATURAL PHENOMENA.

—All the "wonders" represented anywhere in Scripture as done by the power of God are intimately associated with natural phenomena. In Egypt—"the 10th plague"—human beings have no other way of perceiving external events than through those senses which only deal with
natural phenomena. Accordingly, all theophanies and miraculous doings are embodied in natural events.

The presence of Jeh with the sacrifice by Abraham was marked by the appearance of a "burning furnace and a burning lamp" between the pieces of the offerings (Gen 15:17 AV). The majesty and power of God at Sinal were manifested in the "cloud" and the "bright light" as the "voice" and the "sound of a trumpet" (Ex 13:19). The Deity of Jesus was attested on the mountain by a "voice" (17:5), Jesus Himself was "God, ... manifest in the flesh" (1 Tim 3:16). He was 3 "foursquare" in fashion as a man (Phil 2:8). And all the miracles of Jesus were of a kind sensible phenomena: He sent them to the sea and it was calm; He touched the leper and he was clean; He called to Lazarus and he came forth.

Yet in all these natural events, the miraculous working of God was as clearly seen as the natural phenomena. It is thus to be expected that the "wonders" of God in the land of Pharaoh should also be associated with natural events as well as manifest miraculous elements. The "blood" in the river, the "frogs", hopping about on the land, the "flies," the "gnats," the "murrain," the "hail," the "locusts," the "darkness," and the "pestilence" are all named as natural phenomena. Long familiarity with the land of Egypt has made it perfectly plain to many intelligent people, also, that, if not quite, all the plagues of Egypt are still in that land as natural phenomena, and occur, when they do occur, very exactly in the order in which we find them recorded in the narrative in Ex. But natural events in the plagues as in other "wooded miracles" are doings.

The first of the plagues (חָרָם, ħâram, from חָרָם, ḥârâm, "to be red" [Ex 7:19-25]) was brought about by the smiting of the water with the rod in the hand of Aaron, and it consisted in the defamation of the water so that it became blood. The waters were polluted and the fish died. Even the water in vessels which had been taken from the river became corrupt. The people were forced to get water only from wells in which the river water was filtered through the sand. There are two Egypt seasons when, at times, the water resembles blood. At the full Nile the water is sometimes of a reddish color, but at that season the water is quite potable and the fish do not die. But at the half-time of the flood it is watered from the time of the lowest Nile just before the rise begins. Then also the water sometimes becomes defiled and very red, so polluted that the fish die (Bib. Sacra, 1905, 409). This latter time is evidently the time of the plague. It was the same time in the month of May. The dreadful severity of the plague constituted the "wonder" in this first plague. The startling character of the plague is apparent when it is remembered that Egypt is the product of the Nile, the very soil being all brought down by it, and its irrigation being constantly dependent upon it. Because of this it became one of the earliest and greatest of the gods (Breasted, Development of Religion and Thought in Egypt, 3-47; "Hymn to the Nile," Records of the Past, New Series, 3, 48, 54). The magicians imitated this plague with their enchantments. Their success may have been by means of sleight of hand or other devices of magic, as may be seen in the East today, with claim of supernatural aid, and as used in western lands for quite similar purposes, but it may have, as has been suggested, that they counted upon the continuance of the plague for at least a time, and so took advantage of the materials the "wonder" had provided.

**1. Water Turned to Blood**

Spawn in the mud is hatched by the sun, and the marshes are filled with myriads of these creatures. The frog was the hieroglyph for the "wonders," and the Egyptians, being much given to fishing, were greatly disturbed in the marshes, but in this case they came forth to the horror and disgust of the people. "Frogs in the houses, flies in the beds, frogs baked with the food in the oven." Frogs in the kneading troughs worked up with the flour; frogs with their monotonous croak, frogs with their cold slimy skins, everywhere—"from morning to night, from night to morning—frogs." The frog was also associated with Divinity, was the symbol of Hest, a form of Hathor, and seems also at times to have been worshiped as a god. This plague created such horror that thus early Pharaoh came to an agreement (8:1-10). A time was set for the disappearance of the frogs that he might know that "there is none like unto Jeh our God," but when the frogs were dead, Pharaoh hardened his heart (8:15). In this plague the magicians did in like manner with their enchantments (7). Frogs were plentiful, and it would not seem to be difficult to claim to have produced some of them.

It is impossible to determine which of the two more troublesome pest of Egypt is meant by the 3rd plague, whether body-louse or mosquitoes or sandflies or ticks or fleas or flies or gnats. The Egyptians are disposed to think it was not. Certainly that reason of the months spent in Egypt, not that Pharaoh put his faith on the Nile, but in a native village, will furnish very satisfying evidence that stinging and biting insects are a very real plague in Egypt yet. The magicians failed with their enchantments and acknowledged that Divine power was at work, and seems to have acknowledged that Jeh was abominations (8:19), but Pharaoh would not heed them.

As the seasons pass on, after the recession of the waters, the flies (חָרָם, ħâram, "swarrows," probably of flies [Ex 8:20-32]) became more and more numerous and they are almost a plague every year. The flies are changed variety of this plague. The plague of flies is a greater and greater every year. The magicians imitated this plague with their enchantments. Their success may have been by means of sleight of hand or other devices of magic, as may be seen in the East today, with claim of supernatural aid, and as used in western lands for quite similar purposes, but it may have, as has been suggested, that they counted upon the continuance of the plague for at least a time, and so took advantage of the materials the "wonder" had provided.

**2. The Plague of Frogs**

The frogs (חָרָם, ħâram, probably "marsh-leapers" [Ex 8:1-13]) are very abundant just after the high Nile when the waters begin to recede.

**3. The Plague of Lice**

Those who have experience of these pests in Egypt are quite ready to except any of them as adequate for the plague. Lice seem rather to be ruled out, unless different kinds of lice were sent, as there is no kind that torments both man and beast. All the other insect pests appear in incredible numbers out of the "dust" when the pools have dried up after the reeding of the waters. The assertion that the account of this plague is not complete, because it is not recorded that Pharaoh asked its removal or that Moses secured it, is amazing. Perhaps Pharaoh did not, in fact, ask its removal. There seems also at this time some difficulty in Moses having access to Pharaoh after this plague (8:20). Perhaps the Egyptians was not removed at all. The Egyptians are disposed to think it was not. Certainly that reason of the months spent in Egypt, not that Pharaoh put his faith on the Nile, but in a native village, will furnish very satisfying evidence that stinging and biting insects are a very real plague in Egypt yet. The magicians failed with their enchantments and acknowledged that Divine power was at work, and seems to have acknowledged that Jeh was abominations (8:19), but Pharaoh would not heed them.

4. The Plague of Flies
In addition to the separation established between Israel and the Egyptians, a definite time is now set for the coming of the 5th plague. It is to be noticed also that diseases of cattle are described (v. 17), debter, a term usually translated as "destruction." [Ex 9 1-7] and of men few quickly after the plague of insects. This is in exact accord with the order of Nature as now thoroughly understood through the discovered relation of mosquitoes and flies to the spread of diseases. Rinderpest must have been at times in Egypt; so that beef becomes very scarce in market and is sometimes almost impossible to obtain. It is a fact, also, that the prevalence of cattle plague, the presence of boils among men (see 6, below) and the appearance of bubonic plague are found to be closely associated together and in this order. The mention of camels as affected by this plague is interesting. It is doubtful if any clear indication of the presence of the camel in Egypt so early as this has yet been found among the monuments of Egypt. There is in the Louvre museum one small antiquity which seems to me to be intended for the camel. But Professor Maspero does not agree that it is so. It would seem likely that the Hyksos, who were Bedouin princes, princes of the desert, would have introduced with the wells of the desert to Egypt. If they did so, that may have been sufficient reason that the Egyptians would not picture it, as the Hyksos and all that was theirs were hated in Egypt.

In the plague of boils (טוען, skhén, and רבקת, 'āḇhāḇāṯ, "boils") [Ex 9 8-17] ashes were used, probably in the same way and to the same end as the clay was used in opening the eyes of the blind man (Jn 9, 6), i.e. to attract attention and to fasten the mind of the observer upon what the Lord was doing. This plague in the order of its coming, immediately after the murrain, and in the description given of it and in the significant warning of the "pestilence" yet to come (Ex 9 15), appears most likely to have been pestis minor, the milder form of bubonic plague. Virulent rinderpest among cattle in the East is regarded as the precursor of plague among men and is believed to be of the same nature. It may well be, as has been thought by some, that the great aversion of the ancient Egyptians to the contamination of the soil by decaying swine and the desire of the miseries of starting an epidemic of plague among men (Dr. Merrin, Bib. Sacra, 1908, 422-23).

Hail (טוען, bārāḏ, "hail") [Ex 9 18-35] is rare in Egypt, but is not unknown. The writer himself seems to have seen a very little, and has known of one instance when a considerable quantity of hail as large as small marbles fell. Lightning, also, is not as frequent in Egypt as in many semi-tropical countries, yet great electric storms sometimes occur. This plague is quite accurately dated in the seasons of the year (9 31.32). As the first plague was just before the rising of the Nile, so this one is evidently about 9 months later, when the new crops after the inundation were beginning to mature, January-February.

The plague of locusts (טוען, 'ārebh, "locust") [Ex 10 1-20] was threatened, and so frightened were the servants of Pharaoh that they persuaded him to try to make some agreement with Moses, but the attempt of Pharaoh still to limit in some way the going of Israel thwarted the plan (Ex 10 7-10). Then devouring swarms of locusts came up over the land as far as the desert of the Red Sea. They devoured every green thing left by the hail. The desperate situation created by the locusts soon brought Pharaoh again to acknowledgment of Jehovah (10 16). There was the same persistence yet manifested by Pharaoh, but he soon showed that it was deceitful, and again he would not let the people go. When the wind had swept the locusts away, he hardened his heart once more.

The progress of the season has been quite marked from the first plague, just before the rising of the waters, on through the year until now the khamis period (טוען, ḫōsekh, "darkness") of "darkness" from any cause [Ex 10 21-29] has come. When this dreadful scourge comes with its hot sand-laden breeze more unendurable than a London fog, it is in very truth a "darkness which spreadeth over the face of the earth." The dreadful horror of this monster from the desert can hardly be exaggerated. Once again Pharaoh said "Go," but this time he wished to retain the flocks and herds, a hostage for the return of the people (10 24). Upon Moses' refusal to accept this condition, he threatened his life. Why had he not done so ere this? Why, indeed, did he let this man Moses come and go with such freedom, defying him and his people in the very palace? Probably Moses' former career in Egypt explains this. As is most probable, he had grown up at court with this Merenptah, and had been known as "the son of Pharaoh's daughter," heir to the throne and successor to Ramesses II, instead of Merenptah, then this refuge had undoubtedly many friends still in Egypt who would make his death a danger to the reigning Pharaoh.

No intimation is given of the exact character of the death inflicted on the firstborn (טוען, bēkhr, "firstborn," "chief" or "best") of the Egyptians, of the Firstborn by the angel of the Lord, or its appearance. But it is already foretold as the "pestilence" (9 15). The pestis major or virulent bubonic plague corresponds most nearly in its natural phenomena to this plague. It culminates in arrival of the disease and overwhelming violence, in which the strongest and bost, and then subsides with startling suddenness.

Thus it appears that probably all the plagues were based upon natural phenomena which still exist in Egypt in the same order, and, when they do occur, find place somewhere during the course of one year.

**II. Miraculous Use of the Phenomena.**—The miraculous elements in the plagues are no less distinctly manifest than the natural phenomena themselves.

There was an intensification of the effect of the various plagues so much beyond all precedent as to impress everyone as being a special Divine manifestation, and it was so.

1. Intensification

There was national horror of the blood-like water, disgust at the frogs, intolerable torture by the stinging insects and flies, utter ruin of the farmers in the loss of the cattle, the beating down of the crops by hail, and the devouring of every green thing by the locusts; the sufferings and dread of the inhabitants by reason of the boils, the frightful electric storm, the suffocating darkness and, finally, the crushing disaster of the death of the firstborn. All these calamities
may be found in Egypt to the present day, but never any of them, not to say all of them, in such overwhelming severity. That all of them should come in one year and all with such devastation was plainly a Divine arrangement. Merely natural events do not arise in such a systematic fashion. In this systematic severity were seen miracles of power.

The prediction of the plagues and the fulfilment of the prediction at the exact time to a day, sometimes to an hour, is the conclusion of the thunder and lightning): There was first a general prediction (Ex 3 19-20; 7 3; 9 14-15) and an indication as the plagues went on that the climax would be pestilence (9 15). Then several of the plagues were specifically announced and a time was set for them; e.g. the flies (8 23), the murrain (9 5), the hail (9 18), the locusts (10 4), the death of the firstborn (11 4). In some cases a time for the removal of the plague was also specified: e.g. the frogs (8 10), the thunder and lightning (9 20). In every instance these predictions were exactly fulfilled. In some instances careful foresight might seem to supply in part this ability to predict. Perhaps it was the means of such foresight that magicians "did not do with their enchantments" for the first two plagues. The plague being in existence, foresight might safely predict that it would continue for a little time at least, so that, if the magicians sought for the bloody water or called for frogs, they would seem to be successful. But the evidence which Jehovah produced went beyond them, and, at the third plague, they were unable to do anything. These things postulate, on the part of Moses and Aaron, a knowledge far beyond human ken. Not only magicians could not do so with their enchantments, but modern science and discoveries are no more able so to predict events. Even meteorological phenomena are only predicted within the limits of reasonable foresight. Such wonders as the plagues of Egypt can in no wise be explained as merely natural. The prediction was a miracle of knowledge.

The discrimination shown in the visitation by the plagues presents another miraculous element more significant and important than either the miracles of power or the miracles of knowledge. God put a difference between the Egyptians and the Israelites, beginning with the plague of darkness and continuing, apparently, without exception, until the end. Such miracles of moral purpose admit of no possible explanation but the exercise of a holy will. Merely natural events make no such regular, systematic discriminations.

The orderliness and gradually increasing severity of the plagues with such arrangement as brought "judgment upon the gods of Egypt," vindicating Jehovah as Ruler over all, and educating the people to know Jehovah as Lord of all the earth, present an aspect of events distinctly non-natural. Such method reveals also a Divine mind at work.

Last of all and most important of all, the plagues were so arranged as to accomplish in particular a great Divine moral purpose in the revelation of God to the Israelites, to the Egyptians and to all the world.

5. Moral Purpose

This is the distinctive mark of every real miracle. And this leads us directly to the consideration of the most important aspect of the plagues.

III. The Divine Moral Purpose.—This discriminating of the gods of Egypt is marked at every step of the progress of the plagues, and the accumulated effect of the repeated discriminating of the gods must have had, and, indeed, had, a great influence upon the Egyptians. The plagues did 'execute judgment against the gods of Egypt' (12 12), and the people and princes brought great pressure to bear upon Pharaoh to let the people go (10 19). The Egyptians, who claimed to represent the gods of Egypt were defeated, Pharaoh himself, who was accounted divine, was humbled, the great god, the Nile, was polluted, frogs defiled the temples and, at last, the sun, the greatest god of Egypt, was blotted out in darkness.

Pharaoh was made to know that Jehovah is Lord, and acknowledged it (9 27; 10 16). To this end the issue was clearly drawn. Pharaoh challenged the right of Jehovah to command him (5 2), and God required him then to 'stand' to the trial until the evidence could be fully presented, in accordance with the fundamental principle that he who makes a charge is bound to stand to it until either he acknowledges its utter falsity or affords opportunity for full presentation of evidence. So we see God made Pharaoh to 'stand' (9 16) while the Bible, which speaks in the concrete language of life, calls it the hardening of Pharaoh's heart (9 32) until the case was tried out (cf Lamb, Miracle of Science, 126-49).

A more blessed and gracious moral purpose of the plagues was the revelation of God as the Saviour of the world. This began in the revelation of Jehovah at the burning bush, where God, in fire, appeared in the bush, yet the bush was not consumed, but saved. This revelation, thus given to the people, was further evidenced by the separation between Israel and the Egyptians; was made known even to the Egyptians by the warning before the plague of hail, that those Egyptians who had been impressed with the power of God might also learn that He is a God that will save those who give heed to Him; and, at last, reached its startling climax when the angel of the Lord passed over the blood-marked door the night of the death of the firstborn and the institution of the Passover.

Last of all, the plagues had a great moral purpose in that they equipped the Divine of evil in the experience of men in this world. As Divine experience of Job illustrates the Use of Evil, use of evil in the life of the righteous, so the plagues of Egypt illustrate the same great problem of evil in the life of the wicked. In the one case, as in the other, the wonders of God are so arranged as 'to justify the ways of God to men.'

The minutely accurate knowledge of life in Egypt displayed by this narrative in the Book of Ex is inconceivable in an age of so little and difficult intercommunication between nations, except by actual residence of the author in Egypt. This has an important bearing upon the time of the composition of this narrative, and upon the question of its author.

Literature.—The literature of this subject is almost endless. It will suffice to refer the reader to all the general commentaries and the special commentaries, on discussion of doctrinal and critical questions. Two admirable recent discussions of the plagues, in English, are Lamb, Miracle of Science, and Mering, The Plagues of Egypt," in Biblica Sacra, 1908, July and October.

G. E. Ki

Plain, plan, (1) נֵפְשׁ, נֵפָשׁ, "circle," "circle," or "round loaf"; (2) יָשָׁר, מִשָּׁר, מִשָּׁר, yashar, "to be level"; of Arab. ڈ, a, "that which is easy"; (3) בָּקָע, bāk'ā, of Arab. بکع, bāk'āt, "a plot of ground," or "a wet
[1 7 17 2]; [8] הָר, 'ābhel): See NATURAL FEATURES.

(1) Kikkār, when meaning "plain" usually refers to the alluvial plain about Jericho near the north end of the Dead Sea: "Plain [RVm 'circle'] of the Jordan" (Gen 13:10,11; 1 K 7:46; 2 Ch 4:17); "Plain of the valley of Jericho" (Dt 34:3); "cities of the Plain" (Gen 13:12; 19:29); "the all Plain" (Gen 19:17,25); "by the way of the Plain" (2 S 18:25); but "the plain round about Jerus" (Neh 12:28).

(2) Mishār, EV "plain," RVm usually "tableland," clearly refers in most places to the highlands of Gilead and Moab, E. of the Jordan and the Dead Sea; e.g. Josh 13:9, "the plain [RVm 'tableland'] of Medebea.

(3) Bīlāh is more often trd "valley" (q.v.).

(4) Arābāh is in RV often trd "the Arabah," denoting the whole Jordan-Dead-Sea-Arabah depression = Arab. Ghawr (Ghôr).

In Dt 11:30, AV has "champaign" (q.v.). The "plains of Moab" (Nu 23:1; 25:3-5; 31:12; 33:48,49,50; 36:1; 36:3; 14:6, 13; 13:32) and "plains of Jericho" (Jos 10:13; 10:2; 2 K 25:3; Jer 39:5; 52:8) are the low plain or ghawr N. of the Dead Sea.

Arābāh is here equivalent to kikkār (see above). Note the distinction between mishār used of the highlands, and kikkār and arābāh used of the plain. See ARABAH.

(5) Skerphélāh is by RV throughout trd "lowland" (q.v.), and includes the western slopes of the Judean hills and the maritime plain.

(6) Topos pedíou occurs only in Lk 6:17.

(7) Elōn is trd "plain" in AV: "plain of Moreh" (Gen 12:6; Dt 11:30); "plain (or plains) of Mamre" (Gen 13:18; 14:13; 18:1); "plain of Zaanaim" (Jgs 4:11); "plain of the pillar" (Jgs 9:6); "plain of Moenemin" (Jgs 9:37); "plain of Tabor" (1 S 10:3). RV has throughout "oak," RVm "terebinth," el "oak" (Gen 35:4,8, etc).

(8) 'Ābhel kerāvim (Jgs 11:33) is in AV "the plain of the vineyards," RVm "Abel-cheramim," RVm "the meadow of vineyards." Elsewhere in EV 'ābhel is "Abel" or "Abel-," See ABEL-CHERAMIM; MEADOW.

ALFRED ELY DAY

PLAIN, plain, PLAINLY, plā′ni: In Gen 25 27, AV "plain" represents סלך, tām. If a contrast between the vocations of Jacob and Esau is meant, RV ("quiet," m "harmless") may be right. But elsewhere (Job 1:1; Ps 37:37, etc) the word means "perfect," and so probably here; the failings of the great patriarch did not detract from the general estimate of him (Mt 8:11). In Ezr 4:18 translated (RVm) is better than "plainly read.

PLAIN, CITIES OF THE. See CITIES OF THE PLAIN.

PLAIN OF MOAB: In Dt 1 1; 2 8, "plain," is trd in RV. "Arabah," and explained, "the deep valley running N. and S. of the Dead Sea." It was here that Moses delivered his last addresses. Usually the word is pl. הַרְבָּה, 'ārābāh, the "plains" or steppes of Moab (Nu 22:1, etc; Dt 34:18).

An interesting description is given in an article on "The Steppes of Moab" by Professor G. B. Gray in EXPOS, January, 1905. See MOAB.

PLAIN OF THE PILLAR (בְּנֵבֶל, 'bēlān, μνημονεῖον; B reads πρὸς τὴν ἐπίστευσιν τῆς στασίας τῆς ἐν Σικελίῳ, πρὸς τὴν βαλίντ τῇ θεωρεῖται τῇ θάλασσα τῇ εἰς Σικελίῳ): A column in Μοσχοῦ, and the second Μοσχοῦ: With RVm we must read "terebinth of the pillar," the place where the men of Shechem and Beth-millo made Abimelech king (Jgs 9:6).

This was one of the sacred trees of which there seem to have been several near Shechem. See MOSCHIM, OAK OF. "The pillar" may possibly have been the great stone which Joshua set up "under the oak that was by the sanctuary of Jeh" (Josh 24:26). W. EWING

PLAIN OF THE VINEYARDS. See ABEL-CHERAMIM.

PLAISTER, plaśtər. See PLASTER.

PLAETING, plaťing, plaťing (from OFr. pleít, lat. planctum, "fold"): An interweaving, braiding, knot; an elaborate gathering of the hair into knots; éparce, empłéké, " outward adorning of plaeting the hair" (1 Pet 3:3). Compare "platted" (Isa 9:16). See CLOTHES OF THORNS (Mt 27:29; Mk 15:17; Jn 19:2). See BRAIDED, BRAIDING.

PLANE TREE, plān'tree (ἡμέλαμον, śālāwak, πλανόσιν, plánonos [Gen 30:37], ἀρμόνιον, ἀρμόνιον ["pine" or "firm") [Ezk 31:8]; AV chestnut): "Armōn is supposed to be derived from ἡμέλαμον, sharp, meaning "to be bare" or "unshackled," this is considered a suitable term for the plane, which sheds its bark annually. The chestnut of AV is not an indigenous tree, but the plan, Plania orientalis, is one of the finest trees in Pal, flourishing esp. by water courses (cf Ezek 14:14).

PLANETS, plan'ets (ἡλικόν, mazzalith). See ASTROLOGY, II, 3.

PLAIN, plank: Thick beams or pieces of wood, for which several Heb words are used. RV changes "planks" (of fir) into "boards" in K 6 15, and in a few instances substitutes "planks" where AV has "boards" (Ex 27:8; 38:7, the altar; Ezek 27:5).

So in the NT in Acts 27 44, for σκέφτες, sarto. See SHIPS AND BOATS, II, 2, (3).

PLANT, PLANTS. See BOTANY.

PLASTER, plaśtər (טְל, sidāh): In Egypt, now as anciently, the buildings are plastered inside and out. The poor quality of the stone commonly used makes this necessary if a smooth attractive surface is desired. Among the poorer classes, clay mixed with straw is used. In Pal and Syria, where there is a rainy season, the coating on the outside walls, if of clay, must be frequently renewed. In Egypt burnt gypsum, and in Pal and Syria burnt limestone (lime) are the commonest materials for making mortar. For the first coat of plastering the lime is mixed with "fat" red sand or with the ash from the bathhouse fires, and the finishing coat is composed of white sand and slaked lime with or without chopped flax straw. The plaster on some of the ancient Egyptian ruins seems to indicate
Plaster
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Plow

that milk or some similar substance was added to
the mortar to give a better surface.
The ancients preferred plastered surfaces for
decorating, and even the finest granite was covered
with stucco on which to paint or carve the decorations (Dt 27 2; Dnl 5 5).
Columns were often
first stuccoed and then painted.
The Arab, word for mortar is tin, which really

means

The Heb

"clay."

"'IB, sidh,

lit.

"to boil

up," refers to the boiling of the water with which the
lime is slaked, because of the heat generated during
the slaking process. In Dnl 5 5 occurs 1^3 gir,
i.e. "burned in a kiln," which might mean either
lime or gypsum. In Lev 14 42 occurs n^T3 til''h,
"to smear."
James A. Patch
,

,

PLASTER,

plas'ter (n-|)2
marah): Only used
38 21 of the application of the cake of figs
to the boil from which Hezekiah suffered.
In
Papyrus Ebers, figs are used as the ingredient in a
,

in Isa

Dioscorides also recwith other substances as a poultice

plaster (xxxv, Ixxix, Ixxxiii).

ommends

figs

some skin

in

diseases.

PLASTERING,

See Ceafts,

plas'ter-ing.

II, 15.

A

PLATE,

term seemingly not used in the
plat:
Bible for a dish as it is so commonly used at present,
but always for a tablet or sheet of metal.
(1) f^?
(Ex 28 36; 39 30; Lev 8 9), a plate of gold on
the front of the mitre of the high priest. The name
seems to have been given because of the radiance
of the object.
(2) ns pah (Ex 39 3; Nu 16 38),
of plates or sheets of metal produced by hammering.
ftf

,

(3) nib lil'h, used for tablets or tables of stone (Ex
24 12, etc), but in 1 K 7 36 for the metal plates
on the bases of the lavers in the temple. The
word T^D seren, is rendered "plate" in 1 K 7 30
,

,

AV, manifestly

PLATTER,

incorrectly,

plat'er:

RV

"axle."

Walter R. Betteridge
J^'araA, "a deep
(1) nn^p
,

dish"
(Nu 7 13 f.84.85).
"charger,"
"platter"

ARV

In'

AV

and

ERV

Ex

25 29; 37 16);
LXX Tpv^Xiov, truhlion, and in the NT rendered
"dish" (Mt 26 23; Mk 14 20). In Ezr 1 9, ARV
b-jnji*, 'dghartal, rendered "platter," AV and ERV
"chargers"; probably a deep dish or basin used in
(cf

slaughter.
(2) n-a.po'f'ls, paropsis, originally a side dish, for relishes, entrees, but of dishes
for food, in general, esp. meats, fish, etc, used with
TTOT-fipLov, poterion, "cup" or "drinking vessel" (Mt
23 2.5 f); also ttItoI, pireax, originally a large wooden
chsh or plate (Lk 11 39); rendered "charger" in
Mt 14 8.11 AV, and
6 25.28
and ERV.
sacrificial

Mk

AV

Edward Bagby Pollard
PLAY,

pla.

PLEAD,

See Games.

In modern non-legal Eng. is a
"pray" or "beseech," but in legal
"plea,"
phraseology
"plead," and "pleading" have
a great variety of technical meanings, with "present
a case before the court" as the idea common to all.
All the uses of "plead" in
are connected with
this legal sense, so that outside of the set phrase
"plead a cause" (1 S 24 15, etc) there is hardly
a use of the word in AV, ERV, or
that is clear
modern Eng. The most obscure instances are due to
AV's employment of "plead" to translate the Niphal

synonym

pled:

of

EV

ARV

USID shapliat. Shdphat means "judge," so its
Niphal means "bring one's self into a case to be
judged," "enter into controversy with," and so
"plead" in the legal sense. Hence "None pleadeth
in tn_ith" (Isa 59 4) means "None of their lawsuits

of

meaning is that God states His side of the case and
not at all that He supplicates man to repent. And
this statement by God is a judicial act that of course
admits of no reply. Hence RV has changed "plead
with" into "enter into judgment with" in Jer 2 35,
and ARV has carried this change into all the other
passages (Jer 25 31; Ezk 17 20; 20 35.36; 38 22),
with "execute judgment" in Isa 66 16; Joel 3 2.
The same vb.-form occurs also in Isa 43 26: "Let
us plead together," where "Let us present our
arguments on both sides" would be a fair paraphrase.
Otherwise "plead" usually represents
3"'"1,

Accordingly, when God is said to
"plead with" man (Isa 66 16 AV, ERV, etc), the

RV

which

for

ribh,

gives "strive" in place

"plead" in Ps 35 1, and "contend" in Job
13 19; 23 6 (ARV also in Jgs 6 31.32; Isa 3 13;
Jer 2 9; 12 1; Hos 2 2, retaining "plead" only in
H?^,
Isa 1 17 and in the phrase "plead a cause").
yakhah, is rendered "plead" in Job 19 5 ("plead
against me my reproach," where the meaning is
"convict me of"), in Mic 6 2 AV and ERV (ARV
"contend"), and Job 16 21 AV (RV "maintain
the right").
"Plead" is used also for X!^., din, in
Jer 30 13 and Prov 31 9 AV (RV "minister justice to"), and Jer 5 28 RV (AV "judge"; cf 22 16,
of

AV and RV

RV would have done vastly

"judge").

better if the use of "plead"
gether.

had been avoided

alto-

(i.e. "arguments") occurs in Job 13 6
and "plea" {din, in a specific legal sense)
Dt 17 S. AV uses "implead" in Acts 19 38 for

Pleadings
(for rihh),

in
i^KoKioi, egkaleo,
"accuse " lit. "call into court";
cf also "pleaded the cause
in 2 Mace 4 44 (lit.

RV

"argued the case") and ver 47, RV "pleaded"
"spoken," AV "told their cause").

(lit.

Burton Scott Easton

PLEASURE,

(7Dn, hepheg, l^^n,
plezh'nr
rdgon; eiSoKta, eudokta, T\Sovf\, hedone) "Pleasure"
is the tr of various Heb words, chiefly of hephe;,
"inclination," hence "pleasure," "delight" (job 21
21, "What pleasure hath he in his house?"
"what caret h he for"; 22 3, "Is it any pleasure to
the Almighty?"; Ps 111 2; Eccl 5 4; 12 1; in
Isa 44 28; 46 10; 48 14; 53 10, it has the sense
of will or purpose, "He shall perform aU my pleasure," etc); of rof on, "dehght," "acceptance," "good
will" (Ezr 10 11; Neh 9 37; Est 1 8; Ps 51 18;
103 21, etc); iiephesh, "soul," "desire," is tr"*
"pleasure" (Dt 23 24; Ps 105 22; Jer 34 16).
In the
"pleasure" is the tr of eudokia, "good
thought or will," "good pleasure" (Lk 2 14 RVm;
Eph 1 5.9; Phil 2 13; 2 Thess 1 11,
"every
desire of goodness,"
"Or 'good pleasure of goodness.'
CfRom 10 1").
:

ARV

NT

RV

m

"To

take or have pleasure" is eudokid (2 Cor 12 10;
He 10 6.8.38); eudoked is once tr^i

2 Thess 2 12;

"good pleasure" (Lk 12 32, "It is your father's good
pleasure to give you the Idngdom "
the neuter participle
of dokeo. "to think," etc
meaning "it seems good to
me"
td dokoun, is trd "pleasure" {He 12 10, "after
their pleasure," RV "as seemed good to them"); he-

—

—

)

;

done, "sweetness," "pleasure," occurs in Lk 8 14; Tit
2 Pet 2 13 (referring to the lower pleasures of
thelema, "wish," "will" (Rev 4 11.
"because
of thy will"); chdris, "favor" (Acts 24 27; 25 9.
"favor"); spatalda. "to live voluptuously" (1 Tim 5
"she that giveth herself to pleasure") suneudokeo,
6.
"to think well with," "to take pleasure with others"
(Rom 1 .32,
"consent with"); lruphdr>, "to live
luxuriously" (.Tas 5 5,
"lived delicately ").
The vb. "to pleasure" occurs in 2 Mace 2 27 as the
tr of eucharistia,
"gratitude"; 12 11, ophelisein,

3 3;

RV

life);

RV

RV

RV

RV

"to help."

W.

PLEDGE,
'arabh [2

K

plej

n;i-;y,

[Gen 38

(vbs.

15],

'ambbah

i7. 18.20];

[l

L.

bnn, Mbhal

18 23 = Isa 36

[Ezk 18 12.16; 33
7],

RV

;

RV

,

are honest."

2408

8];

nbln,
S 17

Walker
[10

t],

nouns bnn,
hdbholah

18],

|i3-iy,

Dl^,
hdbh'al

[Ezk 18
'erabhon

also 133?, 'dbhot[Dt 24 10-13]

and [RV only] I2^P3?

,

'abhtit

[Hab 2

6])

:

All these


words have about the same meaning. (1) The "pledge" is, as in modern Eng., security given for future payment (Gen 38:17-24) or conduct (Hab 2:6), where the conquered nations have given guarantees of their subserviency to the Chaldeans; AV's "thick clay" here rests on a misreading of the Heb. In 2 K 18:23 (= Isa 36:8) the "pledge" is a wager (so RV). Rabshakeh mockingly dares Hezekiah to stake a "pledge" that he can produce 2000 men for the defence of Jerusalem, although the mighty Assyr host has that number of horses alone. The general point of the obscure passage Prov 20:16 (= 27:13) is that he who guarantees strangers needs a guaranty himself. 1 S 17:18 is uncertain and the text may be corrupt. If not, the "pledge" is some (presarranged?) token of the welfare of David's brethren. (2) Most of the occurrences of "pledge," however, deal with the debts of the very poor, who had no property that they could spare even temporarily. Consequently, the execution of a pledge from such persons worked genuine hardship, and to take a pledge at all was a cruel act (Job 24:3), although of course the dishonesty of withholding a pledge (Ezk 18:7; 35:15) was worse. In those cases the creditor who took the pledge was the debtor, and the guarantee that he gave was the security for the debt. The garbment the borrower was wearing (Am 2:8; Job 22:6; 24:9 m.), and special legislation controlled this practice. A garment (the outer "clack")—see Dress—not worn while doing manual labor so that one could not easily cut it (Ex 22:26; Dt 24:12-13), for it was the usual covering of the sleeper. (Apparently, though, the creditor regained custody of it in the daytime until the debt was paid.) A widow's clothing, however, was entirely exempt (Dt 24:6), as was the heir's small estate (Num 36:6, making it 24:6). The lender had no right of entry into the borrower's house to obtain the pledge (24:10,11), but it is not said that he could not dictate what he would accept; indeed, the contrary is inconceivable. (3) ARV gives "pledge" for AV and ERV "faith" in 1 Tim 5:12. See also Earnest.

Burtton Scott Easton

PLEIADES, pl′-a-dez, pl′-ya-dēz, pl′-ay-dēz. See Astrology, 10; Astronomy, II, 10.

Pleroma, pl′-rō-ma. See Fullness.

PLOW, plow (Uṣṣā, ḥārash; ἀπορτάω, ἀροτρίῳ): No implement of the Bible is more frequently illustrated today, because there is every reason to believe that the plows still used throughout Egypt, Pal, and Syria are counterparts of the ancient ones. The first plows were probably an adaptation of the ancient Egypt hoe, where the handle was lengthened in order that animals might be hitched to it. To make it easier to break up the ground, it was pointed, and handles were added by which it could be guided. The ancient plow probably varied in type in different sections of the country, as it does today. In one form a young tree of oak or other strong wood of a diameter of 3 or 4 in. is cut off just below a good-sized branch and again 15 or 20 in. above. The upper end of the severed trunk is pointed and forms the share. Between this and the side branch, cut off at night, the branch is cut off 10 or 12 ft. from the trunk and forms the pole. A lighter stick, about 3 ft. long, projects upward from the share and forms the handle. The plow used in Syria is of slightly different construction. The handle and share are one continuous piece, in such a way that there is a slight bend at the middle. The share is pointed and is used bare in the plains, or in more stony regions is shod with iron. The pole is of 2 pieces joined end to end. The thicker end of the pole is notched, so that it may be attached firmly to the share. The whole plow is so light that it can be easily carried on a man's shoulder. These plows literally scratch the soil, as the Heb. word implies. They do not turn over the ground as the modern implement does. The plowman guides the plow with one hand, and

Syrian Plow, Yoke and Pick.

with the other sometimes goads the oxen, and at other times with the chisel end of his goad breaks away the lumps of earth or other material which impedes the progress of his plow. See Yoke.

In addition to the words which are found above, the following terms are found: ἀροτρίῳ, "hitch" (lit. "to serve"), "worked," or "plowed" (Dt 21:4); ἀπορτάω, spelled "plowed," (lit. "to break open,") Ps 141:7.

One special law is mentioned in connection with plowing, namely that an ox and an ass should not be yoked together (Dt 22:10), a prohibition which is utterly disregarded today. Principally oxen were used for plowing (Job 1:14). Often several yokes of oxen followed each other plowing parallel furrows across the field, a sight still common on the plains of Syria (1 K 19:19). Plowing was done by bond servants (Lk 17:7; cf ἀροτρίῳ, Dt 21:4). Plowing cannot be done before the rains (Jer 14:4); on the other hand the soil is too sticky to plow in the winter time (Prov 20:4). The law requiring one day of rest in every seven included plowing time (Ex 34:21).

Figurative: "The plowers plowed upon my back," typified deep affliction (Ps 129:3; cf 141:7). "Plow iniquity" is urged in the sense of "plant iniquity." Doing evil was sure to bring evil consequences (Job 4:8); thus this is particularly true of that which comes after plowing, so surely will Jeh carry out His decree of destruction (Isa 28:23-25). "Judah shall plow," i.e. become enslaved (Hos 10:11); cf "Foreigners shall be your plowmen" (Isa 61:5). "Will one plow there with oxen" (Am 6:13)? "Neither plowing nor harrowing" (Gen 46:6) are figures of desolation. Zion plowed as a field, i.e. utterly destroyed (Jer 26:18). The plowman shall overtake the reaper, i.e. the soil shall be so fertile as to require no rest—typical of great abundance (Am 9:13). No opportunity to plow because of lack of rain is a desolate picture of drought (Jer 14:4). As the plowman expects to share in the fruits of the harvest, so might an apostle expect his temporal needs to be provided for (1 Cor 9:10). "If ye had not plowed with my heifer," i.e. used my wife, was Samson's reply to those who had secured the answer to his riddle from her (Jgs 14:18). "Beast their swords into plowshares" (or hoes) (Isa 2:4; Mic 4:3) typified peace; "best your plow-hares into swords"—war (Joel 3:10). "Having put his hand to the plow, and looking back," i.e. longing for evil things when one has set his face toward doing what is right, unfit a man for the kingdom of God (Lk 9:62; cf Gen 19:26; Phil 3:19).

James A. Patch
PLUCKING, pluk'ing, OFF THE HAIR. See Hair, 7; Punishments.

PLUMB-LINE, plum'lin, PLUMMET, plum'et, plum'it. See Tools.

POCHERETH-HAZZEBAIM, pok'-reth, pök'kè-reth, pō-kè-reth, ha-æk-bé-im (םֹכֶרֶת הָצֶבְיָם po-khereth haqibhyam [Exx 2 57], or בֹּכֶרְת הָצֶבְיָם b. p. ha-qibhyam [Neh 7 59], "binder [fem.] of the gazelles"): Name of the head of a post-exilic family. The first word is a fem. participle Kal; of kiboleth ("preacher"), the Heb. title of the Book of Ezr. DB suggests that the suffix is that of office. AV has "Pochereth of Zebedai" in Ezr, but Ryle (Cambridge Bible, 235) notes that "of" is not in the 1611 ed.

POET, pō'et (ποιητής, poíeth, "a maker"): Occurs in this sense only in Acts 17 28, where St. Paul quotes from the general expression of Gr mythology. The quotation if intended to be exact is probably from Aratus, as the words of St. Paul in his speech at Athens precisely agree with the opening words of the Phaenomena by Aratus. A like but not identical expression is found in the Hymn to Zeus by Cleanthes. Aratus in his poem endeavors to poset Jupiter as the father and controller of all things, and worthy to be worshipped. In so doing he that of Cleanthes, but esp. in the latter, there is a true and lofty note of spiritual devotion. St. Paul takes this praise and devotion offered by the Gr poets to their unknown or fictitious gods and bestows it upon the one true God whom he declared unto the people of Athens.

C. E. SCHENK

POETRY, pō'ē-tri, HEBREW:

I. is THERE Poetry in the OT?

Poetry Defined: 1. In Matter Concrete and Imaginative
   2. In Form Emotional and Rhythmlcal

II. neglect of Hebrew Poetry: Causes
   3. Characteristics of Hebrew Poetry, External and Internal
      5. Other Literary Devices
      6. Units of Hebrew Poetry

IV. Poetical Writings of the OT
   1. The Poetical Books in the Narrow Sense
   2. Customary Division of the Poetical Books
   3. Poetry in Non-poetical Books

Literature

By Heb poetry in the present article is meant that of the OT. There is practically no poetry in the NT, but in the OT Apoc Sir is largely poetical and Wisd only less so. Post-Bib. Heb poetry could not be discussed here.

1. Is There Poetry in the OT?—It is impossible to answer this question without first of all stating what poetry really is. The present writer submits the following as a correct definition: "Poetry is verbal composition, imaginative and concrete in matter, and emotional and rhythmic in form." This definition recognizes two aspects of poetry, the formal and the material. The substance of poetry must be concrete—it is philosophy that deals with the abstract; and it has to be the product more or less of the creative imagination. It is of the essence of poetry that, like music, it should be expressed in rhythmical but not necessarily in metrical form. Moreover, the language has to be such as will stir up the aesthetic emotions. Adopting this account of poetry as criticism, it may unhesitatingly be affirmed that the Heb Scriptures contain a goodly amount of genuine poetry; of the Ps., Job, Cant., etc. It is strange but true that poetical is older than prose written composition. An examination of the literature of the ancient Indians, Babylonians, Hebrews, Greeks and Arabs makes this quite certain.

II. Neglect of Hebrew Poetry: Causes.—Notwithstanding the undoubted fact that poetry is largely represented in the Bible, it is noteworthy that this species of Biblical literature was almost wholly ignored until the 18th cent. Why this happened has the fact mainly to two causes: (1) Since the Bible was regarded as preeminently, if not exclusively, a revelation of the Divine mind, attention was fixed upon what it contained, to the neglect of the literary form in which it was expressed. It was regarded as inconsistent with its lofty, Divine function to look upon it as literature at all, since in this last the appeal is made, at least to a large extent, to the aesthetic and therefore carnal man. In the aim contemplated by Bible writers was practical, the communication of religious knowledge—not literary, and still less artistic. It was therefore regarded as inconsistent with such a high purpose that these writers should trouble themselves about literary embellishment or beauty in language, since the sense was clear and unambiguous. It was in this spirit and animated by this conception that the middle of the 19th cent. Isaac Taylor of Ongar (The Spirit of Heb. Poetry, 1861, 56 ff) and Keil of Dorch. (The Intro to the OT, 1851, 1, 457) decided on a priori grounds the presence of epic and dramatic poetry in the Bible. How, they exclaimed, could God countenance the writing of fiction which is untruth—and the epic and the drama have both? Matthew Arnold rendered invaluable service to cause of Bible science when he undermined all theogonists, Jewish and Christian, for making the Bible a mere collection of proof texts, an arsenal whence religious warriors might get weapons with which to belabor their opponents. Indeed the language of the Bible is fluid . . . and literary, not rigid, fixed, scientific" (Preface to 1st ed of Literature and Dogma). The Bible contains literature, poetical and prose, equal as literature to the best, as Matthew Arnold, Carlyle, and Froude (on Heb) hold. The neglect of this aspect of the Scriptures made theologians blind to the presence and therefore ignorant of the character of Bible poetry. (2) Another factor which led to the neglect of the poetical element in the OT is the undoubted fact that Bib. Heb poets were less conscious as poets than western poets, and thought much less of the external form in which they expressed themselves. Biblical poetry lacks therefore such close adherence to formal rules as characterizes Gr, Arab., or Eng. poetry. The authors wrote as they felt and because they felt, and their strong emotions dictated the forms their words took, and not any objective standards set up by the schools. Bib. poetry is destitute of meter in the strict sense, and also of rhyme, though this last occurs in some isolated cases (see below, III, 1, 4, c and e). No wonder then that western scholars, missing these marks of the poetry which they knew best, failed for so long to note the poetry which the OT contains.

III. Characteristics of Hebrew Poetry: External and Internal—The definition of poetry adopted in I, above, implies that there are marks by which poetry can be distinguished from prose. This is equally true of Heb poetry, though this last lacks some of the features of the poetry of western nations.

(1) Vocabulary.—There are several Heb words which occur most frequently and in some cases exclusively in poetry. In the following list the corresponding prose
Outing "Yahwe," which belongs alike to both kinds, it will be seen that the rest of the two half-lines corresponds word for word: "thy loving-kindness" corresponding to "thy faithfulness," and "to the heavens" answering to "to the clouds" (cf Ps 15:1; 24:1–3; 25:5; 1 S 18:7; Isa 6:4; 13:7).

(2) Antithetical parallelism: in which the second member of a line (or verse) gives the opposite sense of the same thought, e.g. Prov 10:1:

'A wise son gladdens his father,
But a foolish son grieves his mother' (see Prov 11:3; Ps 37:9; cf Prov 10:1 ff; Ps 20:8; 30:6; Isa 64:7 ff). Sometimes there are more than two corresponding elements in the two members of the verse, as in Prov 29:27; cf 10:5; 16:9; 27:2.

(3) Synthetic parallelism: called also constructive and epithetic. In this the second member adds something fresh to the first, or else explains it, e.g. Ps 19:5 ff.

The precepts of Yahwe are right, rejoicing the heart:
The commandments of Yahwe are pure, enlightening the eyes:
The fear of Yahwe is clean, enduring for ever:
The judgments of Yahwe are true and righteous altogether.

More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold;
Sweeter also than honeycombs and the honeycomb' (see Prov 1:7; cf 3:5, 7; Ps 1:3; 15:4).

In addition to the three principal species of parallelism noticed above, other forms have been traced and described.

(4) Introverted parallelism (Jebb, Sacred Lit., 553) in which the hemistichs of the parallel members are chiasically arranged, as in the scheme ob.

Thus Prov 23:15a:

(a) 'My son, if thy heart be wise
(b) My heart shall be glad, even mine;
(c) Yea, my reins shall rejoice,
(d) When thy lips speak right things' (cf Prov 10:4, 12; 13:24; 21:17; Ps 51:3).

(v) Palilological parallelism: in which one or more words of the first member are repeated as an echo, or as the canon in music, in the second. Thus Nah 1:2:

'Yahwe is a jealous God and avenges: Yahwe avenges and is full of wrath;
Yahwe takes vengeance on his adversaries, And preserves wrath for his enemies' (cf Jgs 5:3, 6:11 ff; f.23:27; Ps 72:12, 17; 121:1; 124:1; Isa 2:7; 24:5; Hos 6:4).

(vi) Climactic or comprehensive parallelism: In this the second line completes the first. Thus Ps 29:1:

"Give unto Yahwe, O ye mighty ones,
Give unto Yahwe glory and strength" (see Ex 15:6; Ps 29:8).

(vii) Rhythmic parallelism (De Wette, Franz Delitzsch): thus Ps 138:4:

"All the kings of the earth shall give thee thanks . . . For they have heard the words of thy mouth." (See Prov 13:5; cf 16:7, 10; 17:13, 15; 19:20; 21:23, 25.)

Perfect parallelism is that in which the number of words in each line is equal. When unequal, the parallelism is called imperfect. Ewald (see Die poetischen Bücher des alten Bundes, 1, 57–92; Die Dichter des alten Bundes, 1, 91 ff, 2d ed of the former) aimed at giving a complete list of the relations and rules which can be expressed by parallelism, and he thought he had succeeded. But in fact every kind of relation which can be indicated in words may be expressed in two or more lines more or less parallel. On the alleged parallelism of proverbs see below.
(b) Parallelism as an aid to exegesis and textual criticism: If in Lowth's words parallelism implies that "in two lines or members of the same period things for the most part correspond in syllables, and word to word, we should expect obscure or unknown words to derive some light from words corresponding to them in parallel members or clauses. In a few cases no corresponding words areenable causing a comparison of words to restore with considerable confidence the words which in the OT Parallelism is in a general way as follows: ab: cx. We know what a, b and c mean, but are wholly in the dark as to the sense of x. Thus: "and what z might be. We have an illustration in Jgs 5:28, which may be thus literally translated: "Through the window she looked." And Sisera's mother "through the arrow." Here we have two words, however, corresponding to known terms. The Heb vb. accompanying "drew," "he came," etc., wdbd, wdbd, is "and cried." But no such vb. (ydbhabb) is known for the Talm, as usually, follows the traditional interpretation. We want a vb. with a meaning similar to "looked." If we read wdba in "and cried," wdbd; we have a form which could easily be corrupted into the word in the MT, which gives a suitable sense and moreover has the support of the Tg's of Onkelos and Jonathan, and even of the LXX (A and Luc). What about the other Heb word untranslated above b"", "eshnahh?" This occurs in but one other passage (Prov 7:6), where it stands as in the present parallel with thbbl, "which also was." This vb. (probably Prov 7:6 is defective. We get no help from etymology or in this case from the VSS, but parallelism had suggested to our translators the meaning intended. In Eastern, East, the rendering always gives a kind of sound, and the rhyme must be meant. The vb. shânâbh, "to be cool," the rendering of the Hebrew as a hole in the wall to secure coolness in the house. Glass windows did not exist in Pal, and are rare even now. There are innumerable other examples in the OT of the use of parallelism in elucidating words which occur but once, or which have no significance underrstood, and frequently a textual emendation is suggested which is otherwise supported.

(c) Prevalence and value of parallelism: Two statements about parallelism in the OT may be and be of high importance in the study of all OT poetry. Lowth who had so much to do with its discovery gave it naturally an exaggerated place in his scheme of Heb poetry, but it is lacking in the largest part of the poetry of the OT, and it is frequently met with in elevated and rhetorical prose. (i) That it pervades other poetry than that of the OT. It occurs in Assyrin (see A. Jeremias, Die bab.arsa. Vorstellung von Leben nach dem Tod), in Egypt (Georg Ebers, Nord u. Süd, I), in Finnish, Ger. (¡Der deutsche Volk's-Ausgabe der Gegenwart, 1869, 157), and Eduard Norden (Die antike Kunstprosa, 1898, II, 813) maintain that parallelism is the primitive form of the poetry of all nations. It must therefore be that in the OT parallelism is employed in proportion a larger place than in any other literature and that the correspondence of the parts of the stichs or verses is closer.

(5) Other literary devices—OT poetry has additional features which it shares with other oriental and with western poetry. Owing to lack of space these can hardly be more than enumerated.

(a) Alliteration: e.g. "Round and round the rugged rocks," etc. We have good examples in the Heb of Ps 6:8 and 27:12. (b) Assonance: an example of this in the Heb Scriptures that one can regard it as a feature in Heb poetry, though in Arab, and even in the East, it is very frequent. B H e V is a Hebrew Bible, instances in the Heb text of Gen 43:29; Job 10:8; Lam 1:16; Prov 3:27; Ps 44:10ff; Lam 1:4; cf ch 5, where the number of verses assigned to each Heb alphabet, though the letters of that alphabet do not introduce the verses.

(c) Meter: The view of the present writer may be stated as follows: That the poetry of the Heb is not in the strict sense metrical, though the writers under the influence of strong emotion express themselves rhythmically, producing often the phenomena which came later to be codified under metrical rules. Thinking and reasoning and speaking preceded psychology, logic, and grammar, and similarly poetry preceded prosody. In the OT we are in the region of the fact, not of the law. Poets wrote under strong impulse, usually religious, and without recognizing any objective standard, though all the time they were supplying data for the rules of prosody. Those who think that OT poets had in their minds objective rules of meter have to make innumerable changes in the text, and to change even the original material, they bring their prior theory and alter the text to suit it. It can be fearlessly said that there is not a single poem in the OT with the same number of syllables, or feet, or accents in the seven stichs or hemistichs. If we attempt to introduce violent changes into the MT, such as would be resented in classical and other ancient literature. It is important, before coming to any definite conclusion, to take into consideration the fact that the poetry of the OT belongs to a remote period, many centuries before the Song of Deborah (Jgs 5), the earliest Heb poem, down to the last rhymes in the Psalter. In the oldest specimens of Heb poetry there is a naïve simplicity which excludes the idea of conscious art. In the best and most characteristic poetry of the OT, the poets have written with imagination and his poetry more artistic. It would be manifestly unfair to propound a theory of poetry based on the poetry of Keats and Tennyson and to apply it to the productions of Anglo-Saxon and Old English, and the same can be said of a literature differing widely in age, aim and authorship, and it needs care in educating a conception of Heb poetry that will apply to all the examples in the OT. The later pse-acrostic, etc., many of them made up of cross-references, etc., are an example of the conscious effort at imitation. If, however, there were among the ancient Hebrews, as there was among the ancient Greeks, a code of prosody, it is strange that the Mish and Ge'mal'sh should be wholly silent about it. And if some one system underlies our Heb Bible, it is strange that so many systems have been proposed. It should be remembered too that the oldest poetry of every people is nonmetrical.

The following is a brief statement of the views advocated:

(i) Philo and Josephus, under the influence of Gr models and customs, had no such notion as we have of the poetic literature of pagan literature, taught that Heb poetry had metre, but they make no attempt to show what kind of meter this poetry possessed, and that they even introduced conscious effort at imitation. If, however, there were among the ancient Hebrews, as there was among the ancient Greeks, a code of prosody, it is strange that the Mish and Ge'mal'sh should be wholly silent about it. And if one system underlies our Heb Bible, it is strange that so many systems have been proposed. It should be remembered too that the oldest poetry of every people is nonmetrical.

(ii) Calm, Lowth and Carpzov held that though in the poetry of the Heb Bible as originally written and read there must have been metrical rules which the authors were conscious of following; yet, through the corruption of the text and our ignorance of the sounds and accentuation of primitive Heb, it is now impossible to ascertain what these metrical rules were.

(iii) In their scheme of Heb meter Bickell and Merx reckon syllables as is done in classical poetry, and they adopt the Syr law of accentuation, placing the stress on the penultimate. These writers make drastic changes in the text in order to bolster up their theories.

(iv) The doctrine of the镑'ective theory is that advocated by Lev., Briggs, Duhm, Buhl, Grime, Sievers, etc., for example, that in Heb prosody the accented syllables were alone counted. If this principle is applied to Job, it will be found that many of the lines would be reduced to stichs, each with three main accents. See, for illustration, Job 12:16: 'when he is box: he is a little box and ye are with him, he is one that causes to err.' Man's rhetorical instincts are quite sufficient to account for this phenomenon without assuming that the Heb had an objective standard. Those who adopt this last view and attempt solely making the poetry metric must fail. For an examination of the metrical systems of Hubert Grimm, who takes account of quantity as well as accent, and of Eduard Sixers who shows in certain cases to come to the conclusion after examining small parts of the Heb
Bible that Heb poetry is normally ana pa s, see W. H. Cobb, Criticism of Systems of Heb Metre, 152 ff, 169 ff. In our treatise, K. R. Schmidt, K. Eberhard, and E. Dohle reject all systems of Heb meter hitherto proposed, though Budde has a leaning toward Leibniz's system.

(f) Budde's kinah measure: Though Budde takes up in general a negative position in regard to Heb meter, he pleads strenuously for the existence of one specific meter with which his name is associated. This is the so-called kinah measure (from הֵנָּה, kînâh, "a lamentation"). In each such stich is said to consist of one hemistich with three beats or stress syllables and another having two such syllables, this being held to be the specific meter of the dirge (see Lam 1:1, etc.). Ley and Briggs call it "pentameter." Because it is made up of five (5+2) feet (a foot in Heb prosody being equal to an accented syllable and the unaccented syllables combined with it). See Budde's full treatment of the subject in ZAW, 60, 152, "Das heb. Klagegedicht." It must, however, be borne in mind that even Herder (d. 1803) describes the use in elegies of what he calls, anticipating Ley and Briggs, the "pentameter" (see Geist der ebräischen Poesie, 1782, i, 321, ET The Spirit of Heb Poetry, 1833, i, 40). But the present writer submits the following criticisms: (i) Budde is inconsistent in rejecting all existing theories of meter and yet in retaining one of his own, which is really but part of the system advocated by Bellermann, Ley and Briggs. (ii) He says, following Herder, that it is the measure adopted by mourning women (Jer 9:16), but we have extremely few examples of the latter, and his statement lacks proof. (iii) There are dirges in the OT not expressed in the kinah measure. David's lament over Saul and Jonathan is more hexametric and tetrametric than pentameter, unless we proceed to make a new text (2 S 1:19 ff). (iv) The kinah measure is employed by Heb poets where the theme is joyous or indifferent; see Ps 119, which is a didactic poem.

6. Units of Hebrew poetry.—In western poetry the ultimate unit is usually the syllable, the foot (consisting of at least two syllables) coming next. Then we have the verse-line crowned by the stanza, and finally the poem. According to the theory of Heb poetry adopted by the present writer, the following are the units, beginning with the simplest: (a) The meter: This embraces the accented (tone) syllable together with the unaccented syllable preceding or succeeding it. This may be called a "rhythmic foot." (b) The stich or verse: In Job and less regularly in Ps and Cant and in other parts of the OT (Nu 23:19-24) the stich or verse consists commonly of three toned syllables and therefore three meters (see above for sense of "meter"). It is important to distinguish between this poetic sense of "verse" and the ordinary meaning—the subdivision of a Bible chapter. The stich in this sense appears in a separate line in some old MSS. (c) The number of stichs (verses): In Heb poetry a stich hardly ever stands alone. We have practically always a distich (couplet, Job 18:5), a tristich (tripllet, Nu 6:24-26), a tetristich (Gen 24:23), or the pentastich.

7. Songs. Hebrew 

8. Prophetic poetry: This poetry is the expression of the inspiration under which the seer wrote. One may compare the oracular utterances of diviners and other poetic forms as well as in matter. But the poet has to bear in mind that the heathen diviner claimed to have his messages from jinns or other spirits, and the means he employed were a rule omens of various kinds. The OT prophet professed to speak by and under divine inspiration. God (see Divination, VIII). Duhm thinks that the genuine prophecies of Jeremiah are wholly poetical, the prose parts being interpolations. But the prophet is not merely or primarily a poet, though it cannot be doubted that a very large proportion of the prophecies of the OT are poetical in form and substance.

9. Philosophical poetry: This expression is intended to include such poetry as is found in the Wisdom literature of the OT and the Apoc (see Wisdom Literature). The so-called didactic...
poetry, that of the proverbs or parables (סִפְרֵי, māshāl), also comes in here.

(5) Lyrical poetry: This includes the hymns of the Psalter, the love songs of Cant and the many other lyrics found in the historical and prophetic writings. In these lyrics all the emotions of the human soul are expressed.

Does the OT contain specimen of epic and dramatic poetry? The answer must depend on what definition of both is adopted.

(a) Epic poetry: The present writer would define an epic poem as a novel with its plot and development charge, however, with the passion and set out in the rhythmic form of poetry. There is no part of the OT which meets the requirements of this definition, certainly not the Creation, Fall and Deluge stories, which De Wette (Beiträge, 228 ff, Einleitung, 147) and R. G. Moulton (Literary Study of the Bible, ch ix) point to as true epics, and which Ewald (Dichter des alten Bundes, I, 87 ff) held rightly to have in them the stuff of epics, though not the form.

(b) Drama: Defining theatrical poetry as that which can be acted on a stage, one may with confidence say that there is no example of this in the OT. Even the literary drama must have the general characteristics of that which is adaptable. Franz Delitzsch and other writers have pointed to Job and Cant as dramatic poems, but the definition adopted above excludes both.

IV. Poetical Writings of the OT.—According to the Massoretes or editors of our present Heb Bible, there are but three poetic books in the OT, Job, Prov, and Ps, known in Jewish liturgy by the mnemonic abbreviations, שִׁמְתָּה, אֲשֶׁר, וְיִֽשְׂרָאֵל (šimmah, asher, ve’ishreal), i.e. Ps, Cant, Lam; (2) those containing for the most part didactic poetry (סִפְרֵי, māshāl), i.e. Job, Prov, Ecc.

There is a large amount of poetry in the OT outside the books usually classed as poetical: (a) poetry in the prophetic books (see above, III, 2); (b) poetry in the historical books including the Pent (see Michael Hellaire, The Historical Poetry of the Hebrews, 2 vols., 1879-80). We have examples in Gen 4 23 ff; 49; Ex 15; Nu 21 14 ff 27-30 (JE); 23 f (Balaam’s songs); Dt 321 (song and blessing of Moses); Josh 10 12-14 (JE); Jgs 5 (Deborah’s Song); 9 8-15; 1 S 2 1-10; 2 S 8; 1 33 f; 23 (Ps 18), etc.

LITERATURE.—The most important books and articles on the subject have been mentioned in the course of the foregoing article. Here is a full list of works dealing with Heb meter in W. H. Cobb, Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Meter, 2 vols., 1858–59, and in the first edition of C. A. Karello’s still valuable "Essay on Hebrew Poetry" prefixed to his comm. on the Ps was published in Eng. in the Journal of Sacred Literature (1848), 74 ff, 220 ff. In 1869 J. W. Rothstein issued a suggestive treatise on Heb rhythm (Grundzüge des Hebräischen Rhythmus und der kritischen Kommentar, Svo +4v+398s), reviewed by the present writer in Review of Theol. and Philos. (Edinb. 1871). Early Religious Poetry of the Hebrews by E. G. King (Cambridge University Press) contains a good, brief, popular statement of the subject, though it makes no pretense to originality. In The Poets of the OT, 1912, Professor A. R. Gordon gives an excellent popular account of the poetry and poetical literature of the OT.

T. W. DAVIES

POETRY, NEW TESTAMENT: No one questions the presence of poetry of a high order in the NT. The study of the OT as the literature of the ancient Hebrews has been critically made, and the attention of the ordinary reader of the Scriptures called to the beauty and wealth of its poetic passages. The message of the NT is not only vitally spiritual and concerned with religion that but little attention has been paid to it as literature. Naturally it would be strange if the poetic inspiration which runs like a tide through the prophetic and poetic periods of the OT should altogether cease under the clearer spiritual dispensation of the NT. The fact is that it does not cease, but that under every fundamental rule for poetic utterance, save that of rhyme, the NT is seen to be rich in imaginative vision, in religious thought and emotion, and in poetic expression. The Gospels, the Pauline Epistles, and the Ep. of Jas, all afford examples of lofty poetic utterance, while the message of Jesus is saturated with words which really lend themselves to song. In fact it is thought that Jesus was no less careful of the form than of the content of His message, and that all the finer types of Hebrew poetry found in the OT can be matched from His sayings, even when tested by the same rules.

In the Gospels that of St. Luke gives us best examples of poetry. "No sooner have we passed through the vestibule of His Gospel than we find ourselves within a circle of harmonies" (Burton, in Expositor’s Bible). From the poetic utterances of Mary, Elisabeth, Zacharias, Simeon, and the Angels, the church gains her Magnificat, Beatitude, Benedictus, Nunc Dimittis and Gloriae.

The utterances of John the Baptist are filled with a rugged desert vision and an expression which reveals a form of poetry in novisie to be mistaken for prose. St. Paul presents many of his ideas in harmonious and beautiful forms. He knew the secular poets of his day, and has immortalized Cleanthe’s Hymn to Jesus (Acts 17 28). He also quotes from Epimenides and the Athenian dramatist Menander in 1 Cor 15 33 f. St. Paul knew the Hebrews, and enriches his own message with many quotations from it. He was acquainted with the Christian hynmology of his own times, as is seen in Eph 5 14 and 1 Tim 3 16. He offers also original flashes of poetic inspiration and imagination, a good example of which is found in Rom 8 31-37.

Who could doubt the poetic imagery of St. James? He might almost be called the poet of social justice and of patient waiting under affliction for the will of God to come to men.

When one comes to the words of Jesus he discovers that in a very true sense His speech answers to the requirements for Heb poetry. Examples of synonymous, antithetic, synthetic and causal parallelism are the rule rather than the exception in the utterances of Jesus, for the religious form see Mt 10 24; for the antithetic see Lk 6 41; for the synthetic and causal forms see Lk 9 23 and Mt 6 7. Not alone are these forms of Heb poetry found in the words of Jesus, but also the more involved and sustained poetic utterances (Lk 7 31-32).

No one can question the deep emotional quality, the vivid imagination and spiritual idealism of Jesus. That the form of His speech is adequately set to poetic expression, and that the poetry for Heb poetry has not been so freely acknowledged. Independently of the theory advanced in Did Jesus Write His Own Gospel? (William Pitt
MacVey), every student of the literature of the NT must be grateful for the chapter on "The Poems of Jesus."

Spirituality and poetry have a kinship, and the interpretation of any message is aided by the adequate knowledge of its poetic form. When the NT has been carefully studied as literature, it will be seen, not only that Jesus was a poet, but that the entire NT, if not as rich as the OT in poetic passages, is sufficiently poetic to receive treatment as such in religious encyclopaedias. See also Pétrarque, Sayings; Poetry, Hebrew.

C. E. SCHENK

POUNTS, points: The word occurs in Ecclet 5:16, "In all points (κατά πόντον, kátá pínto) as he came, so shall he go"—a man leaves the world in all regards as helpless as he entered it, no matter what he may have accomplished during his life.

Also in He 4:15, "In all points (κατά πόντον, kátá pínto, "in all things," as in His human nature (2:14), so in His human experience (cf. 2:17.18)] tempted like as we, are yet without sin." He successfully resisted temptation at all points of His nature, in body, soul, and spirit. This temptation of Christ (of Curaus) Westcott (in loc.) thinks that the reference is not so much to Christ issuing out of all His trials without the least stain of sin, as to "a limitation of His temptation. Man's temptations come in many cases from previous sin. So the temptation had necessarily no place in Christ. He was tempted as we are, sharing our nature, yet with this exception, that there was no sin in Him to become the spring of trial." Whichever interpretation is adopted there is profound insight into the things of the soul in joining sinlessness with fulness of experience of temptation.

M. O. EVANS

POISON, poi'zn (ἡμαθί, hēmati, ἐρεῖ, rēĩ; θυμός, thumós, ῥοσί, rōsĩ): Residents in Pad must, from the first, have been acquainted with venomous serpents. Six species of these are widely diffused in the land, and at least three of them are fairly common in places. Besides, there are scorpions, centipedes and the large spider, which are as much dreaded by the fallahin as are the serpents, not to speak of the many but very serious discomforts of mosquitoes, sandflies and ticks, some of which were credited with lethal powers. In Wisi 16:9 RV we read that "the bites of locusts and flies did slay, and there was not found a healing for them" (Ex 4:26,20). There are many poisonous plants, such as belladonna, henbane, thorn apple, and the opium poppy. None of these is mentioned in the Bible; the only names found there are the hemlock (Conium maculatum) of Hos 10:4, the poisonous gourd (Citroidus colocynthos) of 2 K 4:39, and the grapes of gall, probably the fruit of Calotropis procera, the apples of Sodom of Jos (BJ, IV, vii, 4). Some, however, believe that these are poppyheads. Poisonous waters are referred to at Marah (Ex 15:20) and Jericho (De 2:19). There is no direct record of any person dying of poison except in 2 Mac 10:13, where the suicide of Ptolemy Maceron is related. Our Lord's promise in the appendix to Mk 16:18, however, that poisons were known and might be administered by way of the water of jealousy (Nu 5:17). In this connection the story in Eusebius (HE, I, 39, 39) is interesting, that "Justus surnamed Barsabas, though he drank a deadly poison, suffered no injury, through the grace of the Lord, in which poison the serpent is mentioned are Dt 32:24, where serpents (RV "crawling things") of the dust, probably Ceraeotes hasseilquisti, the little horned vipers, are mentioned, and in ver 33: "poison of serpents, and the cruel venom of asps." The asp may be the cobra Naia haje, not uncommon on the borders of the wilderness to the S. Ps 58:4 mentions the poison of serpents. Ps 140:3, "They have sharpened their tongues like a serpent; adders' poison is under their lips," indicates, what is still a common belief that the forked tongue of the snake is the poison-bearer. This is referred to in Jas 3:8. That it was the fang and not the tongue which carried the poison was known to Pliny (xli.62). This verse of Ps 140 is given in St. Paul's composite quotation in Rom 9:13. There may be a reference to the giving of an intoxicant poison in Hab 2:15, where RV reads "that addest thy venom." The prophets speak in several places of God's wrath as a cup of trembling (RV "staggering"), e.g. Isa 51:17-22, probably suggested by the fact that wine (Ps 95:6) primarily means "fury" and is used in that sense in more than a hundred passages. In Zec 12:2 Jesus is to be such a "cup of reeling unto all the peoples round about."

The ἱσθίαμβος, "lizard" (AV "spider"), mentioned in Prov 30:25 (LXX kolabóts) was formerly regarded as poisonous and it is still much disliked by the fallahin, as they believe that it makes mocking gestures mimicking at their prayers. They are really not poisonous. It is doubtful whether the lizard mentioned by Agur is really this stellion; the description better fits the gecko.

ALEX. MACALISTER

POLE, pōl: Nu 21:8-9 AV for νῆς, RV "standard."

POLICY, pol'isi: Lit. "method of government," and so "ability to manage affairs." In a bad sense, "cunning," "craft," in Dl 8:25 (גננה, genanah, "understanding"); in a good sense in 1 Mac 8:4 (בנויה, bunoia, "counsel"); also in AV 2 Mac 13:18, 14:29-31 ( UnityEditor, "counsel, strategy, stratagem," etc., where RV has "strategy,"") Polices occurs in Jth 11:8 AV for ΠΟΛΙΟΓΥΡΙΑ, "poloigyria, lit. "readiness for anything," here in a good sense; RV "subtile devices."

POLISHED, pol'isht. See Corner-stone, (2).

POLL, pōl: The word (on the derivation of which see Skeat, Concise Etym. Dict. of the Eng. Language, 300) has been eliminated as a vb. in ARV. In AV and ERV it represents the Heb. ובו, ḫāqām, "to shear," "to shear the sheep," "to shear out," "to uproar," thence "to shear the sheep," figuratively, "to destroy an enemy" (Mic 1:16), מים, gālāh, in Piel, lit. "to make bald or rounded-headed" (2 S 14:26) and גננה, gāqās, "to cut off" (Jer 9:26; 25:23; 49:32). The Heb noun is גננה, gūdōēth. As will be seen from the above enumeration, the Heb. vb.s differ considerably in etymology, while RV has not tried to distinguish. In Mic 1:16 we have a reference to the oriental custom of cutting or tearing one's hair as a sign of mourning for one's relatives. "Make thee bald, and cut off thy hair [AV and ERV "poll thee," Heb gāzāz] for the children of thy delight: enlarge thy baldness as the eagle [in "culture"]; for they are gone into captivity from thee." The priests, the sons of Zadok, are instructed to abstain from outward resemblance to heathen patterns of priesthood: "Neither shall they shave their heads, nor suffer their locks to grow long; they shall only cut off the hair [AV and ERV "poll"] Heb ḫāqām] of their heads" (Ezk 44:20). The Piel form of gālāh is employed in the description of the annual hair-cutting of Absalom (2 S 14:26). Thrice we find the vb. "to poll" as the tr of Heb ḫāqās, where AV authoritatively im-
proves the tr by adopting the marginal version of AV (Jer 9 26; 25 23; 49 32). See Hair.

The noun (gubhōth, lit. "head") is tr* “polf” in the phrase “by the poll,” “by their polls” (Nu 1 2. 13. 14. 22. 14 7; 1 Ch 23 8. 24). The expression has a polygamy in the number of persons by there heads, in the same way in which we speak of head- tax, etc.

H. L. E. Lering

POLLYON, po-lis'han (גַּלְוָנ, gat'al, “to pol- lute”; ἀλογωμα, ἀλογίμα, “contamination”): In Mat 1 7, “Ye offered polluted bread,” i.e. not actually unclean, but worthless, common (cf Ex 2 62), bread here being used metonymically for sacrificial offerings generally (cf Lev 21 6; Mt 6 11). The phrase in Acts 15 20, “the pollutions of idols,” is explained in ver 29 by “things sacrificed [AV “meats offered’] to idols.”

POLLUX, pol'yoks. See Castor and Pollux.

POLYAGANY, pó-lig'a-mi:
1. Meaning of the Term 4. Polygamy Unnatural
2. Origin of Polygamy 5. Weakness of Polygamy
3. OT and Polygamy

Polygamy has been and is the open blazon by the human race of sex vice. The very term is a misnomer. Since man became moralized he has apprehended that the proper marriage relation between the sexes is monogamy. Whatever may have been the practice, since man could ask himself, What is right? he has known that αρ' ἄρπασον, αρ' ἄρχει ("from the beginning;" Mt 19 4), αὐς ἄνδρα, at bottom, marriage is the choice of one man and one woman of each other for a life family relation. La Rochefoucauld said: “Hypocrisy is a sort of homage which vice pays to virtue.” There is hypocrisy beneath the word polygamy. It is an attempt to cover up the truth to "plural marriages" what is marriage and cannot be marriage. There is no particular need of defining what the condition is, so long as we can look upon it as a violation and negation of the marriage relation. The very use of the term from any language covering a like condition is attempt—

“To steal the livery of the court of heaven
To serve the Devil in.”

Polygamy is a general term and might mean a multiplicity of partners in the family relation by one of each sex; it does not technically mean exactly “polygyny” (γυνή, γυν), i.e. it describes a many-wived man. The correlative term “polyandry” describes the condition of a woman who has many men in family relation with herself. They are all husbands to her, as in polygamy all the women are wives to one man. But polyandry in historic times has had so little illustration that it may be dismissed as so exceptional as to be worthy of no further notice here.

Polygamy has captured the whole position philologically covered by polygyny is readily apparent. The might of the physically strongest has dictated the situation. Man has on the average one-fourth more muscular force than woman. When it comes to wrong in sex relation, man has that advantage, and it has given him the field covered by the word “polygamy.” There he is master and woman is the victim.

It is plainly evident that polygamy is primarily largely the outcome of tribal wars. When men had separated into clans and had taken up different places of abode, collisions Polygamy would soon occur between them. What would happen in such cases would be what we know did happen in North America soon after its first settlement by Europeans, to wit, the destruction of the Hurons by the Iroquois. The great majority of the men were massacred; the women and children, driven to the abode of the conquerors, disappearing there mainly in concubinage and slavery. What shall be done with this surplus of females? which of the two women the strongest comes to the front. The chief or the most heroic fighter would assert his right to choice of captives, and thus concubinage or what is the same thing—polygamy—would be set up. Successes in further wars come and add others to be distributed. Of course to the sheik or king there soon comes the seraglio and the harem. Polygamous practices will come in in other ways. The prisoner of war becomes property and passes from hand to hand by gift or sale. So woman—the weaker party—endures what comes to her as slave, concubine. We have now no longer the “helpmeet” originally destined for man—"bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh"—for whom he would “leave his father and his mother” and to whose single self he would “cleave” for life (Gen 2 18.24; Mt 19 5.6). Monogamy, with its unity in labor, thought and feeling, with its immeasurable modifying influences of moral, ideal and spiritual cast, is gone. Woman is reduced to the position of ministrant to man’s unmodified sensuality.

The complications introduced into morals by polygamy are not often considered. But the Bible sets them forth in plainness. The marriage of Abraham and Sarah seems to have been an original love match, and even to have preserved something of that character through life. Still we find Sarah under the influence of polygamous ideas, presenting Abraham with a son, afterward, when she herself had a son, she induced Abraham to drive out into the wilderness this concubine and her son. Now Abraham was humane and kind, and it is said “The thing was very grievous in Abraham’s sight” (Gen 21 11). But he was in the toils of polygamy, and it brought him pain and retribution. A Divine direction may be hard to bear.

The conditions of Jacob’s marriages were such that it is hard to say whether he was married to four wives or of any other than of polygamous origin (Gen 35 22-26). Where the family idea and affection went, in such mixed condition, is evidenced by the unhallowed sale, for slavery in Egypt, of one of the brothers by his polygamous career. His retributions ran along an extended line. There was a case of incest and murder among his children (2 S 13). The son in whom he had most hope and pride organized treason against his throne, and lost his life in the attempt.

David left his kingdom to Solomon, of whom much might be said, but of whom this can be said—evidently originally a man bright, keen-witted, wise, yet in his old age he went to pieces by the wiles of the women with whom he had loaded his harem. Partly by his extravagance in his polygamous life, and partly in attempt to build temples in distant places for the religions represented by the inmates of his harem, he bankrupted his nation. As a consequence his kingdom was divided at his death, and there was never again a united Israel (1 K 11.12). Polygamy must be justly charged with these unworthy results.

It can be demonstrated scientifically, even mathematically, that polygamy is a moral wrong. Statistics show that births are substantially equally divided between the sexes. Excess seems slightly
on the side of males. When this fact is considered and also the fact of the wide prevalence of poly- 
gamy (polygyny), it would seem that polygamy
4. Polygamy (polygyny) is a greater crime against 
Unnatural Nature than polyandry. To put out
of view for a moment the wrong to women in denying to her the rights and privileges of monogamous marriage, the interference with the rights of man in such marriage is, in vast proportion. Every harem is the denial to men
of the right to seek among its inmates wives according
to the dictates of their own hearts.

The eunuch.—But we are not done with the crime against man. Given a harem, he who set it up
has made, or there brought, the eunuch. The
lord of the harem must be served by emasculated
men. A search in history will reveal an amount of
this wickedness that is past belief. The eunuch has
been fixed in office by emperors or princes and
kings. They have not only been servants to
women in harems, but they have acquired such
influence with their masters that they have some-
times even dictated the policy of government.
They have been an aggregate force that has had
the last word in public affairs. They have sometimes
held public positions and shown therein astonishing
ability. Witness Narsees, the brilliant general
of the emperor Justinian. See EUNUCH.

Gibbon noticed the fact that nations began to decline
in the time when their policies were dictated and managed
by eunuchs. But that is taking a symp-
tom for the disease. There are weaknesses
behind that weakness. We have found
women in muscular strength equal to three-fourths of a man. If we claim nothing more for woman than that ratio through
the whole scale of her faculties, what would be thought
of a nation that should try to reduce that three-fourths of
potency as nearly to zero as it could? This is what
polygamy has done—reduced woman as nearly to a
cipher as it could in all the departments of her being.
She has been held to the lowest and most primitive
industrial pursuits. She has been deprived of intellectual
development. She has been debauched from society, per-
mitted to look at it only through a home lattice, or, if
abroad, through a watched face. The harem of shiek or
sultan has fixed the condition of woman in provinces of
nation—the bounds to her life. The highest office
assigned her has been breeder of children, and for one-
half of them—the daughters—she could have no possible
hope or ambition (see WOMAN).

Where in such degradation is the "helmsmen" for man
in all his problems? This condition is reflected back
over man. What possible appeal can there be to a
man for thought and energy except to repeat the same
dull round exhibited in his daily life? Polygamous
nations have never been industrial inventors, have contributed
little to science. They have usually ruined the fertility of
the lands they have occupied. They have been
heavily weighted with the lethargy of a system that
appeals to nothing but the most primitive instincts
and vices of man.

The monogamous have been the forceful nations.
Rome conquered the world while she was monogamous;
and lost control of it when she dropped to the moral level
of the sex corruption of the peoples she had conquered.
The Teuton tramped into and over Europe in caravans mounted
on solid wood trucks. But his cart carried one
wife, and now all polygamy is held under the trained guns
of the Teuton.

There may seem to be two exceptions—the establish-
ment of the Mogul empire in India and the subjugation
of Western Asia and Eastern Europe by the Turk. That
in both cases there was great success in war is granted.
They were authorized by their religion to exhibit the
frenzy of bloodshed and indulge in lust. Indeed, enjoy-
ment of the latter was a bright hope for the life to come
But when they had possession of a country, and mas-
sacraces and ravishing were over, what then? For
what is mankind indebted to them?

A lyric.—A lyric has been put in the hand of the present
writer by a friend who wrote it as the last date of
the title. It is one of the lyrics of the centuries in its
synthesis of history and in its insight into the forces
physical, moral and spiritual of the Mogul
empire of India. Notice the dates. The text will show
what took place between.

The Mogul 1525-1857

A war steed coursed out the wind-swept north,
Snuffing far battles with nostril wide,
Neering the joy of heroic desire.
The crisping herbage of arid plains
Had touched his skewes like bands of steel;
The snow-fed waters of Zarafshan
Had nurved the might of a northern will.
The war steed grazed in the fertile meadows,
Drinking the waters of indolent streams:
He rested at eve on bloom-dight beds,
Toyled with by maidens in goldening gleams.
They charmed his ear with dalliant song:
Of many closed his eyes in witchery's gleam;
They fed him the vineyards' wildering draught—
He slept in the breath of the lotus tree.
White bones lie strewn on the flowering mead,
The flowers of the arid grass grow by his side.
The carrion bird hath flown—hath died—
Rideth the war-horse? Neibeth? Hark!

The above lyric may be taken as the epitaph of any
polygamous nation. The last words are significant—
"Neibeth? Hark!" Would the old war steed arise?
"Hark!" The Sepoy rebellion was one. We "hark-
ened," but the rebellion went to pieces and an end was
put to the Mogul empire. We have listened for half a
century and heard no sound. We hear mutterings now,
but the end will be as before—even if the "war-horse" is
riseth and is victorious. He will then again lie down in
"Beem-rank grass grown high and dark," and the "carrion
bird" will fly from his "white bones." Streams cannot
rise higher than their fountains. The causes remaining,
the same effects will follow. See DIsvoGe; FaMLy; MArrieGe.

POMEGRANATE, pom'gran-ät, pom-gran'ät, pun'gran-ät (נְפֶרֶן, rimon [tree and fruit]; the
Heb name is similar to the Arab., Arum, and Ethiopic; see, rho): One
of the most attractive and most charac-
teristic of the fruit trees of Syria, Palestine
probably indigenous to Persia, Af-
ghanistan and the neighborhood of the
Caucasus, but introduced to Pal in very ancient
times. The spics brought specimens of figs and
pomegranates, along with grapes, from the Vale
of Eschol (Nu 13 23). Vines, figs and pomegranates are
mentioned (Nu 20 5) as fruits the Israelites
missed in the wilderness; the most
valued land was to be one "of wheat and barley, and vines and fig-
trees and pomegranates" (Dt 8 8), a promise
renewed in Hag 2:19. In the lamentation in Joel 1:11-12 we have the pomegranate, the palm tree and the apple tree represented as withered, "for joy is gone out of the sons of men."

The pomegranate tree, Punica granatum (N.O. Granatoideae) occurs usually as a shrub or small tree 10-15 ft. high, and is distinguished by its fresh green, oval leaves, which fall in winter, and its brilliant scarlet blossoms (cf. Cant 7:12). The beauty of an orchard of pomegranates is referred to in Cant 4:13. The fruit which is ripe about September is apple-shaped, yellow-brown with a blush of red, and is surrounded by a crown-like calyx, or breaking the hard rind, the white or pinkish, translucent fruits are seen tightly packed together inside. The juicy seeds are sometimes sweet and sometimes somewhat acid, and need sugar for eating. The juice expressed from the seeds is made into a kind of syrup for flavoring drinks, and in ancient days was made into wine: "I would cause thee to drink of spiced wine, of the juice (in "sweet wine") of my pomegranate" (Cant 5:8). The beauty of a cut section of pomegranate—or one burst open naturally, when fully ripe—may have given rise to the comparison in Cant 4:3; 6:7: "Thy temples are like a piece of a pomegranate." The rind of the pomegranate contains a very high percentage of tannic acid, and is employed both as a medicine and for tanning, particularly in making genuine morocco leather.

Whether the pomegranate tree in Migron under which Saul is said (1 S 14:2) to have abode with his family was a tree or a plane, Rimmon, is doubtful. See Rimmon.

A large number of references to the pomegranate are to the use of the form of the fruit in ornamentation, in which respect it appears among the Hebrews to have something of the position of the lotus bud as a decorative motive in Egypt. It was embrodered in many colors on the skirts of Aaron's garments, together with golden bells (Ex 28:33f; 39:24-26; cf. Ecclus 45:9). Hiram of Tyre introduced the pomegranate into his brass work ornamentation in the temple: "So he made the pillars; and there were two rows round about upon the one network, to cover the capitals that were upon the top of the pillars" (2 Chr 3:7). The Heb has 'pomegranates'") (1 K 7:18). "And the pomegranates were two hundred, in rows round upon about the other capital" (ver 20; cf. also ver 42; 2 K 25:17; 2 Chr 3:10; 4:13).

E. W. G. Masterman

POMMEL, pum'el (2 Ch 4:12.13): RV reads "bowl" (q.v.).

POND. See CISTERN; POOL.

PONDER, pon'der. Occurs in AV 5 t in the Book of Prov and nowhere else in the OT. In each case it means "to consider carefully," "to weigh mentally." In Prov 4:26 and 5:21, RV substitutes "make level." In Prov 5:6, it drops out entirely in RV. In Prov 21:2 and 24:12, "weigh" is substituted for "ponder." The one NT passage is Lk 2:19; here RV has "pondering" where AV has "and pondered."

PONTIUS, pon'shi-us, pon'ti-us. See PILATE.

PONTUS, pon'tus (Πόντος, Pontos): Was an important province in the northeastern part of Asia Minor, lying along the south shore of the Black Sea. It is a geographical and ethnic, in origin, and was first used to designate that part of Cappadocia which bordered on the "Pontus," as the Euxine was often termed. Pontus proper extended from the Halys River on the W. to the borders of Colchis on the E., its interior boundaries meeting those of Galatia, Cappadocia and Armenia. The chief rivers besides the Halys were the Iris, Lyceus and Thermodon. The configuration of the country included a beautiful but narrow, riparian margin, backed by a noble range of mountains parallel to the sea coast, these in turn were broken by the streams that forced their way from the interior plains down to the sea; the valleys, narrower or wider, were fertile and productive, as were the wide plains of the interior such as the Chilikomon and Phanarrea. The mountain slopes were originally clothed with heavy forests of beech, pine and oak of different species, and when the country was well wooded, the rainfall must have been better adequate than now to the needs of a luxuriant vegetation.

The first points in the earliest history of Pontus emerge from obscurity, much as the mountain peaks of its own noble ranges lift their heads above a fog bank. Thus we catch glimpses of Assyrian culture at Sinope and Amiasus, probably as far back as the 3rd millennium BC. The period of Hittite domination in Asia Minor followed hard after, and there is increasing reason to suppose that the Hittites occupied certain leading city sites in Pontus, constructed the artificial mounds or tumuli that frequently meet the eyes of modern travelers, hewed out the rock tombs, and stamped their character upon the early conditions. The home of the Amazons, those warrior priestesses of the Hittites, was located on the banks of the Thermodon, and the mountains rising behind Termess are still called the "Amazon Range"; and the old legends live still in stories about the superior prowess of the modern women living there. See ARCHAEOLOGY OF ASIA MINOR.

As the Hittite power shrank in extent and force, by the year 1000 BC bands of hardy Gr adventurers appeared from the W. sailing along the Euxine main in quest of lands to exploit and conquer and colonize. Cape Jason, which divides the modern mission fields of Trebizond and Marsovan, preserves the memory of the Argonauts and the Golden Fleece. Miletus, "greatest of the Ionic towns," sent out its colonists, swarm after swarm, up through the Bosphorus, and along the southern shore of the Black Sea. They occupied Sinope, the northernmost point of the peninsula with the best harbor and the most commanding situation. Sinope was in Paphlagonia, but politically as well as commercially enjoyed intimate relations with the Pontic cities. Settlers from Sinope, reinforced by others from Athens direct, pressed on and founded Amiasus, the modern Sansoun, always an important commercial

Rock Tombs at Amasia.
city. Another colony from Sinope founded Trebizond, near which Xenophon and the Ten Thousand reached the sea again after they had sounded the power of Persia and found it hollow at Cunaxa. Among the cities of the interior, picturesque Amasia in the valley of the Jaxartes, where sacrifices were performed with more pomp than in any other place. Comana, near the modern Tokat, was a city famous for the worship of the great god Ma. Gr culture by degrees took root along the coast; it mixed with, and in turn was modified by, the character of the older native inhabitants.

When the Persians established their supremacy in Asia Minor with the overthrow of Lydia, 546 BC, Pontus was loosely joined to the great empire and was ruled by Pers satraps. Abiarbaranes, Mithradates and Pharnaces are the recurring names in this dynasty of satraps which acquired independence about 363 and maintained it during the Macedonian period. The man that first made Pontus famous in history was Mithradates VI, surnamed Eupator, Mithradates was a typical oriental despot, gifted, unscrupulous, commanding. Born at Sinope 136 BC and king at Amasia at the age of twelve, Mithradates was regarded by the Romans as "the most formidable enemy the Republic ever had to contend with." By conquest or alliance he widely extended his power, his chief ally being his son-in-law Dikran, or Tigranes, of Armenia, and then prepared for the impending struggle with Rome. The republic had acquired Pergamus in 133 BC and assumed control of western Asia Minor. There were three Rom armies in different parts of the peninsula when war broke out, 88 BC. Mithradates attacked them separately and overthrew them all. He then planned and executed a general massacre of all the Romans in Asia Minor, and 80,000 persons were cut down. Sulla by patient effort restored the fortunes of Rome, and the first war ended in a drawn game; each party had taken the measure of its antagonist, but neither had been able to out the other. As a result of this first war, Pharnaces of the third race, grandson of Polyxenus, returned to Rome. He was a man of masterful mien, with an eye to the future and a head for strategy. These events paved the way for the annexation of Pontus by Rome in 63 BC. Between these events Pontus was for administrative purposes united with the rest of Asia Minor under Polemon, who afterwards administered the province. Polemon was an active ruler, maintaining peace and order and maintaining the existing religious practices. With the accession of the emperor Tiberius, aided by the Syrian politician Pliny the Younger, the Roman empire absorbed Pontus.

The Roman empire in the East was gradually merged into the Byzantine, which is still known to the local inhabitants as the empire of "Romun," i.e. Rome. Pontus shared the vicissitudes of this rather unfortunate government until, in 1204, a branch of the Byzantine imperial family established in Pontus a separate small state with its capital at Trebizond. Here the house of the Grand Comneni, sheltered between the sea and the mountain ranges, set up an independent government within its borders and beyond the fall of Constantinople. In 1401 Trebizond was taken by Mohammed the Conqueror, since which date Pontus, with its conglomerate population of Turks, Armenians, Greeks and fragments of other races, has been a part of the Ottoman empire.

G. E. WHITE

POOL, pōöl, POND, pond, RESERVOIR, res‘er-vwär, res‘er-vwär [1] ֱָם, בָּרָכַה, "pool"; cf Arab. ברכה, birkat, "pool"; [2] ַע, בַּרָכָה, "blessing," and Arab. برکة, barakat, "blessing"; [3] ֶב, בָּאָמ, "pool," "marsh," "ponds"; cf Arab. بام, "thicket," "jungle"; [4] ֵב, миквэй, mikveh, "reservoir," AV "ditch" [Isa 22:11]; [5] ֵב, mikweh, "pond," AV "pool" [Ex 7:19]; [6] ֵב, mikveh, mikveh ha-mayim, EV "gathering together of the waters" [Gen 1:10]; [7] ֵב, mikveh, mikveh-mayim, "a gathering of water," AV "plenty of water" [Lev 16:19]; [8] ֵב, koulamb, koulambä, "pool," lit. "a place of diving," from koulambä, koulambä, "to dive"; [9] ֵב, Lakes (q.v.) are very rare in Syria and Paul, but the dry climate, which is one reason for the fewness of lakes, impedes the inhabitants to make artificial ponds or reservoirs to collect the water of the rain or of springs for irrigation and also for drinking. The largest of these are made by damming water courses, in which water flows during the winter or after showers of rain. These may be enlarged or deepened by excavation. Good examples of this are found at Dibân and Mâdeba in Moab. Smaller pools of rectangular shape and usually much wider than deep, having no connection with water courses, are built in towns to receive rain from the roofs or from the surface of the ground. These may be for common use like several large ones in Jerus, or may belong to particular houses. These are commonly excavated to some depth in the soil or rock, though the walls are likely to rise above the surface. Between these and cylindrical pits or cisterns no sharp line can be drawn. The water of springs may be collected in large or small pools of masonry, as the pool of Siloam (Jn 9:7). This is commonly done for irrigation when the spring is so small that the water would be lost by absorption or evaporation if it were attempted to convey it continuously to the fields. The pool (Arab. birkat) receives the trickle of water until it is full. The water is then let out in a large stream and conducted where it is needed. (In this way by
POOLS, pools, OF SOLOMON. See Cistern; Pool.

POOR, poor (יִפְטַשׁ, 'ebhyôn, פֶּטַשׁ, dal, עַנִי, עַנָּי, יַעֲשָׂנָה, יַעֲשׇנָה; פֶּטְחָה, פֶּטְחָה): 1. In the OT.—The poor have great prominence in the Bible; in fact, indeed, there should be no poor among the Hebrews because Jehovah should so greatly bless them (Dt 15 4 RV and AV); but this was only to be realized on certain conditions of obedience (ver 5), and in ver 11 it is said, "The poor will never cease out of the land"; but they were to see to it that none was left in destitution. The very foundation of the Heb religion was God's pity on a poor and oppressed people.

2. Representations

3. Special provisions were made on behalf of the poor: (a) Every third year a tithe was to be given "unto the Levite, to the sojourner, to the fatherless, and to the widow" (Dt 14 29); (b) the poor were to have the free use of all that grew spontaneously in field or vineyard during the Sabbatical year (Ex 23 10 10; Lev 25 6); (c) each year the gleanings of the fields and vineyards should belong to the poor, the corners of fields were to be left for them, and if a sheaf was forgotten it should remain (Lev 19 9; 10; 23 22; Dt 24 19); (d) fruit and ripe grain in a field might be eaten by any hungry person, but it should be carried away (Dt 23 24 25); (e) in the Feast of Weeks the poor were to participate (Dt 16 9 12); (f) every seventh year there should be a "release" of debts (Dt 15 1 1); in the seventh year of servitude the Heb bond-servant should go free (Ex 21 2). No, and the Jubilees were to take place on which—the fiftieth year—property that had been sold returned to its owner or his family (Lev 25 8 17); (g) they were to lend readily to the poor, and no interest or increase was to be taken from their brethren (Ex 22 25; Lev 25 35 37; Dt 15 7); in Lev 25 39, no poor Hebrew was to be made a bond-servant, and, if a hired servant, he was not to be ruled with rigor (ver 43); his hire was to be given him daily (Lev 19 13; Dt 24 14); no widow's raiment could be taken as pledge (Dt 24 17), nor the handmill, nor the upper millstone so essential for daily life (ver 6), a man's garment should be returned to him before sundown, and no house should be entered to seize or fetch any thing (ver 10 15); the poor should be sin and their observance righteousness (Dt 24 13 1 13; etc; see ALMS, ALMSGIVING); (h) justice was to be done to the poor (Ex 23 6; Dt 27 19, "Curse be he that wrecketh the justice due to the sojourner, fatherless, and widow"); (i) offerings were graduated according to means (Lev 5 7 12 8).

(4) Divine penalties were not always attached to those laws, and the prophets and psalmists have many complaints of the unjust treatment of the poor, contrary to the will of God, and frequent exhortations to justice and a due regard for them (Ps 10 2 9; 12 5; 14 6; etc; Isa 3 14 15; Jer 2 34; Ezek 16 49, "the iniquity of... Sodom"); 16 12 17; 22 29; Am 2 7 4; Hab 3 14; of Job 20 19; 24 9 1 4, etc; Prov 14 31).

The duty of caring for the poor is frequently and strongly set forth and Divine promises attached to its fulfillment (Ps 41 1; 72 12 6; Prov 17 5 23; 22 9; 26 3 27; Isa 58 7; Jer 22 16; Ezek 18 7; Amos 7 7; Del 4 27; etc; etc; of Job 29 12 6; 30 25 31 19; Ps 112 9).

(6) The day of the Divine manifestation, the times of the Messiah, shall bring deliverance and rejoicing to the poor (Ps 72 12 15; Isa 11 4; "With righteousness shall he judge the poor"); etc; 11 30; 29 19 1 11 RVm).

(7) The equality of rich and poor before God and the superiority of the righteous poor to the ungodly rich, etc, are maintained (Prov 19 1 2 2 23 12; Ecle 4 153).

(8) Ways in which men can willy-nilly make themselves poor are mentioned (Prov 6 11 4 2 13 4 18; 14 23; 20 13; 25 1 17; 35 1 21 24; 28 19).

The chief words given above all mean poor, literally, but 'אֹгиб (rendered also "afflicted") also denote Israel as a nation in its afflictions and low estate, e.g. Ps 68 Godly Poor 10; Isa 41 17; 49 13; 51 21; 64 11; in Zeph 3 12 it is "the ideal Israel of the future." Dr. Driver remarks (in "Poor," HDR) that such passages show that the "poor are also its frequent parallel 'הָ֔בִיָּן, and, though somewhat less distinctly, dal) came gradually to "denote the godly poor, the suffering righteous, the persons who, whether 'bowed down' or 'needy' or 'reduced,' were the godly servants of Jehovah." The humble poor became in fact distinguished as the line in which faithfulness to Jehovah was maintained and spiritual
PORTYR, Porter, Pottery

THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

pine"; LXX τυχουσ, eichinos, "hedgehog"; τιμ, kippas [Isa 34 15], AV "great owl," ERV "arrow-snake," ARV "dart-snake"; LXX eichinos; of Arab. κουφαζ, τουφαζ, "hedgehog" or "porcupine." τιμ, kippas, is referred to as τιμ, kaphad, "to draw one's self together" or "to roll one's self up," while τιν is referred to τιμ, kaphas, and τιμ, kaphas, "to draw together in order to spring." The resemblance between all these words, including the Arab. κουφαζ, is obvious, and it is to be noted that LXX has eichinos in all the places cited).

The Gr eichinos is the hedgehog. The Arab. κουφαζ is used in some localities for the hedgehog and in others for the porcupine, which is also called τουφαζ. These two animals are both found in Syria and Pal, and, while both have spines, they are very different animals, though often confused. The hedgehog, Erinaceus europaeus, is one of the Insectivora, and not only insects but also snakes and other small animals, as well as fruits and roots. It is about 10 in. long, covered with short, short and rolls itself into a ball when attacked. It inhabits the countries bordering the Mediterranean. The porcupine Erinaceus cristatus, is a rodent, about 26 in. long, having long spines. It is herbivorous. It backs rapidly at its foes, thrusting its sharp spines into their flesh, not through its spines, as is often stated. It inhabits most of Europe and Asia. It is very different from the little porcupine, Erethizon dorsatum, as well as from the true porcupines of Mexico and Central and South America.

As to the rendering "bitterm" for kippas (Isa 14 33; 34 15; Zeph 2 14), while the etymology favors "hedgehog," the context favors a bird, esp. in Isa 34 15, though it cannot be said that in any of the passages the context makes "hedgehog" an impossible rendering.

In Isa 34 15, for kippas, most modern authorities (cf RV) have some sort of serpent, referring to the Arab. κοτας, "to spring." (See notes above on kaphas and kaphas.) In this passage also the context is not unfavorable to a bird (cf AV "great owl"). See Bittern; Owl; Serpent.

ALFRED ELY DAY

POPHORY, Ποφορυ- (in Ex 28 11; RV has "pophory" [AV "porphory"] for τυχουσ ὑμ. τιμ, tahash, RV "sealskin," AV "badgers' skin." [Ex 25 5; 26 14; 35 7; 36 19; 39 34; Nu 4 6.8.10.11.12.14.25; Ezek 16 10]: The word denotes leather used in the furnishings of the tabernacle (for shoes in Ezek 16 10), and was probably the skin of the dugong, Halichoerus dugon, of Arab. تکوس, tukhas, which is found in the Red Sea. See Badger.

PORT, port, PORTER, porter: "Port" in the sense of "gate" (of a city or building) is obsolete in modern Eng, and even in the AV is found only in Neh 2 13. Porter, as "gate-keeper," however, is still in use, but "port" now (and never in EV) generally means a bolder-carrier. In the OT, except in 2 S 18 26; 2 K 7 10.11, the porter (תּוֹש, shob) is a sacred officer of the temple or tabernacle, belonging to a particular family of the Levites, with a share in the sacred dues (Neh 13 5; 12 47). The "porters" are mentioned only in Ch, Ezra and Neh, and Ch has an especial interest in them, relating that their duties were settled as far back as the time of David (1 Ch 26 1-19), and that the office extended further to the first settlement of Pal and even to Moses' day (1 Ch 9 17-26). The office was evidently one of some dignity, and the "chief porters" (1 Ch 26 3) are important persons. For some inscrutable reason RV renders shōbēr by "doorkeeper" in 1 Ch 15:26, but not elsewhere. See Doorkeeper.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

PORTION, pôr'tshun, PART: As far as a distinction between these three words is possible in Eng, it lies in the fact that a "portion" is a "part" about whose destiny something is implied (Ps 142 5, etc). The Heb has no two synonyms similarly related, and in consequence the use of the words in EV is settled either by rather arbitrary considerations (תּוֹש, m'nâh, is always "portion" in RV, but is "part" in AV, Ex 39 26; Lev 7 33; 8 29) or by the context, irrespective of the Heb word used. So "part" and "portion" both represent מ'נ', dabbâr, 1 K 6 38; Neh 12 47; מ'נ', peh, Zec 13 8; Dt 21 17; מ'נ', hebbel, Jos 17 5 (RV); Ezek 47 13; מ'נ', môrâs, Lk 11 36; 13 46. And in the vast majority of cases in the OT both words represent simply some derivative of מ'נ', halâk, normally the noun מ'נ', hâlak.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

POSIDONIUS, po-sid':nus (Ποσιδόνιος, Posidónios, al. Ποσιδόνιος, Posidónios and Posidónia, Possidón): One of the three or four envoy's sent by the Syrian general Nicander to treat with the Jews under Judas during his invasion of Judaea, 161 BC (2 Mace 14 19). In 1 Mace 7 27 ff, it is proposed that Nicander sent two or two, but no envoys are named, and it is there asserted in contradiction to 2 Mace that Judas broke off the negotiation because of the treacherous designs of Nicander.

POSSESS, po-zes', POSSESSION, po-zesh'un: "Possess" in modern Eng, means normally only "keep in one's possession." But in Elizabethan Eng it means also "take into possession," and, in fact, the word in the OT always represents Heb wbs, with the meaning as the latter as the former (יִצְבָּא, yâzâh, in nearly all cases, otherwise מָנָּה, mhâth, מִנָּה, מְנָה; Aram. מ'נ', hâlân). Consequently, in almost every case "take possession of" could be substituted advantageously for "possess," but RV has not thought the change worth carrying through. In the Apoc and NT, however, the designation has been made, AV's "possess" being retained for karîy, kalâch, in 1 Cor 7 30; 2 Cor 6 10, but the same tr for קָרִי, קָלַש, is changed into "take us for a possession" (Jth 8 22), "get" (Lk 18 12), "win" (Lk 21 19), and "possess himself of" (1 Thes 4 4, a very obscure passage). In the noun possession, on the other hand, no such ambiguity exists, and attention need be called only to the following passages. In Dt 11 6, AV has, "all the substance that was in their possession," Heb "all that subsisted at their feet," RV "every living thing that followed them." AV use "possessed" loosely in Acts 28 7 for χωρεῖν, chôrion, RV "lands." πορφοίας, periptôlēs, "perimetrics, from peripto, to cause to remain over," is rendered "God's own possession" in Eph 1 14 RV (AV "possessing") and 1 Pet 2 9 (AV "peculiar Avem purchased"). "God's own" is a gloss but is implied in the context.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

POSSESSION, DEMONIACAL, de-mô-ni'ak-al (Mt 4 24; 8 16, etc). See Demon, Demonic, Demonology.
POST, post (πόστ, ποστο, "to run," ἄποστ, ἀπόστα, "runners"): The "runners" formed the royal guard (1 S 22 17; 1 K 14 27; 2 K 11 4.13; see Guard). From them were chosen the couriers who carried royal letters and dispatches throughout the kingdom (2 Ch 30 6.10; Est 3 13.17; Jer 51 31). In the Persian service they were mounted on the swiftest horses (Est 8 10.14; of Xenophon, Cyrop. vii.6.17; Herodotus viii.98). They had the right to command the service of either men or animals in order to expedite their progress (Mt 5 26; Mk 15 21; Mt 19 13). Used in Job 9 25 and AV Wisd 5 9 (ἀγγέλλα, ἀγγέλλα, RV "message") of the swift passage of time. See also Hose, 11, 1, 4, 7). M. O. Evans

POT, pot: A term used as the tr of a number of Heb and Gr words whose fundamental meaning seems to describe them as intended for the most part to hold liquid or semi-liquid substances, but the pots of Ex 27 3 are intended to hold ashes. (1) τρύγος, the most common word for "pot." It designates most frequently a vessel for holding broth, or possibly a pot or kettle for boiling. So 2 K 4 38 ff; Ex 16 3; Jer 1 13 AV; Ex 23 13.7.17, "caldron"; 24 3.6 AV; Mic 3 3; Zec 14 21, etc. It is also used as the name of some vessel of the same character in Ex 27 3, where in context shows it was intended to hold ashes; 1 K 7 45; 2 Ch 4 16; 2 K 25 14; Ps 6 9; 18 9, it is a pot for washing. (2) τσύ, pārār (Nu 11 8; 1 S 2 14), a vessel for boiling; in Jgs 6 19, a vessel for holding broths; (3) δόχος, ἀγγέλλα, rendered "pot" in Ps 21 6 in AV, "basin" in RV: "pot" both AV and RV in Job 41 20. (4) φυτίζω, φυτεύν (Ex 16 53), the jar in which the manna was placed. This jar or pot is mentioned in He 9 4 under the name στάκμα, στάκμα. (5) ἄγγελλα (2 K 4 2), some kind of jar for holding oil. (6) στάκμα, στάκμα (Mt 7 4), some kind of household utensil. Mention may also be made of the word rendered "pot" in Lev 6 28 AV, where RV renders more correctly by the general term "vessel"; for AV "pots" (Ps 68 13) RV substitutes "sheepfolds." The root is uncertain. Those who render "sheepfolds" connect with the related, but in most cases somewhat household utensil. Others render "fireplaces" or "ash heaps." See also "range for pots" in Lev 11 35; "pots," Jer 36 5 AV, correctly "bowls" RV; "refining pots" in Prov 17 3; 27 21. See also Food.

WALTER OTTERIDGE

POTENTATE, poten-tāt (συνάρτητος, συνάρτητος, "mighty one," from συνάρτη, συνάρτη, "to be able"): A person who possesses great power and authority. Only in 1 Tim 6 15, "the blessed and only Potentate" (= God). The same Gr word is used of Zeus in Sophocles (Ant. 608), and of God in Apoc (e.g. Sir 46 5; 2 Mac 15 3.23). It is used of men in Lk 1 52 (AV "the mighty", RV "princes") and Acts 8 27 ("of great authority").

POTIPHAR, pot'i-far (ποτιφαρ, pōtiphar; of Egypt Potiphera [Gen 39 1 f]): A high Egypt official who became the master of Joseph. It is particularly mentioned that he was an Egyptian, i.e. one of the native Egypt officials at the Hyksos court.

POTIPHERA, poti-fē'-ra (ποτιφ'ερα, pōtiph'era; Egyptian Potippara, "the one [given] of the sun-god"); of Heb Nathaniel, "the gift of God," Gen 41 45.50; 46 20): There is no certain evidence from Egypt that this name was in existence until the XXII Dynasty, about 950 BC. But names of the Hyksos period, and, indeed, any kind of Hyksos inscriptions, are so scarce on account of the destruction of Hyksos monuments by the Egyptians of later times that the absence of such names is really no evidence on the subject. The fact that this name has not been discovered earlier than 950 BC does not give any warrant for the claim that the narrative is of a late date. M. G. KYLE

POTSHARD, potshārd (ποτηρίς, heres): A piece of earthenware (Job 2 8; Ps 22 15; Isr 45 9). RV renders the word in Prov 26 23, "an earthen vessel," and in Job 41 30 substitutes "sharp potshards" for "sharp stones." Sir 22 7 refers to the art of "shaping a potsherd [ποτηρίς, ἄκρακον] together." See HARSITH; OSTRACA.

POTSHARD GATE (Jer 19 2). See HARSITH GATE.

POTTAGE, pot'āj. See Food, III.


LITERATURE

(1) Prehistoric.—The making of pottery ranks among the very oldest of the crafts. On the rocky plateaus of Upper Egypt, overlooking the Nile valley, are found the polished red earthenware pots of the prehistoric period, 3000 BC. These are buried in shallow oval graves along with the crumpled bodies of the dead and their chipped flint weapons and tools. These jars are the oldest examples of the potter's art. It is inconceivable that in the country of Babel, Egypt's great rival in civilization, the ceramic arts were less developed at the same period, but the difference in the nature of the country where the first Mesopotamian settlements were made makes it unlikely that relics of the prehistoric dwellers of that country will ever be recovered from under the débris of demolished cities and the underlying deposits of clay and silt. (2) Babylonia.—The oldest examples of Bab ceramics date from the historical period, and consist of baked clay record tablets, bricks, drainage pipes, household shrines, as well as vessels for holding liquids, fruits and other stores. (See Perrot and Chipiez, History of Art in the Ancient East, I, figs. 159, 160, II, figs. 163, 168.) Examples of pottery of this early period are shown in the accompanying figures. By the 9th to the 7th cent. BC the shaping of vessels of clay had become well developed. Fragments of pottery bearing the name of Esarhaddon establish the above dates.

(3) Egypt.—With the close of the Neolithic period in Egypt and the beginning of the historical or dynastic period (4500–4000 BC) there was a decline in the pottery art. The workmanship and forms both became bad, and not until the IVth Dynasty was there any improvement. In the meantime the process of glazing had been discovered and the art of making beautiful glazed faience became one of the most notated of the ancient Egyptian arts. The potter's wheel too was probably an invention of this date.

(4) Palestine.—The making of pottery in the land which later became the home of the children of Israel began long before this people possessed the land and even before the Phoenicians of the coast cities had extended their trade inland and brought the earthenware vessels of the Tyrian or Sidonian potters. As in Egypt and Babylonia, the first examples were handmade without the aid of the wheel.
It is probable that Jewish potters learned their art from the Phoenicians. They at least copied Phoenian and Mycenaean forms. During their wanderings the children of Israel were not likely to make much use of earthenware vessels, any more than the Arabs do today. Skins, gourds, wooden and metal vessels were less easily broken.

To illustrate this, a party, of which the writer was a member, took on a desert trip the earthenware water jars specially made for travel, preferring them to the skin bottles such as the Arabs guides carried, for the bottles were less easy to keep filled. At the end of six days only one out of eight earthenware jars was left. One accident or some carelessness was not the rule.

When the Israelites became settled in their new surroundings they were probably not slow in adopting earthenware vessels, because of their advantages, and their pottery gradually developed distinctive though decadent types known as Jewish.

Toward the close of the Hebrew monarchy the pottery of the land again showed the effect of outside influences. The red and black figured ware of the Greeks was introduced, and still later the less artistic Roman types, and following these by several centuries came the crude glazed vessels of the Arab or Saracenic period—forms which still persist.

It is not within the limits of this article to describe in detail the characteristics of the pottery of the various periods. The accompanying illustrations taken from photographs of pottery in the Archeological Museum of the Syrian Protestant College, Beirut, give a general idea of the forms. Any attempt at classification of Palestinian pottery must be considered more or less provisional, due to the uncertainty of origin of many forms. The classification of Palestinian pottery here used is that adopted by Bliss and Macalister and based upon Dr. Petrie's studies.

(1) Early pre-Israëlitic, called also "Anatolian" (before 1800 BC).—Most of the vessels of this period are handmade and often irregular in shape. A coarse clay, turning red or black when burned, characterizes many specimens. Some are brick red. Specimens with a polished or burnished surface are also found.

(2) Late pre-Israëlitic or Phoenician (1800-1000 BC).—From this period on, the pottery is all wheel-turned. The clay is of a finer quality and burned to a brown or red. The ware is thin and light. Water jars with pointed instead of flat bases appear. Some are decorated with bands or lines of different colored ines. Cyproite ware with its incised decorations was a development of the period.

(3) Jewish (1000-500 BC).—Foreign influence is lost. The types which survive degenerate. New forms are introduced. Ordinary coarse clay burning red is used. Cooking pots are most characteristic. Many examples bear Hebraic stamps, the exact meaning of which is uncertain.

(4) Seleucid.—Foreign influence again appears. Gr and other pottery types are imported and copied. Ribbed surfaces are introduced. The old type of burnishing disappears.

(5) Roman and Saracenic.—Degenerate forms persisting till the present time.

(6) Present-day pottery.

The clay as found in the ground is not suitable for use. It is dug out and brought to the vicinity of the pottery (the "potter's field," Mt 27:7) and allowed to weather for weeks. The dry material is then passed through a coarse sieve and ground, the coarsest fractions being rejected. The material is then mixed with water until all have disintegrated and a thin slurry mud or "slip" has been formed. In coast cities the potteries are all near the sea, as the seawater is considered better for the "slipping" process. The slip is drawn off into settling tanks. All stones and lumps remain behind. When the clay has settled, the water is drawn off and the plastic material is worked by treading with the feet (cf. Isa 41:25; Wisd 15:7). The clay used on the Syrian coast is usually a mixture of several earths, which the potters have learned by experience gives the right consistency. The prepared clay is finally packed away and allowed to stand another six months before using, during which time the quality, especially the plasticity, is believed to improve.

Before the invention of the potter's wheel the clay was shaped into vessels by hand. In all of the countries previously mentioned the specimens rep-

resenting the oldest work are all hand-made. Chopped straw was usually added to the clay of these early specimens. This material is omitted in the
ANCIENT POTTERY

Selotician Period, 300 BC
Note appearance of "combing"

Cyproite Pottery
1, 2 and 3, incised ware of pre-bronze period before 2000 BC
4 and 5, of Phoenician Period, 1200 BC

Greek-Roman Period
1, red and black figured, before 350 BC
2 and 3, Cyprian of 330 BC
4, 5 and 6, Roman pottery from Bethga
Note characteristic "combing"

Jewish Period
Blackening on 5 due to use over fire

Pre-Israelite Period
1, hand-made throughout
1, 2 and 3, of early period or Amorite
4, 5, 6 and 7, of late period or Phoenician
6, 8 and 7 are burnished
The shaping of vessels is now done on wheels, the use of which dates back to earliest history. Probably the Egyptians were the first to use such a machine (11th Dynasty). In their original form they were stone disks arranged to be turned by hand on a vertical axis. The wheel stood only a few inches above the ground, and the potter sat or squatted down on the ground before it as he shaped his object (see Wilkinson, Ancient Egypt, II, fig. 307). The wheels used in Pal and Syria today probably differ in no respect from those used in the potter's house visited by Jeremiah (Jer 18 1-6).

The wheel or, to be more exact, wheels (cf Jer 18 3) are fitted on a square wooden or iron shaft about 3 ft. long. The lower disk is about 30 in. in diameter, and the upper one 8 in. or 12 in. The lower end of the shaft is pointed and fits into a stone socket or bearing in which it rotates. A second bearing just below the upper disk is so arranged that the shaft inclines slightly away from the potter. The potter leans against a slanting seat, bracing himself with one foot so that he will not slide off, and with the sole of his other foot he kicks the upper face of the lower wheel, thus making the whole machine rotate. The lower wheel is often of stone to give greater momentum. With a marvelous dexterity, which a novice tries in vain to imitate, he gives the pieces of clay any shape he desires.

After the vessel is shaped it is dried and finally fire-dried in a furnace or kiln. The ancient Egyptian kiln was much smaller than the one used today (Wilkinson, II, 192). Most of the kilns are of the crudest form of the "up-draught" variety, i.e. a large chamber with perforated bottom and a fireplace beneath. The fire passes up through the holes, around the jars packed in tiers in the chamber, and goes out at the top. An interesting survival of an early Gr form is still used in Rachiyet-el-Fakhar in Syria. In this same village the potters also use the lead cross, which comes from the parting of silver, for glazing their jars (cf Prov 26 23).

In firing pottery there are always some jars which come out imperfect. In unpacking the kiln and storing the product others get broken. As a consequence the ground in the vicinity of a pottery is always strewn with potsherds (see also separate article). The ancient potteries can frequently be located by these sherds. The potter's field mentioned in Mt 27 7-10 was probably a field near a pottery strewn with potsherds, thus making it useless for cultivation although useful to the potter as a place in which to weather his clay or to dry his pots before firing.

Pottery was used anciently for storing liquids, such as wine or oil, fruits, grains, etc. The blackened bot-

![Interior of Pottery.](image)

toms of pots of the Jewish period show that they were used for cooking. Earthenware dishes were also used for boiling clothes. Every one of these

4. Uses: In the Bible lands today it seems inconceivable that the Hebrews did not readily adopt, as some writers disclaim, the porous earthen water jars which they found already in use in their new country. Such jars were used for carrying live coals to start a fire, and not only for drawing water, as they are today, but for cooling it (Isa 30 14). The evaporation of the water which oozes through the porous material cools down the contents of a jar, whereas a metal or leathern vessel would leave it tepid or tainted. They were also used for holding shoemaker's glue or wax; for filling up the cracks of a wall before plastering; ground up they are used as sand in mortar.

Only a few of the Heb words for vessels of different sorts, which in all probability were made of pottery, have been given by terms which indicate that fact. (For כּוֹתָן, cuvot, and יִסְעָר, yis'ar, see Earthen Vessels; Ostracai.)

Terms: קֵתָן, is tri "pitcher" in Gen 24

14 ff: Jgs 7 16 ff; Est 12 6 (cf אָסָר, iser, kerdinnon, Mk
Figurative: The shaping of clay into pottery typified the molding of the characters of individuals or nations by a master mind (Jer 18:1-10; Isa 29:16; 45:9; 64:5; Rom 9:20 ff); commonplace (Lam 4:2; 2 Tim 2:20); frailness (Ps 2:9; Isa 30:14; Jer 19:11; Dn 2:41; 2 Cor 4:7; Rev 2:27).

LITERATURE.—Publications of PEF, esp. Bliss and Macalister, Excavations in Pal; Excavations of Gaster; Bliss, A Mound of Many Cities; Flinders Petrie, Tell el-Hesy; Bliss and Dickin, Excavations at Jerus; Perrot and Chipiez, History of Art (i) in Chaldaea and Assyria, (ii) Sardis and Judaea, (iii) Cyprus and Phoenicia, (iv) Egypt; King and Hale, Egypt and Western Asia in Light of Modern Discoveries; S. Birch, History of Ancient Pottery; Wilkinson, The Ancient Egyptians; PEPQ; EB; IDB.

JAMES A. PATCH

POTTER'S, pot'ər's. See ACELAMDA.

POUND, pound (ג'קָד, māneh; μᾶρα, mard, λίρα, lirə, which was formerly used for drinking instead of modern cups. כְּלָה, pabbâh, tr'"bowl" in Jer 33:5.

חֵט', khit, "vessel," was of wood, metal or earthenware in Lev 6:28; Ps 2:9; 31:12; Isa 30:14; Jer 19:11, etc.; of bronzeware, [אָשָׁר, pot, 2: Cor 4:17, etc.

יָחָש, yakhâsh, "cup" or "bowl." tr'"cup" in many passages, like Arab. כָּשָׁה, which was used in the OT (Gen 45:11) outside of the Book of Prov in which it occurs 11 t. (6:11; 10:15; 11:24 AV; 13:18; 20:13; 23:21; 34 References 34; 28:19,22 AV; 30:8; 31:7), in a tr of מִעָנָה, mīy wārah, "to be poor," "to come to poverty" (Gen 45:11). Four different Heb words are used in the 11 references in Prov, all bearing the idea of being in need of the necessities of life, although a distinction is made between being in want and being in extreme want. Prov 18:23 well illustrates the general meaning of "poverty" as found in this book: "The poor [מִעָנָה, mīy wārah, "to be impoverished," "destitute"] used entertain; but the rich answereth roughly.

"Poverty" occurs 3 t in the NT (2 Cor 8:29;
Rev 2:9 and is the tr of πτωχεύς, πτοχεύω, "to be reduced to a state of beggary or pauperism."

2. NT References unless all the references to the "poor" are to be considered as such.

Indeed the word for "poverty" has its root in the word for "poor" (πτωχός, πτοχή, τρία, or ὑπάρχω, dale). See Poom.

At least two degrees of poverty are recognized. The OT does not distinguish between them as clearly as does the NT. The NT, for

3. Two Degrees of "poor" sets forth this distinction. In

Poverty 2 Cor 9:9, "he hath given to the poor," the word used is πτωχος, πτωχία, which does not indicate extreme poverty, but simply a condition of living from hand to mouth, a bare and scant livelihood, such as that made by the widow who cast her two mites into the treasury (Lk 21:2); while in such passages as 2 Cor 6:10: "As poor, yet making many rich," and Lk 6:20: "Blessed are ye... for ye... outcasts of abject beggary, pauperism, such as that in which we find Lazarus who was laid at the gate of the rich man's palace, begging even the crumbs which fell from the table of the rich man (Lk 16:21, 22). This is being varied by this last condition that Christ voluntarily entered for our sakes: "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor (2 Cor 8:9). Between 30 and 40 t in the NT this latter word is used.

The causes of poverty are failure of harvest and poor crops (Neh 5:1-3); devastation caused by enemies sweeping through the land; the oppression of the people by their own rulers (Isa 5:8); excessive interest, usury (Neh 5:1-5); persecution because of the faith (2 Cor 6:8). Widows and orphans by reason of their desolate condition were in a special sense subject to poverty. Gluttony brings poverty (Prov 29:21), as does indolence (2 Th 3:10).

God commanded His people to care for the poor. The exhortations to relieve poverty are numerous, esp. in the Prophets. "Every one that is indigent must be treated with kindness (Dt 23:15-16) must be allowed to glean in the vineyards (Lev 19:10); to reap the harvest (23:2; cf Ruth 2:1); "The poor were not neglected (Rom 15:25; 1 Cor 16:2). God dealt with harshly (Am 3:4-6); must be treated as equal before the law (Gal 3:28); are precious in our house of faith (Lk 14:12-15). Indeed, the truth or falsity of a man's religion is to be tested, in some sense at least, by his feeling in their need (Jas 1:27). The year of Jubilee was intended to be of great benefit to the poor by restoring to them any possessions which they, by reason of their poverty, had been compelled to sell over to their creditors (Lev 25:25-55; Dt 15:12-15).

God required certain tithe from His people which were to be devoted to the helping of the poor and needy (Dt 14:28; 26:12, 13).

special emphasis upon remembering the poor in the matter of offerings. Paul, e.g., included this duty upon which he had founded his defense (Acts 20:35-38).

The attitude of the early Christian church toward its poor is amply illustrated in that first attempt at communism in Acts 4, 5, 12. James, in his Ep., strikingly reminds his readers of the fact that they had grossly neglected the poor man in their midst (Jas 2). Indeed, so strong is he in his plea for the care of the poor that he claims that the man who willily neglects the needy thereby proves that the love of God has no place in his heart, and that he has consequently no real faith in God (Jas 2:15, 16). Christians were exhorted about in the grace of hospitality, which, of course, is nothing less than kindness to those in need (Rom 12:13; 1 Thes. 4:12).

The happiest mother and the noblest and holiest son that ever lived were among the poor. Jesus was born of poor parents, and had not where to lay His head (Mt 8:20), no money with which to pay tribute (Mt 17:27), no home to call His own (Jn 7:53; cf 8:1), and was buried in a borrowed grave (Mt 27:57-61).

Figurative: Of course there is also a spiritual poverty indicated by the use of this word—a poverty in spiritual things. "Blessed are the poor in spirit," by this is meant that no one is more precious to the Lord, who feel that they have no self-righteousness, no worth of their own to present to Christ as a ground of their salvation, who feel their utter bankruptcy of spirit, who say "Nothing in my hand I bring." It is to this state of spirit that Christ refers in Mt 5:3. "Because thou sayest, I am rich, and have gotten riches, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art the wretched one and miserable and poor and blind and naked." William Evans

POW DERS, pou/dorz (παυς, 'abhebath rikhel): The "powders of the merchant" in Cant 3 6 were probably perfumes, as they are associated with myrrh and frankincense in the account of the festal procession of the litter of Solomon. They may have been some sweet-scented wood in powder, or else some form of incense.

POWER, pou'er: This word, indicative of might, strength, force, is used in the OT to render very many Heb. terms, the tr in numerous instances being varied without apparent reason. The Heb. words for "strength," "might," "dominion." The principal words for "power" in the NT are δυναμίς, ἀνάμις, and ὁδεία, ezovia. In the latter case RF frequently changes to "authority" (Mt 3:15; 6:7; Eph 1:21, etc.) or "right" (Rom 9:21; 1 Cor 7:6; 2 Thes 3:9, etc.). Power is attributed pre-eminently to God (1 Ch 29:11; Job 26:14; Ps 66:7; 145:11; Rev 7:12, etc.). On this attribute of power of God, see OMNIPOTENCE. The supreme manifestation of the power, as of the wisdom and love of God, is in redemption (1 Cor 18:24).

The preaching of the gospel is accompanied by the power of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor 4:1; 1 Thes 5, etc.). Miracles, as "mighty works" are denoted by the term "powers" (so Mt 11:21,23, Revm, etc.). The end of all time's developments is that God takes to Him His great power and reigns (Rev 11:17).

JAMES ORR

POWER OF KEYS. See KEYS, POWER OF.

PRAETORIAN, pré-tó'ri-an, GUARD: "My bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace, and in all other places?" (Phil 1:13 AV). This verse is brt in RV, "My bonds became manifest in Christ throughout the whole praetorian guard, and to all the rest," and is noteworthy.

It has been usual to connect the words, "the soldier that guarded him," Acts 26:16, with this statement in Phil 1:13, that the apostle's bonds were manifest in the whole praetorium, and to understand that the result was the cause of the latter; that the result was the consequence of the fact that he was in prison, and was a prisoner of Jesus Christ. In this way the gospel would spread through the whole praetorian guard in that regiment's headquarters which were situated in a permanent camp established by Trajan in Rome, outside the Colline Gate, at the N.E. of the city. This verse would also mean that the gospel had been proclaimed in the same way to those members of the praetorian guard...
who were on duty as the bodyguard of the emperor and who were lodged in one of the buildings which adjoined the emperor's palace on the Palatine Hill.

Thus Lightfoot, discussing the meaning of the phrase "in the whole praetorium," in judicial matters (p. 57), reviews the different interpretations which have been given of the word, and shows that it is to be found in various works of Tacitus and Suetonius. The "praetorium" means the emperor's palace on the Palatine Hill; (2) that which precedes in the Interim Epistle which would make it mean the praetorian barracks on the Palatine: (3) that neither is there any authority for making it mean the praetorian camp outside the walls of Rome. In Lightfoot's words (p. 57), "It follows from the interpretation which the praetorium thus fail for want of evidence:"

Lightfoot accordingly defines the interpretation, "the praetorian guard," and RV, above cited, follows him in this.

One of the meanings of "praetorium" is a council of war, the officers who met in the general's tent (see Praetorium). Lightfoot is very decided in interpreting "praetorium" to mean the praetorian guard and Ramsay mentions the imperial guards, and he adds, "in this sense and in this alone can it be safely affirmed that the apostle would hear the word praetorium used daily," and that this sense is in all respects appropriate. But the other meaning, though not appropriate here, viz., a council of war composed of the officers and their general, is much nearer to that which is now accepted by such authorities as Mommsen and Sir W. M. Ramsay, who hold that in this passage "praetorium" means a council, not of war, however, but the council of judgment, the emperor's court of appeal in which he was assisted by his legal assessors (see Mommsen, Berlin Akad. Sitzungsber., 1895, 501; Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller and the Rom Citize, 357, where he is in accord with Lightfoot). The Emperor's Court, over this court there presided the emperor or his delegate, the prefect of the praetorian guard, and associated with him were twenty assessors selected from the senators. Formerly their votes were taken by ballot, but Nero preferred to receive from each a written opinion and on the next day to deliver his judgment in person. Such, it is now believed, is the praetorium to which Paul refers.

The meaning, therefore, of the words, "My bonds in Christ are manifest in the whole praetorium," will be that when Paul wrote the Ep. to the Phil, he had written the following words to his imperial guards, and Phil, 4:2 1, 2, it be he: "These résemblances are seen in the Ep. Phil, 4:2 and Phil, 4:2, the circumstances will allow," earlier, that is, than Col and Eph. Lightfoot concludes that Phil is the earliest of them, basing his opinion largely on the resemblance which exists between the thoughts and expressions in Phil and in the Ep. to the Rom, making Phil, as it were, a connecting link between Paul's earlier and his later ep. see Lightfoot, Philippians, 42 f.; he writes: "These resemblance are suitable for the Phil, 4:2 and Phil, 4:2, the circumstances will allow," earlier, that is, than Col and Eph. Lightfoot's argument is supported by the fact that a light which has been thrown upon the real meaning of "praetorium." Sir W. M. Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveller, p. 128) remarks: "The trial occupied about a year and a half, and the entire case was decided toward the end of AD 61. Its earliest stages were over before Paul went to Philippians, 2:4. He says, "the things which happened unto me have fallen out rather unto the progress of the Good News; so that my bonds became manifest in Christ in the whole Praetorium, and to all the rest; and that most of the Brethren in the Lord, being confident in my bonds, are more abundantly bold to speak the word of God without fear."

This passage has been generally misconceived and connected with the period of imprisonment; and later connected to Mommsen for the proper interpretation. The Praetorium is the whole body of persons connected with the imperial court, different in Proconsul and in this case the Prefect or both Prefects of the Praetorian Guard, and being the emperor in his capacity as the fountain of justice, together with the assessors and high officials of the court. The expression of the chapter as a whole shows that the interesting question is not how the issue as it is so favorably that the Brethren are emboldened by the success of Paul's speech, but the spoken defence and the strong impression which he evidently produced on the court; but he himself, being entirely convicted of loyalty to Christ, was prevented from preaching as he had been doing when he wrote to the Colossians and the Asian churches generally.

Thus the correct meaning of "praetorium" enables us to fix the date of the Ep. to the Phil, as having been written close to the end of Paul's first Bearing Romans imprisonment. That this inference is correct is confirmed by various other facts, such as his promise to visit that city, and his assurance of Timothy, "I have no man like-minded, who will naturally care for your state. For all seek their own ends, not the things which are of Christ's."

We could not conceive of Paul writing like this if Mark, Luke, and John thus and specially after he had written to him then, and yet we know (Col 4:7,10.14) that each and all of these companions of the apostle were with him in Rome when he wrote the Ep. Phil. Paul is evidently, perhaps, with others, been on missions to Asia or other parts of the world. But it is certain that Paul was not "liked them" when he wrote to Philippi. See Paul the Apostle, Philippians, Epistle to the.

All these facts and considerations confirm us in accepting the signification of "praetorium" as the emperor's supreme court of appeal, before which Paul when he wrote the Ep. to the Phil had so conducted his defense as to produce a most favorable impression, from which he inferred that he might soon be liberated from imprisonment. And his liberation, as the event proved, soon followed.

John Rutherford


The Praetorium was originally the headquarters of a Roman camp, but in the provinces the name became attached to the governor's official residence. In order to provide residences for their provincial governormen, the Romans were accustomed to seize and appropriate the palaces which were formerly the houses of the princes or kings in conquered countries. Such a residence might sometimes be in a royal palace, as was probably the case in Caesarea, where the procurator used Herod's palace (Acts 23:35).

The Praetorium where Jesus was brought to trial has been traditionally located in the neighborhood of the present Turkish barracks where once stood the Antonia and where was stationed a large garrison (Acts 21:38, 39; 25:65, but the statements of Jos make it certain that the headquarters of the procurator were at Herod's palace. This was a building whose magnificence Jos can hardly sufficiently appraise (Wars, I, xxi, I; IV, iv, 4). It was in this palace that Phorus, the procurator took his court and based his tribunal in front of it, held his sessions and the chief priests, influential persons and notables of the city appeared before the tribunal" (Wars, II, xiv, 8). Later on, "Florus . . . brought such as were with him out of the king's palace, and would have
of it in human consciousness; and so Paul associates praise with virtue as an aid and incentive to holy living on which the mind should dwell (Phil 4:8).

In the Bible it is God who is esp. brought before us as the object of praise. His whole creation praises Him, from the angels of heaven (Ps 103:20; Rev 5:11) to those lower God as its existences that are unconscious or even inanimate (Ps 19:1-4; 148:1-10; Rev 5:13). But it is with the praises offered to God by man, and with the human duty of praising God, that the Scriptures are principally concerned. In regard to this subject the following points may be noticed.

1. The grounds of praise.—Sometimes God is praised for His inherent qualities. His majesty (Ps 104:1) or holiness (Isa 6:3) fills the mind, and He is “glorified as God” (Rom 1:21) in view of this divine grandeur. Others see Him as He works in creation, providence, and redemption. References may be dispensed with here, for the evidence meets us on almost every page of the sacred literature from Gen to Rev, and the Book of Ps in particular, from beginning to end. In essence these are the same as the revelations of God’s operations under those aspects present themselves, not simply as general effects of His power and wisdom, but as expressions of His personal love to the individual, the nation, the church, His works become benefits, and praise passes into blessing and thanksgiving (Ps 34, 105; Eph 1:3; 1 Pet 1:3).

2. (The modes of praise.—True praise of God, as distinguished from false praise (Isa 29:13; Mt 15:8), is first of all an inward emotion—a gladness and rejoicing of the heart (Ps 4:7; 33:21), a music of the soul and spirit (Ps 105:1; Lk 1:46) which no language can adequately express (Ps 106:2; 2 Cor 9:15). But utterance is natural to strong emotion, and the mouth instinctively strives to express the praises of the heart (Ps 81:15 and passim). Many of the most moving passages in Scripture come from the inspiration of the spirit of praise awakened by the contemplation of the Divine majesty or power or wisdom or kindness, but above all by the revelation of redeeming love. Again, the spirit of man creates words to utterance. The man who prays God desires to praise Him in the hearing of other men (Ps 40:10), and desires also that their praises should be joined with his own (31:3). Further, the spirit of praise is an activity of the mouth. It may find expression in other ways—in sacrifice (Lev 7:13), or testimony (Ps 66:16), or prayer (Col 1:3); but it finds its most natural and its fullest utterance in musical and musical forms. When God fills the heart with praise He puts a new song into the mouth (Ps 40:3). The Book of Ps is the proof of this for the OT. And when we pass to the NT we find that, alike for angels and men, for the church on earth and the church in heaven, the higher moods of praise express themselves in bursts of song (Lk 2:14; Eph 5:19; Col 3:16; Rev 5:9; 11:3; 15:3). Finally, both in the OT and NT, the spirit of song gives birth to ordered modes of public praise. In their earlier expressions the praises of Israel were joyful outbursts in which song was mingled with shouting and dancing to a simple accompaniment of timbrels and trumpets (Ex 15:20; 2 Sam 6:5.14 ff). In later times Israel had its sacred Psalter, its guilds of trained singers (Ezr 3:11; Neh 7:44), its skilled musicians (Ps 81:1-9, etc) that waited for God in Zion and were full of the solemn beauty of holiness (Ps 29:2; 96:9). In the NT the Psalter is still a manual of social praise.

compelled them to get as far as the citadel [Antonia]; but his attempt failed" (II, xv, 5). The word ταξινόμησις (taxinomhēsis) is used here, rather as if "court" in Mk 15:16, "the soldiers led him away within the court [aulē], which is the Pretorium. There is no need to suppose that Herod Antipas was in the same palace (Lk 23:4 ff); it is more probable he went to the palace of the Hasmonaeans which lay lower down on the eastern slope of this southwest hill, whereat a later tradition expressly states that Herod Agrippa II and his sister Bernice were living (Wars, II, xi, vii, 3).

The palace of Herod occupied the highest part of the southwest hill near the northwest angle of the ancient city, now traditionally called Zion, and the actual site of the Pretorium cannot have been far removed from the Turkish barracks near the so-called ‘Tower of David.’ It is interesting to note that the two stations of the Turkish garrison of Jesus today occupy the same spots as did the Roman garrison of Christ’s time. It is needless to point out how greatly this view of the situation of the Pretorium must modify the traditional claims of the ‘Via Dolorosa,’ the whole course of which depends on the theory that the ‘Way of Sorrow’ bore down on the Aemilian and the Antonine ramparts of late ecclesiastical tradition. See also GABBATHA.

With regard to the expression ἐν ἴδιῳ τῷ πρατήριῳ, ἐν κόλλῳ τῷ πρατηρίῳ, in Phil 1:13, there is now a general consensus of view that: ‘Prætoriu[m]’ here means, not a place, but the imperial prætoria guard, ten thousand in number, which was instituted by Augustus. St. Paul was allowed to reside in his private house in the custody of a prætorian guard, but these were doubtless constantly changed. It must have become ‘manifest’ to the whole guard that his bonds were for the sake of Christ. See also preceding article.

E. W. G. Masterman

**PRAISE,** πράζ (πραζ), ἀθανάτι, "psalm," "praise," τίττα, ταδήα, "confession," "thanksgiving," πρατηρίων, σιάβαθα, "to praise," "glorify," τοῦτος, ἀνάμειν, ἀθανάτι, "to stretch out the hand," "confess;" αἰσχρό, αἰσχρόν, ἐπάνοια, ἐπάνοιαν, ἐπάνοιαν, ἐπάνοιαν: The word comes from the Lat preter, "price," "value," and may be defined generally as an expression of ascertainment or worth. Praise may be bestowed upon unworthy objects or from improper motives, but true praise is a judgment of a real conviction of worth. Its type may be seen in the representation given in the Apocalypse of the adoration of God and of the Lamb, which is inspired by a sense of their worthiness to be adored (Rev 4:11; 5:12).

Man may be the object of praise, and may receive it either from God or from his fellow-men. In the former case (Rom 2:29; 1 Cor 4:5) the praise is inevitably just, as resting on the Divine estimate of worth; in the latter case its value depends upon the grounds and motives that lie behind it. There is a praise which is itself a condemnation (Lk 6:20), an honor which seals the eyes in unbelief (Jn 5:44), a careless use of the epithet "good" which is dishonoring to God (Lk 18:19). This is the "praise of men" which Jesus warned His followers to shun as being incompatible with the "praise of God" (Mt 6:1-4; cf Jn 12:43; Gal 1:10; 1 Thess 2:6). On the other hand, that which is the distinctive homage of the soul to righteousness (Lk 23:47), the acknowledgment given to well-doing by just government (Rom 13:3; 1 Pet 2:14), the tribute of the churches to distinguished Christians (2 Cor 8:18). Such praise, so far as being incompatible with the praise of God, is a reflection
"hymn" which Jesus sang with His disciples after the Last Supper (Mt 26:30) would be a Hebrew psalm, probably from the Hallel (Pss 113-118) which was used at the Passover service, and various references in the Epistles point to the continued employment of psalms in Christian worship (1 Cor 14:26; Eph 5:19; Col 3:16; Jas 5:13).

But the Psalter of the Jewish church could not suffice to express the distinctive moods of Christian feeling. Original utterance of the spirit of Christian song was one of the manifestations of the gift of prophecy (1 Cor 14:15-17). Paul distinguishes hymns and spiritual songs from psalms (Eph 5:19; Col 3:16); and it was hymns that he and Silas sang at midnight in the prison of Philippi (Acts 16:25 RV). But from hymns and songs that were the spontaneous utterance of individual feeling, the development was natural, in NT as in OT times, to hymns that were sung in unison by a whole congregation; and in rhythmic passages like 1 Tim 3:16; Rev 15:3 f, we seem to have fragments of a primitive Christian hymnology, such as Pliny bears witness to for the early years of the 2d cent., when he informed the Emperor Trajan at the time of the Bithynian emperor's visit that their morning meetings sang a hymn in alternate strains to Christ as God (Ep. x.97). See PENNAVISION.

(3) The duty of praise.—Praise is everywhere represented in the Bible as a duty no less than a natural impulse and a delight. The hour in this duty is to withhold from God a glory that belongs to Him (Ps 50:23; Rom 1:20 f); it is to shut one's eyes to the signs of His presence (Isa 40:26 f), to be forgetful of His mercies (Dt. 6:12), and unthankful for His kindness (Lk 6:35). If we are not to fall into these sins, but are to give to God the honor and glory and gratitude we owe Him, we must earnestly cultivate the spirit and habit of praise. From holy men of old we learn that this may be done by arousing the soul from its listlessness and sluggishness (Ps 57:8; 103:1), by fixing the heart upon God (Ps 117:1), by meditation on His works and ways (77:11 f), by recounting His benefits (103:2), above all, for those to whom He has spoken in His Word (Ps 89:1). So Paul, writing to the Corinthians of the church of Corinth, calls him a gift (2 Cor 9:15; cf Rom 8:31 f; 1 Jn 3:1) See also WORSHIP.

PRAYER. prárr (πραρ, dévésis, προσέχι, προσεύχη, ἵπτεσις, ἐπηδεσία; for an excellent discussion of the meaning of these see Thayer's Lexicon, p. 126, s.v. prárr); the chief vbrs. are προσέχω, προσέχομαι, προσεμάθω, προσεκολάθω, and θεμαται, esp. in Lk and Acts, atidé, atidi, "to ask a favor," distinguished from ἄποθεσις, ἐπηδεσία; "to ask a question," is found occasionally). In the Bible "prayer" is used in a simpler and a more complex, a narrower and a wider signification. In the former case it is supplication for benefits either for one's self (petition), or for others (intercession). In the latter it is an act of worship which covers all the attitudes of the soul in its approach to God. Supplication is at the heart of it, for prayer always springs out of a sense of need and a belief that God is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him (Heb 11:6). But adoration and confession and thanksgiving also find a place, so that the suppliant becomes a worshipper. It is unnecessary to distinguish all the various terms for prayer that are employed in the OT and the NT. But the facts should be noticed that the Heb and Or alike are there on the one hand words for prayer that denote a direct petition or short, sharp cry of the heart in its distress (Ps 30:2; 2 Cor 12:8), and on the other "prayers" like that of Hannah (1 S 2:1-10), which is in reality a song of thanksgiving, or that of Paul, the prisoner of Christ Jesus, in which intercession is mingled with doxology (Eph 3:14-21).

The history of prayer as it meets us here reflects various stages of its development and experience. The first in the "patriarchal period, when 'men began 1. In the to call upon the name of the Lord' OT (Gen 4:6; cf 12:2; 21:33), prayer is naíve, familiar and direct (15:2 f; 17:18; 18:23 f; 24:15). It is evidently associated with the old sacrifice and the designation of desired benefits becomes the condition of promised service and fidelity (28:20 f). In the pre-Pauline history of Israel prayer still retains many of the primitive features of the patriarchal type (Ex 3:4; Nu 11:15-16; Jgs 6:13 f; 11:30 f; 1 S 11:1; 2 S 15:8; Ps 66:18 f). The Law has remarkably little to say on the subject, differing here from the later Judaism (see Schroer, HJP, II, i, 290, index-vol. p. 98; and of Mt 6:5 f; 23:14; Acts 3:1; 16:18); while it confirms the association of prayer with sacrifices, which now appear, however, not as gifts in anticipation of benefit to follow, but as expiations of guilt (De 21:1-9) or thank offerings for past mercies (26:1-11). Moreover, the free, frank access of the private individual to God is more and more giving place to the mediation of the priest (21:5 f; 33:3), the intercessor (Ex 32:11-13; 1 S 7:5-13; 12:23), the ordered approach of tabernacle and temple services (Ex 40:1 K 8). The prophet, it is true, approaches God immediately and freely—Moses (Ex 34:34; Dt 34:10) and David (2 S 7:27); so, also, has numbered among the prophets—but he does so in virtue of his office, and on the ground esp. of his possession of the Spirit and his intercessory function (cf Ezek 2:2; Jer 14:15).

A new epoch in the history of prayer in Israel was brought about by the experiences of the Exile. Chastisement drove the nation to seek God more earnestly than before, and as the way of approach through the external forms of the temple and its sacrifices was now closed, the spiritual path of prayer was a frequent substitute. Two devotional habits of Ezra (Ezr 7:27; 8:23), Nehemiah (Neh 2:4; 4:9, etc) and Daniel (Dan 6:10) prove how large a place prayer came to hold in the individual life; while the utterances recorded in Ezra 9-10 and Neh 1:5-11, and Daniel 6:10 ff., show the prominence now given to confession of sin. In any survey of the OT teaching the Psalms occupy a place by themselves, both on account of the long period they cover in the history and because we are ignorant in most cases as to the particular circumstances of their origin. But speaking generally it may be said that here we see the loveliest flights attained by the spirit of prayer under the old dispensation—the intensest craving for pardon, purity and other spiritual blessings (61, 130), the most heartfelt longing for a living communion with God Himself (42:2; 63:1; 64:2).

Here it will be convenient to deal separately with the material furnished by the Gospel narrative of the life and teaching of Christ and that found in the remaining books.

2. In the NT the distinctively Christian character of prayer comes to us from the Gospels. We have to notice His own habits in the matter (Lk 3:21; 6:12; 9:16-29; 22:32-39; 46; 23:34-46; Mt 27:46; Jn 17), which for all who accept Him as the revealer of the Father and the final authority in religion immediately disti-
Prate all theoretical objections to the value and efficacy of prayer. Next we have His general teaching on the subject in parables (Lk 11 5-9; 18 1-14) and incidentals sayings (Mt 6 44; 6 5-8; 7 7-11; 9 38; 17 21; 18 19; 21 22; 24 20; 26 41 and §§), which presents prayer, not as more energizing of the religious soul that is followed by beneficial spiritual reactions, but as the request of a child to a father (6 8; 7 11), subject, indeed, to the father's decisions (Mt 10 16; ef 6 10; 26 39-43; 1 Jn 5 14), but secure always of loving attention and response (Mt 7 7-11; 21 22). In thus teaching us to approach God as our Father, Jesus raised prayer to its highest plane, making it not less reverent than it was at its best in OT times, while far more intimate and trustful. In the Lord's Prayer (q.v.) He summed up His ordinary teaching on the subject in a concrete example which serves as a model and brevity of prayer (Mt 6 9-13; Lk 11 2-4). But according to the Fourth Gospel, this was not His final word upon the subject. On the night of the betrayal, and in full view of His death and resurrection and ascension to God's right hand, He told His disciples that prayer was henceforth to be addressed to the Father in the name of the Son, and that prayer thus offered was sure to be granted (Jn 16 23.24,26). The differentia of Christian prayer is primarily in its being offered in the name of Christ: while the secret of its success lies on the one hand in the new access to the Father which Christ has secured for His people (17 19; cf He 4 14-16; 10 19-22), and on the other in the fact that prayer offered in the name of Christ will be prayer in harmony with the Father's will (15 7; cf 1 Jn 3 22 f; 5 13 f).

In the Acts and Epp. we see the apostolic church giving effect to Christ's teaching on prayer. It was in a praying atmosphere that the church was born (Acts 1 14; cf 2 1); and throughout its early history prayer continued to be its vital breath and native air (2 42; 3 1; 6 46 and passim). The Epp. abound in references to prayer. Those of Paul in particular contain frequent allusions to his own personal practice in the matter (Rom 1 10; Eph 1 16; Phil 1 9; 1 Thess 1 2, etc), and many exhortations to his readers to cultivate the praying habit (Rom 12 12; Eph 6 18; Phil 4 6; 1 Thess 5 17, etc). But the new and characteristic thing about Christian prayer as it meets us now is its connection with the Spirit. It has become a spiritual act (1 Cor 14 14-16); and even those who have none of this gift in the exceptional charismatic sense may "pray in the Spirit" whenever they come to the throne of grace (Eph 6 18; Jude ver 20). The gift of the Spirit, promised by Christ (Jn 14 16 f, etc), has raised prayer to its highest power by securing for it a Divine cooperation (Rom 8 15,26; Gal 4 6). Thus Christian prayer in its full NT meaning is prayer addressed to God as Father, in the name of Christ as Mediator, and through the enabling grace of the indwelling Spirit. See Prayers of Jesus.

J. C. LAMBERT

PRAYER, HOURS OF. See Hours of Prayer.

PRAYER, LORD'S. See Lord's Prayer, The.

PRAYER OF HABAKKUK. See Habakkuk; Beth-horon, Battle of.

PRAYER OF JOSEPH. See Joseph, Prayer of.

PRAYER OF MANASSES. See Manasses, Prayer of.

PRAYERS, prárz., OF JESUS:

1. The Lord's Prayer
2. Christ's Doctrine of Prayer
3. Prayers Offered by Christ
4. Prayers for the Resurrection
5. General Conclusions

In the history and doctrine of prayer, nothing is more important than the light shed upon the subject by the prayers of Jesus. These are to be studied in connection with His teaching concerning prayer found in the model of the Lord's Prayer, and general statements and hints to His disciples.

This model of prayer is given in two forms (Mt 6 9-13; Lk 11 2-4). The differences of form show that essence of similarity in words is not essential. The prayer includes adoration, supplication, for the Kingdom, for personal needs, for forgiveness, for deliverance from temptation and the ascension of glory. It is at once individual and universal; it sets the recognition of Divine things first, and yet clearly asserts the ethical and social relations of life. See Lord's Prayer, The.

That men should pray is taken for granted (Mt 6 5). Its sacredness is involved in the command (Jn 17 20 f, 21).

2. Christ's Prayer (Lk 11 5-9; 18 1-8): its necessary conditions of humility, absence of self-righteousness (Lk 18 9-14), of display and repetition (Mt 6 7); necessity of faith and a forgiving spirit (Mt 11 24-26); of agreement in social prayer (Mt 18 19); submission to the will of Christ, "in my name" (Jn 14 13).

In Mt 11 25-26 AV, Christ thanks God: "Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes.

3. Prayers Even so, Father: for so it seemed good Offered in thy sight." This language shows Christ the essence of prayer to be not the mere expression of need and request for what is required, but resort to God. The prayer gives us insight into the deeper experience of the Son with the Father, and His perfect submission to the Father's will, with thanksgiving even for what might seem inexplicable. It thus illustrates the truth that the highest form of prayer is found in the serenity of the soul.

Mt 14 23 narrates the retirement of the Lord to a "mountain apart to pray." No word of what the prayer was is given, but the record is suggestive. Following a day of severe toil and probably excitement, Jesus betakes Himself to prayer. The reality, the true humanity of the Christ, are here revealed.

The former prayer may almost be regarded as that of the Son of God addressed to the Father in the sublime communion of the Godhead. This passage emphatically is a prayer-scene of the Son of Man. The association of this incident of prayer in Christ's life with the miracle of walking on the sea (an example of miracle in the person of the Lord Himself, and not performed on another) opens up an interesting question of the relation of the supernatural and the natural. Here perhaps lies an explanation of the true significance of the miraculous. The communion of the Lord with a supreme Father had filled the personal nature of Jesus with spiritual forces which extended the power of the spirit over the material world beyond the limits by which man is bound in his normal and sinful condition (see Lange, Comm, on Mt; Mt 15 36; cf 14 19).

Christ's recognition of God as the Father of all, thanks at the meal, or "asking blessing," should be noted as an example which in modern times is
largely ignored or followed as a mere formality. But it is significant; it expresses that intense and all-compelling sense of the Divine which even dwelt in Him; of which prayer is an expression, and which is more especially true in the case of Our Lord and His Father, the Father rules in a sovereignty at a sublime depth. In Mt 17 21, Our Lord's reference to prayer as a necessary condition of miraculous power, in the light of Mk 7 34, where "looking up to heaven, he sighed, and saith unto him [the deaf man], Ephphatha," may imply His own prayer in connection with the exercise of miraculous energy. This is apparently indicated in Jn 11 41-42, although, as above, it is the expression of the intimate relation between Christ and the Father, which is the essence of prayer, and in which relation He ever exercised the fullest power of God Himself. Mt 19 13 records that little children were brought to Him that He should put His hands on them and pray. That He prayed is not related, but ver 15 relates that He laid His hands on them and, presumably, with the imposition, prayed. The scene is most suggestive, in the light of Our Lord's words. In ver 14 and in Mt 28 26 Our Lord blesses the bread or gives thanks at the institution of the Supper, and has the model of consecration universally adopted, even giving the term Eucharist ("giving of thanks") to the service.

(1) The high-priestly prayer.—This prayer (Jn 17) is the special prayer of the Lord, and may be regarded as the example established by the evangelists of Our Lord's method of prayer. The thanksgiving in Mt 11 23 is the only other instance of any extent in the report of the prayers of Jesus, but even that is brief compared to what is here. The fulness of the prayer clearly shows that it was uttered in the hearing of the disciples. Their relation to it is remarkable. Auditors, they yet could not share in it. At the same time, it was a profound revelation to them both of the relation of the Master to God, and the character of the work which He had come to perform, and the part which they were to take in it. John gives us no hint as to the place in which it was spoken; 14 31 indicates a departure from the upper room. But apparently the prayer was offered where the discourses of chs 15 and 16 were delivered. It has been suggested by Westcott that some spot in the temple courts was the scene of chs 15, 16 and 17. It has been generally supposed that the ornament of the Golden Threshold might suggest the figure of the Vine and Branches which Our Lord employs. Jn 18 1 shows that the prayer was offered before the Lord and His disciples had passed over the brook Kidron. The determination of the exact spot is certainly impossible, except the probability that the words were spoken in the vicinity of the temple.

The first part of the prayer (Jn 17 1-5) is an expression of profound communion between the Son and the Father, that the Father would glorify the Son, but with the supreme end of the Father's own glory. The essentially unique character of Christ's relation to God is the calm assertion of ver 4. Its consciousness of completeness in the work which He had received from God is impossible to the human. It is the complete acceptance the Father's own nature, the supreme nature of the Son of God. In the second part of the prayer (Jn 17 6-19), Our Lord prays for His disciples, to whom He has revealed Himself and His relation to God (vs 7-8). He prays that they may be kept from the evil that is in the world, which is alien from them as it is from Him. In the third portion of the prayer Christ's relation to His ultimate followers is referred to. Their unity is something natural, but the deep, spiritual unity found by the indwelling of Christ in them and God in Christ. The prayer closes by the declaration that Christ is the Father's equal to God, and the end and crown of all is to be the indwelling of God's love in man by the dwelling of Christ in man.

This prayer is unique, not merely among the prayers of Our Lord, but also among the prayers of humanity. While it is distinctly a petition, it is at the same time a communion. In one or two places Our Lord places Our Lord's prayer before the Father upon a level with God. The fact of this prayer of triumph in which every petition is virtually a declaration of the absolute certainty of its realization, immediately preceding the prayer of Gethsemane, is both difficult and suggestive. This anomaly is a powerful argument for the historical reality. The explanation of these contrasted moods is to be found in the depth of Our Lord's nature, and esp. in the complete consistency of His dual nature with the spheres to which each nature belongs. He is most Divine; He is most human. In the fulness of the reach of the prayer and its calm confidence, the believer may find a ceaseless and inexhaustible source of comfort and encouragement. Attention might be called to the remarkable forecast of the history and experience of the church which the prayer furnishes.

(2) The prayer in Gethsemane.—This is recorded by the three Synoptics (Mt 26 36-44; Mk 14 22-41; Lk 22 39-46), and is probably referred to in Jn 17 11. Our Lord's most clearly recognition of God's infinite power, a clear object sought by the prayer, and perfect submission to God's will. All the elements of prayer, as it can be offered by men, are here except the prayer for forgiveness. It is to be noted that the prayer was three times repeated. This is not to be regarded as inconsistent with Our Lord's prohibition of repetition. It was vain repetition which was forbidden. The intensity of the prayer is expressed by the threefold utterance, "Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me." (Paul's prayer in regard to the thorn in 2 Cor 12 8).

(3) The prayers on the cross.—In Mt 27 46; Mk 15 34, Christ uses the prayer of Ps 22 1. In the moment of complete desolation, the Sufferer claims His unbroken relationship with God. This is the victory of the atoning sacrifice. Lk 23 34 records the prayer of intercession for those who crucified Him; in ver 46 is the calm committal of His spirit to the Father. Prayer here again assumes its highest form in the expression of all that is left of man. Thus the three prayers on the cross not only reveal the intimate relation of Our Lord to the Father, but they also illustrate prayer such as man may offer. They represent supplication, intercession, communion. Each is thus expressive of man's needs to others, to ourselves; our trust, our love, our need. In all things He was made like unto His brethren, except without sin (see Points). His prayers on the cross illustrate His high-priestly office. It rises to that intense crisis to its supreme manifestation and activity.

(4) Prayer after the resurrection.—It is to be observed that after His resurrection there is no record of any prayer offered by Christ. In the supper at Emmaus He "blessed" the bread (Lk 24 35); and the ascension took place in the midst of blessing (Lk 24 51), suggestive of the course of the church as ever beneath the benediction of the Lord, to be ended only at the final consummation. The act of eating the fish and honeycomb (Lk 24 40) seems to have been unaccompanied by any act of specifically religious form. Mk, with characteristic regard to details, records Christ's "looking up to heaven" (Mk 6 41; 7 34); Jn 11 41 refers to a similar act, and holds the Lowest of the services that God had heard Him (see also Jn 13 3), but it is not in usual association with Christ's prayers; it is appropriate and suggestive. Lk narrates that Christ prayed at His baptism (Lk 3 21); that He spent a night in prayer before choosing the Twelve (Lk 6 12-15); that the transfiguration was preceded by
of the church in whose name he has been set apart to proclaim the gospel. Both the personal and representative or official are united in him and his preaching.

His work is always to be related to the OT and NT. His sermon is under the creed of his church as the creed is under the word. The preacher is a man with a message, and the preacher who has no message of the particular kind indicated above is in no true sense a preacher. It has been well expressed in one of the valuable Yale series of lectures on the subject, "Every living preacher must receive his divine communication and the constant purpose of his life must be to receive it uncorrupted and to deliver it without addition or subtraction." When he presents the message of his Divinely appointed ambassadorship in its integrity, he speaks with that peculiar kind of "authority" which has been pronounced "the first and indispensable requisite" in giving a message from God. He manifests thereby a "high celestial dogmatism," and "human weakness becomes immortal strength." The true preacher proclaims a Divine impulse. He says with Paul, "Necessity is laid upon me; for wo is unto me, if I preach not the gospel!" (1 Cor 9:16; cf. Jer 20:9). He says with Peter, "Whether it is right in the sight of God to hearken unto you rather than to God? yea: for we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard!" (Acts 4:19-20). The message of the preacher is greater than the man, because it is from God. It largely makes the man who preaches it in his fullness, and the message of the preacher is a message not of his own gifts or whatever the alleged gift conferred in the laying on of hands, without the sense of the message he is not chosen of God to proclaim His word. Destitute of that, he does not have the sustaining impulse of his vocation to enlist his entire personality in his work and give him mastery over the minds and hearts of men.

No agency of religion is older than preaching. It is as old as the Bible itself (2 Pet 2:5). It is a necessary adjunct of a religion that is communicated to man by means of an objective and authoritative revelation, such as we have in the sacred Agency Scriptures. It is an entirely natural agency, the form and manner in which is found in the OT and NT. It is strictly in harmony with those ideas that obtain in both testaments regarding the method of propagating the faith, set forth through the agency of holy men who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. That faith is disseminated by means of teaching through argument, explanation, motive and exhortation. The agency for the spread of a religion of persuasion must be preaching.

In the Bible, usage of the terms which have reference to the subject, preaching means the proclamation of religious truth. It is that continuous and public testimony which the church is always giving, through their mean discourses, by men set apart for such work, to her own living faith as that faith is rooted in and sustained by the written word of God. In this sense "to call," "proclaim," "cry aloud" are used frequently of the prophet's message under the various aspects of its denunciation, as in Jon 1:2, of the role of the Divine, as in Jer 11:6, and of Messianic promise, as in Isa 61:1. The term for "preaching" is also used to designate a political propaganda set forth by the prophet (Neh 6:7). In two passages (Ps 68:11, "publish, O mouth of God", Isa 61:1) the word means "to declare good news." In the case of Jonah's preaching at Nineveh, the word used to

prayer (Lk 9:29); and records the prayer in the garden (Lk 22:41-45). The third evangelist thus in addition to the notes of Our Lord's prayers in retirement, which the other evangelists record, adds these instances of the special relation of prayer to events of critical importance.

(5) General conclusions.—The following conclusions as to prayer may be drawn from the records of Christ's prayer: (1) Prayer is the highest exercise of man's spiritual nature. (2) It is natural to the soul even in perfect accord with God. (3) It is not only the expression of need, the supply of which is sought of God, but by the example of Christ it is the highest expression of trust, submission and union with God. (4) It is to be used both in solitude and in society; it is personal and intercessory. (5) It may be accompanied by the plea of Christ's name, and for Christ's sake. These are the laws which should direct it; that is to say, it should be based upon the merits of Christ the intercession of Christ, and should be addressed to God under the limitations of the Kingdom of the Lord and His purposes for good, both for the interest of the supplicant and others, under the conditions of the interest of the whole Kingdom.

L L. D. BEVAN

PREACHER, prēch'ər, PREACHING, prēch'ing (préch'ər, kōhēlēth, "preacher") [Ecc 1:1], σητόν, básar, "to bring or tell good tidings" [Ps 40:9; Isa 61:1], סֵפֶר, קָדָר, "to call," "proclaim" [Neh 6:7; Jon 3:2], ἐκκλησία, ἔκκλησία, "cry," "preaching" [Jon 3:2]; καὶ ἐκκλησία, ἐκκλησία, "cry," "preaching" [1 Tim 2:7]; ἐκκλήσια, ἐκκλήσια, "to cry or proclaim as a herald" [Mt 3:1; Rom 10:14]. Εὐαγγελίζω, euaggellizó, "to announce good news" [Mt 11:5]:

1. Definition
2. The Preacher's Limitations
3. A Man with a Message
4. Preaching a Necessary Agency
5. Biblical Terms and Their Meanings
6. The Hebrew Prophets
7. Christ as a Preacher
8. The Apostles as Preachers
9. Fundamental Postulates
10. "If You Preach"
11. "We Are Ambassadors"

In the NT sense a preacher is a man who has the inner call from the Holy Ghost and the external call from the church, the witnessing body of Christ on earth, as it has been duly set apart as an accredited and qualified teacher of the Christian religion. His vocation is that of addressing the popular mind and heart on religious truth, as that truth is set forth in the sacred Scripture, for the spiritual profit of the hearer as its end. The preacher, recognized as such by the church, speaks as a personal witness of God's saving truth, explaining it and applying it as the circumstances of the people and the time may require. The gravity and importance of this vocation, as set forth in the sacred Scriptures and amply illustrated in the history of the church, surpass those of any other calling among men. Luther said, "The devil does not mind the written word, but he is put to flight whenever it is preached about." The preacher, in the sense indicated above, is with all other Christians a sharer in the freedom that is in Christ. But as a recognized teacher and leader of the church, he is not an unshackled and entirely unbridled teacher. He is not to speak as his own, but as the mouthpiece of the church whose apprehension of the gospel he has voluntarily confessed. The faith of the church is, by his own assent, his faith, and her doctrine is his doctrine, provided he is not expected to give his own, as distinct from or opposed to the faith of

the...
designate what it was means strictly "proclamation" and corresponds to the NT word used to define Our Lord's "proclamation" as a herald of the Kingdom (Mt 3 17), in which its initial stages particularly was closely associated with the preaching of John the Baptist (Mt 3 1 2).

Thus while preaching belongs esp. to Christianity, it has well-defined antecedents in the OT. Under both the OT and the new dispensation the subject takes the church for granted and utters the truth in the name of a solitary believer, but of a Divinely founded society, whether it be of Jews or Christians.

6. The Jehovah Prophets

The OT books in the canon have them the beginnings and some of the features of the preacher's office and of the high function preaching. In these we find a special class of men set apart and separated unto that particular work, as we find in the Christian church, from its beginnings, the same Divinely instituted office. The Heb prophet had a message direct from God, which frequently came with supernatural knowledge in the power of prediction. The mission of the prophet, however, was not simply or chiefly to forecast the future, but to declare a present message from the Lord to the people. The prophet of the OT was the forerunner in office and the prototype of the messenger of Christ. The development of the synagogue as the center of Heb worship, as well as as interpretation of the Law became essential.

Moses, the most commanding figure in Heb history, was the great prophet. Many messages in the OT are mingled with power, sublimity and pathos than those usual elsewhere. He was the great law-giver, Israel, not so much by his rod as by the word he delivered to the people. There are numerous indications that after Moses there was a continuous class of religious teachers whose work was to instruct men and inspire the people, as is indicated in the case of Joshua, in the history of Deborah and Barak, and in the days of solemn assembly which are inconceivable without men who spoke and others who listened. At the time of Semeuel there was a distinct advance made in the work of the prophetic office. The Heb church became a real institution. There were schools of the prophets at Bethel, Jericho and Gilgal, the very seats of heathen idolatry. Under their dispensation the whole course of progress was toward presenting Divine truth in its simplicity and power, by bringing it to bear upon the popular mind and heart. One of the marks of the new era beginning with John the Baptist was a revival of prophetic preaching (Mt 11 9), which again resumed its old character and meaning. See PROPHECY AND PROPHETS.

The words meaning "to proclaim as a herald" and "preaching," are frequent in the NT. The mission of Our Lord was essentially 7. Christ as one of proclaiming good tidings or a preacher cerning the Kingdom of God (Mt 4 17). He at once, on His entrance upon His mission, gave to preaching a spiritual depth and practical range which it never had before. At that time preaching had manifestly become a fixed part of the synagogue worship, and was made one of the chief instruments in the spread of the gospel. Our Lord constantly taught in the synagogue (Mt 4 23; Mk 1 21; Jn 6 59). He thus read and interpreted and applied the Law and the Prophets (Mk 1 39; Lk 4 16). Christ's testimony about Himself was that He came "to bear witness to the truth." The spoken word became His great power in His life and ministry. Throughout His life Jesus was above all things a preacher of the truths of His kingdom. Telling men what He was in Himself, what in His relation to man and His salvation and what to God the Father, formed a large part of His public work.

The preaching of the apostles was essentially prophetic in character, and bore testimony concerning the resurrection of Jesus and His early return to judgment (Acts 2 Apo'shes 21 52 36; 1 Cor 15 15). The sermons of the apostles which are reported with their names are those of Peter on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 2), his address in the house of Cornelius at Caesarea (Acts 10), and the counsels of James to the brethren at Jesu, as to what ordinances should be imposed on gentile Christians. In the early church preachers were first of all witnesses to Jesus and His deeds and words, and to the significance to be attached to the great facts of the redemptive history. With the spread of the gospel and the passing of time, this office was taken up by others, esp. as such as endowed with "the word of wisdom" and "of knowledge" (1 Cor 12 8).

Upon the basis of what is taught in the word of God there are two fundamentally important postulates concerning preaching and the 9. Funda- mental Postulates of preaching is that it be the word of God (2 Tim 4 2). Out of the Bible must the life of every generation of Christians be fed. To Holy Scripture, therefore, ought the pulpit text in its integrity. In the exercise of his preaching duties, the preacher fulfills his double office of edifying believers and subjugating the world to Christ. There must always be an organic connection between the word in the text and the sermon.

(2) "He is an ambassador."—The work of preaching is the fulfillment of a Divinely instituted ambassadorship (2 Cor 5 20). The gospel is put into the hands of men for a distinct purpose, and is to be administered in accordance with the plan of its author. The preacher is in a very distinct sense a trusted ambassador. But even as we have been approved of God to be intrusted with the gospel, so we speak; not as pleasing men, but God who proveth our hearts" (1 Thess 2 4). Those who have accepted the responsibility imposed upon them by this Divine commission are enjoined to exercise their office so as to warrant the appointment. He who has appointed them to a special work. The homiletic practice of taking the theme of every sermon from a passage of Holy Writ has been an almost invariable rule in the history of the church. It is the business of the preacher to present the truth embodied in the text in its integrity. In the exercise of his appointed ambassadorship he is to administer God's word revealed to Christian faith, not human opinions or speculations.

D. B. HAUSLIN

PRECEPT, prē'pekt: A commandment, an authoritative rule for action; in the Scriptures generally a Divine injunction in which man's obligation is set forth (Lat: preceptum, fr. praecipere, "to instruct").

Four words are so rendered in AV: (1) τῆς, michr, very frequently (188 t) is used "commandment," but 4 t "precept" (in RV only Jer 35 18; Dan 9 9 19) from a root meaning "to teach" (cf 19 15 18 41 10 13; (3) ἀντίδωρος, pikkâ'áthim, only in the Ps (21 in Ps 119, e.g. vs 4 10 17; also RV Ps 19 8 10 18; (4) ἐν τῇ ἔργῳ, enboth, generally in AV is used "commandment" (65 t), but twice "precept" (Mk 10 5; He 9 19; in both cases RV substitutes "commandment"). See COMMANDMENT.

D. M. ALLS EDWARDS

PRECIOUS, pre'shús (stand. for 17 different words, chief of which are τιμίος, yâ'gâ'ar, ri'mos, timios): (1) Generally in the literal sense, "of great price," "costly," "expensive," of material things (e.g. Prov 1 13; Jer 20 5; Mk 14 3 A V), esp. of precious stones (2 S 12 30; 2 Ch 3 6; 1 Cor 3 12 AV, etc.), and sometimes of great corporeal (non-material) value, "Precious in the sight of God is the death of his saints" (Ps 116 15); "his precious and exceeding great promises" (2 Pet 1 4); cf Ps 199 17; 2 Pet 1 1. The literal and the moral sense are both included in the expression, "knowing that ye were redeemed, not with corruptible things, . . . but with precious blood" (1 Pet 1
18.19). "Preciousness" (πρόθεσις, πρόθεσις) occurs in 1 Pet 2:7 ARV, ERV, for AV "precious."

PRÉGUE STONES. See STONES, Precious.

PRECIPITATION, pré-sip-i-ta-Shun. See Punishments, III, (5).
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Literature

Predestination can be, and has sometimes been, regarded as a philosophical question rather than a Biblical one. It is with predestination as a Biblical question, however, that we are here mainly concerned.

1. As a Biblical Question

It is possible to urge, and it has been urged, that the philosophical question —whether all that occurs is decided before it ever happens—is not discussed and decided by Scripture. Theology, starting from God in its interpretation of all things, has arrived at universal foreordination by a species of deductive reasoning. But we must not argue the matter from any abstract principles, but deal with the actual facts as set forth in Scripture and as found, inductively, in the experience of man.

It must first be asserted, however, in view of much loose medieval thinking, that predestination is a category of religious thought of fundamental importance. No category of religious thought could go deeper, for it reaches down to the Infinite Will in relation to the universe of finite wills, and lays stress on will as the core of reality. The philosophy of our time may be said to have received, from the time of Schopenhauer, an impact toward will-emphasis, alike in respect of will as of knowledge. But the relation of the Absolute Will to the universe, and to mankind, is precisely that with which we are concerned in predestination.

Predestination is that aspect of foreordination whereby the salvation of the believer is taken to be effected in accordance with the will of God, who has called and elected him, in Christ, unto life eternal. The doctrine Divine plan of salvation must certainly be conceived under this aspect of individual reference. To understand and set forth the nature, and ethically justifiable character, of such a foreordination to life eternal, is our purpose. For the doctrine has need to be purified of the historic inconsistencies, and fatal illogicalities, with which, in its older form, it presented itself, it was often infected. This, esp., in order that the doctrine may appear as grounded in reason and righteousness, not in absoluteness and almighty caprice.

To begin with, it must be said that there seems to be no evading the doctrine by election by grace, as found both in the letter and the spirit of Scripture. The idea of the Doctrine in predestination is set forth, with great power and clearness, in Rom 8:29-30, and with the elements of parts articulated in natural and striking form. The idea recurs in Eph 1:5, where it is finely said (vs 4.5) that God hath chosen us in Christ "before the foundation of the world," having predestinated or foreordained us unto adoption as sons according to the predestination of God, and where it is said, further, that our salvation imports "the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure" (ver 9), which He purposed in Christ. This "eternal purpose to save men through Christ" is in reference to in Eph 3:11. This helpful mode of viewing predestination is in Christ, and never outside Him, had a place in religious thought at the Reformation time, as the famous "Formula of Concord," to be referred to below, shows. The predestined certainty of God's gracious work in Christ was not meant to overbear men, but to encourage and reassure all who trust in His grace. In Rom 9:14-25, the absolute sovereignty of God is put in a form whereby election is made to originate in the Divine will apart from all human merit, whether actual or foreseen. But from this assertion of God's free supremacy we can derive no concrete theodicy, or do more than infer that God is just and wise in His exercise of free grace, even when His doings are most perplexing to us.
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and John Wyclif, in pre-Reformation times. We are thus brought up to the decretal system—so called from Calvin’s making predestination consist of the eternal decree of God—which became, in its metaphysical principle, the fundamental position of the whole Reformed theology after the Reformation.

The theology of the Reformed church adopted the Calvinistic doctrine of the decree of predestination and election. Calvin, however,

7. Predestina-
    nation in the Reformed Theology

Zwingli, it must be remembered, was, even before Calvin, of consistent deterministic leanings, as part of his large speculative views, which were not without a tendency to universalism. Salvation was, to Calvin, the execution of a Divine decree, which was supposed to fix the extent and conditions of such salvation.

(1) Calvin’s definition.—Reprobation was, for Calvin, involved in election, and Divine foreknowledge and predestination are taken to be identical. Calvin’s mode of defining predestination was as the eternal decree of God, by which He has decided with Himself what is to become and every individual. For all, he maintains, are not created in the same condition; but eternal life is fore-ordained for some, eternal condemnation for others. Calvin confesses that this is “a horrible decree,” and it is not surprising to find competent theologians in our time denying such a form of predestination any place in the teachings of St. Paul, who never speaks of reprobation.

(2) Theology advanced by Calvin.—It is generally overlooked, however, that the theological advance registered by Calvin is to be seen by study of the views of the Middle Ages, and on to the Reforma-
    tion, not by viewing Calvinism in our post-Reforma-
    tion lights. It was love—“the fatherly love of God,” as he terms it—the efficiency of saving love—which Calvin insisted upon, above all, in his teach-
    ings about God. But Calvin also heightened men’s ideas as to the certitude of personal salvation. It is but fair to Calvin to remember—for superficial acquaintance with his teachings is far from rare—that he, in the strongest manner, maintained Divine sovereignty and its absolute, righteous, holy, and love, and expressly rejected the notion of absolute power as, in this connection, a heathenish idea. The Calvinistic doctrine was not absolute, but mediated in Christ, and conditioned upon faith.

Luther and the Lutheran church at first shared the doctrine of predestination and election. Luther in his treatment of free will reproducing the Augustinian form of the doctrine in a strict sense of it predestination of Luther and Melan-
    chron proceeded, not from their con-
    ception of God, but rather from the doctrine of sin and grace. Melancho
    lin was less disposed than Luther to press the doctrine of ab-
    solute predestination, and, in his “synergistic” tendencies, laid increasing stress on human free-
    dom, until he at length rejected the doctrine of absolute predestination. He was blamed by strict Lutheranism for yielding too much to Pelagianism, but the Lutheran “Formula of Concord,” in 1577, was not a very logical and consistent presen-
    tation of the case, for, opposed at points to Augustinianism, it fell back, in the end, on election in the Augustinian spirit. Or, to put the matter in another form, the “Formula of Concord” may have

differed by maintaining a universal call along with a particular election, and it rejected the decree of reprobation. Later Lutheranism adopted a moderate form of the doctrine, which became, in its metaphysical principle, the fundamental position of the whole Reformed theology after the Reformation.
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a lessened interest in this doctrine, largely because of the increasingly ethical conceptions of Deity. That is to say, the doctrine of the
11. Present
needs and
souvereignty of God's will has ceased to
Values
be taken, as often in the older pre-
doctrine
sentations, as mere almightiness, or
expressly taught that no cause or
ground but God's unconditioned will
would be to be sought; but he feebly tried to save
Divine will from sheer omnipotence by saying that
God has now humanized and revealed the Deity
with no greater powers of moral determination
than may be implied in His love, when viewed as a
mere golden haze of good will. See ELECTION:
foreordination

PREÉMINENCE, pré-ên's-ns: Superiority, esp. in noble or excellent qualities; the word stands for:
(1) ἐπιτροπή, “what is over and above,”
“excellence”; (2) ἐπιμέτρησις, “to make above”;
“That in all things he [= Christ] might have the
preéminence” (Col 1 18); (3) ἐπικαιρία,
“to be first”; (4) ἐπικράσία, “that is, above,”
“to be first”; (5) ἐπικράσιος, “whosoever
loved to have the preéminence,” lit. “who loved to be
first” (of Diotrephes, 3 John v 19).

PREFER, pré-fūr': Does not always have the
general meaning “to choose before another.” In
Ps 137 6, it does have this sense and the two VS agree;
in Ew text RV has “preferred” where AV has
“preferred”; in Dtl 6 3, “distinguished” takes
its place; in Jn 1 15, 30, “become,” “is substituted for
“preferred”; in ver 27, “preferred” drops out
entirely; in Rom 12 10, the VS agree.

PREPARATION, pré-ar-ā'shūn: The concord-
ances indicate that the word “preparation” occurs
only twice in the OT, once in 1 Ch 22 5, where it is
used in the ordinary sense “to make
preparation,” and once in Nah 2 3, “in the
stand of his preparation,” both of them translating the
same Heb root and requiring no special elucidation.
In Eph 6 15 the apostle speaks of the
equipment of the Christian as including the “feet
shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace,”
which means, according to Thayer, “with the
shoe made and alacrity which the gospel pro-
duces.”

The word occurs with technical significance ("the
Preparation") in the gospel narratives of the cruci-
fixon, translating the Gr παρασκευή, paraskewa (Mt
27 62; Mk 15 42; Lk 23 51; Jn 19 14, 31, 43, 45).
It is used as a technical term indicating the day of
the preparation for the Sabbath, that is, the evening
of Friday. This is its use in Jos, Ant, XVI, vi, 2,
and presumably in the Synoptics. Later its use
seems to have been extended to denote regularly
the 6th day (Friday) of each week. So in Did., viii
and the Martyrologium of Polycarp, vii.

The addition of the phrase τῶν παρασκευῶν, τοῦ πασχα,
“of the passover,” in Jn 19 14, and of the phrase
“for the day of that sabbath was a high day,” in
19 31, seems to indicate that the author of the
Fourth Gospel regarded the crucifixion taking
place on the Sabbath in the year of the crucifixion.
This is clearly the natural interpretation of the words
of John's Gospel, and if it were not for the seeming
contradiction to the narrative of the Synoptics it
would seem quite probable whether this other story
would ever have been put upon them. This ques-
tion is discussed in the articles on the date of the
crucifixion and the Lord's Supper, and it will be
necessary only to allude to it here.

It is possible that the phrase the "Preparation of the
passover" in the day (Friday) of the Passover week (see Andrews, Life of Our Lord, 451 ff., and most recently Zahn, Das Evangelium des Johannes, 1909, 657 ff.). This method of har-
morizing seems to the present writer to be forced, and
therefore seems wise to give to the words of Jn 19 14
their natural interpretation, and to maintain that,
according to the author of the Gospel, Jesus did not
cease to be celebrated as the time of the cruci-
fixion. There seems to be reason to believe that the
ordinary view is that the Lord's Supper was in connection with the Passover, based upon the narrative
in Mark (14 12 f.), does not have the unanimous sup-
sport of the synoptic gospels.

LITERATURE.—In addition to references to the
word in the articles on the communions, see also
Bible, "St. John," Appendix A; Allen, ICC, "St.
Matthew," 270-74; G_ODT, Concord, in the NT: Gospel
and the significant articles on the interpretation of Lk 22 16
by Burkitt in Expositor, Journal of Theological Studies,
IX, 569 ff., and by Box, ib, X, 106.

WALTER R. BETTGER
PRESBYTERY, presbiteri, presbiteroi, (spor-
 bé-tries, presbitēresos), PRESBYTERY, presbi-
ter-i, presbi'ter-i (sporbé'triovos, presbiteri-
-on): This latter word occurs in the
Used in
NT once (1 Tim 4 14), so rendered in
the NT
both AV and RV. But the original Gr
also appears in Lk 22 66, in RV tr:t4
"the assembly of the elders," in AV simply
"the elders;" and in Acts 22 5, tr:t in EV "the estate
of the elders;" in both of which occurrences the word
might more accurately be translated "elders," just
as it is in 1 Tim 4 14. Besides these three occurrences
of the neuter sing. presbiterion, the masc. pl.
presbiteroi, always tr:"elders," is often used to
indicate the same organization or court as the former,
being applied earlier in the Jewish Synagogue (Mt
27 11; 28 12; Lk 9 22; Acts 5 5), and later in the
development of the church to its governing body, either in general (Acts 15 4-6,22), or locally (Acts 14 23; 16 4; 20 17; 1
Tim 5 17; Tit 1 5, etc.). It is sometimes used of
the body, or succession, of religious teachers and
leaders of the nation's past (Mt 15 2; He 11 2).
The word "presbyter" has been contracted by later
ecclesiastical usage into the title "priest," although
in the NT they are by no means identical, but on the
contrary are always explicitly distinguished (Mk 14
43; Acts 23 14).

The local synagogue of the Jewish church was
under the care and control of a body of representa-
tive men called "the elders" (Lk 7 3).

2. Based

The local Jewish church was
on Syna-
gogue Plan
The local church at Jerusalem and the
beginning at Jerusalem and on the
synagogue Plan
lines of the synagogue, took over the
eldership into its own organization
(Acts 11 30; 15 2; 1 Pet 5 1, etc.), so also in
all the cities where the Christian
the apostles made church organization necessary,
the local synagogues readily suggested and supplied
a feasible plan for such organization (Acts 14 23;
Tit 1 5). The mother-church at Jerusalem, formed after the pattern of the synagogue, might well have
offered to the churches formed elsewhere under apostolic preaching the only conceivable plan. We know from the NT passages how NT elders were selected; we must infer that they were elected by the membership of the churches, as under the synagouge plan; they were then installed into their office by apostles (Acts 14 23), or by apostolic helpers (Tit 1 5), or by "the presbytery" (1 Tim 4 14), or by both together (2 Tim 1 6; cf 1 Tim 4 14). So early as the Pauline letters the office of presbyter seems already to have borne the distinction of two functions: teaching and ruling (1 Tim 1 21; cf Acts 20 17 28; 1 Thess 5 12; 1 Pet 5 2).

In the NT history and epistle, it does not appear that the various churches of a district were already organized into an ecclesiastical body known as "the presbytery," having found in some basis of representation from the NT constituent churches. But the absence of such mention is far from being final proof that such district organizations did not exist; little dependence can be placed on mere negative argument. Moreover, the presence of apostles and elders in Jesus, to which Paul and Barnabas appealed (Acts 15), is positive evidence of the principle of representation and central authority. The various district organizations would quickly follow as a natural development and judicial needs were demanded; such development came early in the growth of the church, so early that it is unmistakably present in the post-apostolic age.

In Rev the 24 elders occupy a conspicuous place in the ideal church (Rev 4 10; 5 1 etc), sitting for those they represent, as an exalted presbytery, close to the throne of the Eternal One. "The four and twenty elders occupying thrones (not seats) around the throne are to be regarded as representatives of the glorified church; and the number, twice twelve, seems to be obtained by combining the number of the patriarchs of the ON with that of the apostles of the NT" (Milligan on Rev 4 4 in Expositor's Bible).

Presbytery is the court, or representative body, in the Presbyterian Church next above the Session of the local church. The Session is composed of the ruling elders of a church, with the minister as moderator or presiding officer. The Presbytery is composed of the ordained ministers, teaching elders, and one ruling elder from each church in a given district or community. To it now, as in NT times (1 Tim 4 14), is committed the power of ordination: as to diaconal and ruling elders, it has the supervision of the affairs which are general to the churches in their sphere of power; the power of retention in all matters concerning the local churches (see Form of Gov, Presby. Church in U.S.A. ch xi). The Presbytery elects the representatives composing the General Assembly, which is the highest court of the Presbyterian Church.

In ecclesiastical architecture the presbytery is that part of the church structure which is set apart for the clergy, usually the space between altar and choir, sometimes composed of the whole choir space, but ordinarily the word is more restricted in its meaning. See further, Bishop; Church; Elders; Governor.

Edward Mack

PRESENCE, presence: In the OT nearly always the rendering of נין י, תיינו, תיינו (Gen 3 8; Ex 33 14 18; Ps 95 2; Isa 69 3, etc.) occasionally of פ, "ayin, 'eye" (Gen 23 11; De 25 9; Jer 11 1.11); and in 2 K 8 22; Prov 14 7, "the presence of" renders the prep. נ, נלנ, nbhcl, "before," cf also Aram. ל, קד, imd in Dn 2 27 AV (RV "before"). In "Gr," presence has an exact equivalent in πρώτη, πρώτος, but this word is rendered as administrative and judicial προς, προσ, προς. Elsewhere προστρατί is rendered "coming," but always with "presence" in the m. Otherwise in the NT "presence" represents no particular word but is introduced where it seems to suit the context (cf Acts 3 13 AV and 10 19). See Parousia.

Burton Scott Easton

PRESENT, present-ent. See Gift.

PRESENTLY, presently-ly: The strict meaning is of "those at the present moment," "at the present time," and the modern force "after a short interval" is due simply to the procrastinating habits of mankind; hence RV modifications of the AV use of the word into "immediately" (Mt 21 19), "even now" (Mt 26 53), and "forthwith" (Phil 2 23). In Prov 12 16, the uncertainty of the meaning (in "openly," Heb "in the day") has led to the retention of the AV word.

President, prez'int-ent. See prez/int-ent.

PRESS, press: As a vb. is used in RV as a tr of no less than 13 Gr and Heb words (rather more in AV). All the RV uses are modern. In AV may be noted Wsd 17 11, "pressed with conscience," RV "pressed by conscience"; Joh 19 41, "pressed on every side" (RV "surrounded by foes"); Acts 18 5, "pressed in the spirit" (RV "constrained by"). As a noun, AV uses "press" in Mk 2 4 for δ, κλος, κλος, "crowd" (so RV). For wine press see Vine; Wine.

PRESSAT, pres'at (Hag 2 16 AV, ERV "winefat," ARV "winewat"). See Wine.

PRESUME, presup'm, presumptuous, pr'zump'tus, presump'tus, PRESUMPTUOUS, pr'zump'tu'lous: To "presume" ("to take or go beforehand") is to speak or act without warrant or proudly. In the OT the words are for the most part the of ט, צדיק, and צדיק, "to boil up" (as water), and derivatives; hence to act proudly, to speak without authorization, etc (Dt 18 20 22, of the prophet; Ex 21 14; Dt 1 43; 17 12 13; Ps 19 3, "presumptuous sins" [צדיק, "prudent"]; cf Ps 86 14; 119 21, etc; Prov 21 24, etc). Other words are מיל, "to fill," to be full" (Est 7 5, "presume"); מיל, "to lift oneself," not noted elsewhere; נֵּּב, מנה, "with a high hand" (Nu 15 30, RV "with a high hand"); in 2 Pet 2 10 המטה, "bold," "daring," is tr "presumptuous," RV "daring;" in 2 Mace 3 24; 5 15 we have הערת, this is rendered "presumption" in 2 Mace 6 18, RV "daring deed."

W. L. Walker

PREVENT, pre'vent (ז, קד, קדם, prophec, φθάνει, φθάνω, φθάνει), "Prevent" occurs in AV in the literal but obsolete sense of "to come or go before." To anticipate, not in the sense of "to hinder." It is the tr of קדם, "to be sharp, "to be in front," "to be beforehand" (2 S 22 6, RV "came upon"); Job 3 12, RV "receive"; 30 27, "are come upon"; 41 11, "first given," Ps 58, "are come upon"; 21 3, ARV "meetest"; 59 10, ARV "meet"; 79 8, ARV "meet"; 88 13, "come before"; 119 147 148, ARV "anticipated"; Isa 21 14, "did meet"; Am 9 10, ARV "meet." In the NT prophec, with same meaning, is tr "prevent" (Mt 17 25, "Jesus prevented him," RV "spake first to him"); φθάνω (1 Thess 4 15, "shall not prevent," RV "shall in no wise precede"). "Prevent" in the above sense occurs in Wis 6 13, RV
"forestalleth" (plēthō) ἀναμφίσπευτος, ἀναρρήτως, ἀναλογία; 15 28, "we must prevent the sun to give thee thanks," RV "rise before."

W. L. WALKER

PREY, πρᾶ (πρᾶ, βάρ, τερέψ, πάρεν, σάλλμπ): 'Priest' is frequent in the OT, chiefly as the τρ of 

baz, 'spoil' (Deu 14 33; Dt 3 9; Isa 10 6, etc); of terēψ, 'prey of wild beasts,'

torn thing (Gen 49 9; Nu 33 24; Job 4 11, etc); of mālēkōr, 'a taking' (Nu 31 11, etc; Isa 49 24 25; of shālām spoil' or 'booty' (Jgs 5 50 8; Ex 13 14; Isa 10 2, etc). Maher-shalal-hash-baz (AV "The spoil speedeth, the prey hasteth") was the symbolical name given to a son of Isaiah (Isa 8 1 3). 'Prey' does not occur in the NT, but is found in the Apoc: 1 Esd 8 77, "for our sins...up...for a prey (pronome); Jth 9 4; 16 5; 1 Macc 7 47; Eccles 27 10 (thēra); Jth 5 24 (katēdroma).

In RV shālām is generally trd "spoil" (Jgs 5 30; 8 24 25; Isa 10 2, etc), while, conversely, 'prey' (noun and vb.) is occasionally substituted for 'spoil,' "booty" (Nu 31 92, etc). See Boovry; Spoil.

W. L. WALKER

PRICE, πρᾶσ: Represents various words in the OT: ὁτὲ, τιμῶν, τίμησι, is the usual Gr word for 'price' in the AV. 'Price' is παρακλήσας, παρακλήσας, in Mt 13 46, and πτωκήσας, πτωκήσας, in 1 Pet 3 4.

The vb. occurs in Zec 11 13 AV and ERV as "preyed." The spelling "prized" in ARV and some ed. of AV is due to a confusion with "prize." For "price of a dog" (Dt 23 18 AV) see Dog.

PRIEST, πρές (πρῆ, κόη, "priest," "prince," "minister;" ἱερεῖς, ἱερέως, ἱερεῖας, archiereis; for ἱερεῖς μέγας, κυριαρχίας, Vulg compungo; cf. Eng. word "compunction").

D. MALL EDWARDS

I. Nature of the Priestly Office.

1. Implies Choice. Not only was the office of Divine institution, but the priest himself was Divinely appointed thereto.

"For every high priest, being taken from among men, is appointed for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both the gifts and sacrifices of men, that are offered according to the Law; but of which there is no mention neither among the sacrifices of clean beasts, nor of blood, nor of any offering made with blood, which could make him perfect, who goeth not into the holy place, but into the temple, even into the holy of holies, where the San
t除此之外，还有其他几个更小的神职人员，如受圣礼的祭司和祭司等，他们在寺庙中也担任着不同的职责。

II. The Two Great Priests of the OT

Melchisedec and Aaron

III. Priestly Functions and Character

1. A Strictly Religious Order
2. Priesthood Dealt
3. The High Priest's Qualifications
4. Symbolism of Aaron's Rod

IV. The OFFICE OF AARON AND HIS SONS

1. Symbolism of Consecration
2. Type and Archetype

LITERATURE

A priest is one who is duly authorized to minister in sacred things, particularly to offer sacrifices at the altar, and who acts as mediator between man and God. In the NT the term is applied to priests of the Gentiles (Acts 14 15), to those of the Jews (Mt 8 4), to Christ (He 5 5 6), and to Christians (1 Pet 2 9; Rev 1 6).

The office of priest in Israel was of supreme importance and of high rank. The high priest stood next the monarch in influence and dignity. Aaron, the head of the priestly order, was closely associated with the great lawyer, Moses, and shared with him in the government and guidance of the nation. It was in virtue of the priestly functions that the chosen people were brought into near relations with God and kept therein. Through the ministrations of the priesthood the people of Israel were instructed in the doctrine of sin and its expiation, in forgiveness and worship. In short, the priest was the indispensable source of religious knowledge for the people, and the channel through which spiritual life was communicated.

1. Nature of the Priestly Office.—The Scriptures furnish information touching this point. To them we at once turn. Priesthood implies choice. Not only was the office of Divine institution, but the priest himself was Divinely appointed thereto. "For every high priest, being taken from among men, is appointed for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both the gifts and sacrifices of men, that are offered according to the Law; but of which there is no mention neither among the sacrifices of clean beasts, nor of blood, nor of any offering made with blood, which could make him perfect, who goeth not into the holy place, but into the temple, even into the holy of holies, where the San
t除此之外，还有其他几个更小的神职人员，如受圣礼的祭司和祭司等，他们在寺庙中也担任着不同的职责。
be effected by means of sacrifice, blood-shedding (He 5 1; 8 3). He would be no priest who should have nothing to offer. It was the high priest who carried the blood of the sin offering into the Most Holy Place and sprinkled it seven times on and before the mercy-seat, thus symbolically covering the sins of the people from the eyes of the Lord who dwelt between the cherubim (Ps 80 1). It was he also who marked the same blood on the horns of the altar of burnt offering in the Court of the Tabernacle, and on those of the golden altar, that the red sign of propitiation might thus be lifted up in the sight of Jah, the righteous Judge and Redeemer.

It implies intercession. In the priestly ministry of Aaron and his sons this function is not so expressly set forth as are some of their other duties, but it is certainly included. For intercession is grounded in atonement. There can be no effective advocacy on behalf of the guilty until their guilt is righteously expiated. The sprinkling of the blood on the mercy-seat served to cover the guilt from the face of God, and at the same time it was an appeal to Him to pardon and accept His people. So we read that after Aaron had sprinkled the blood he came forth from the sanctuary and blessed Israel (Lev 9 22-24; Nu 6 22-27).

II. The Two Great Priests of the OT.—These were Melchizedek and Aaron. No others that ever bore the name and Aaron or discharged the office rank with these, save, of course, the Lord Jesus Christ, in whom they were distinguished types. Of the two, Melchizedek was the greater. There are two reasons why they are to be considered priests: first, because they are the representatives of the Mediator, whose position was not only the head of his order, but he had no successor. The office began and terminated with him (He 7 3). The ordinary priests and the Levites depended for their official existence on Aaron. Apart from him they would not be priests. Second, the priesthood of Christ was typified by both. The office is summed up and completed in Him. They were called and consecrated that they might be prophecies of Him who was to come and in whom all priesthood and offering and intercession would find its ample fulfilment. In the Ep. to the Hebrews of both these men is combined and consummated in Christ. But let it be noted that while He is of the order of Melchizedek He exercises the office after the pattern of Aaron. He perfects all that Aaron did typically, because He is the true and the real Priest, while Aaron is but a figure.

III. Priestly Functions and Character.—These are minutely prescribed in the Law. In the institution of the office the Lord's words to Moses were, "Take thou unto thee a religious order of Aaron thy brother, and his sons with him, from among the children of Israel, that he may minister unto me in the priest's office" (Ex 25 1 AV). Their duties were strictly religious. They had no political power conferred upon them. Their services, their dependent position, and the way in which they were sustained, i.e. by the free gifts of the people, precluded them from exercising any undue influence in the affairs of the nation. It is true that in process of time the high office degenerated, and became a thing of barter and sale in the hands of unscrupulous and corrupt men, but as originally appointed the priesthood in Israel was not a caste, nor a hierarchy, nor a political factor, but a Divinely appointed medium of communication between God and the people.

The Heb priests in no wise interfered with the conscience of men. The Heb worshipper of his own dress of Egyptian Priests.
high priest must not. For he was the representative of life. Death did not exist for him, in so far as he was a priest. God is the Ever-Living, the Life-Giving; and His priest, who had "the crown of the anointing oil of his God upon him," had to do with life alone.

Adolph Saphir believes there is deep significance in the miracle of Aaron's rod that budded and bare almonds (Nu 17). It was a visible sign of the legitimacy of Aaron's priesthood and a confirmation of it, Aaron's Rod and a symbol of its vitality and fruitfulness. The twelve rods of the tribes were dead sticks of wood, and remained dead; Aaron's alone had life and produced blossoms and fruit. It was the emblem of his office which correlated itself with life, and had nothing to do with death.

IV. Consecration of Aaron and His Sons (Ex 29; Lev 8).—The process of the consecration is minutely described and is worthy of a more detailed and careful study than can here be given it. Only the more prominent features are noticed.

(1) Both the high priest and his sons were to get water to wash in (Ex 29.4). But when this was done, the high priest parted company with his sons. (2) Next, Aaron was arrayed in the holy and beautiful garments, with the breastplate over his heart, and the holy crown on his head, the mitre, or bonnet, with its golden plate bearing the significant inscription, "Holy to Jehovah." This was Aaron's investiture of the high office. (3) He was then anointed with the precious oil. It is noteworthy that Moses poured the oil on his head. When he anointed the tabernacle and its furniture, he sprinkled the oil, but in Aaron's case there was a profusion, an abundance in the anointing (Ps 133.2). (4) After the anointing of the high priest the appointed sacrifices were offered (Ex 29.10ff.). Up to this point in the ceremony Aaron was the principal figure, the sons having no part save in the washing. But after the offerings had been made the sons became prominent participants in the ceremonies, sharing equally with the high priest therein.

(5) The blood of the offering was applied to the person of father and sons alike (Ex 29.20–21). On the tip of the right ear, on the thumb of the right hand, and on the great toe of the right foot was the consecrating blood-mark set.

1. Symbol of Consecration

The significance of this action should not escape the reader. It is the whole person and career of the priest were thus brought under power of the blood. He had a bloodstained body that he might execute, rightly and efficiently, the services of the sanctuary and the duties of his great office. He had likewise a blood-stained foot that he might walk in the statutes and commandments of the Lord blameless, and tread the courts of the Lord's house as the obedient servant of the Most High. Sacramental blood, the blood of atonement, is here, everywhere, the foundation for saints and sinners, for priesthood alike in all their relations with God.

The priests of Israel were but dim shadows, obscure sketches and drafts of the one Great Priest of God, the Lord Jesus Christ. Without

2. Type and Archetype

between the type and the archetype, sum up in a few brief sentences the perfection found in the priestly character of Christ: (1) Christ as Priest is appointed of God (He 5.5). (2) He is consecrated with an oath (He 7.20–22). (3) He is sinless (He 7.26). (4) His priesthood is unchangeable (He 7.24). (5) He offers a perpetual and final (He 9.25–28; 10.12). (6) His intercession is all-prevailing (He 7.25).

As God and man in one Person He is a perfect Mediator (He 1, 2). See Christ, Offices of, V.

LITERATURE.—Smith, DB; HDB; P. Fairbairn, Typology of Scripture, London, 1871; The Priests Garments and the Priesthood; Martin, Atonement; A. B. Davidson, Hebrews; Moorehead, Mosaic Institutions.
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PRIEST, CHRIST AS. See Christ, Offices of.

PRIEST, HIGH (הָאָדוֹן, ha-ădôn, ὁ ἅγιος, ho hieroṣ, ho hieros, ἡ ἁγιασμός, ha-s̄̄kohen, ὁ ἁγιασμός, ho-s̄̄kōmenos, ho hieros) was a priest.

I. Institution of the High-Priesthood

A. The Family

1. The Chief High Priest

High Priest (Egyptian).

2. The Consecration of the High Priest

Priest, High

3. The Dress

Priestly Garments, archieria.

4. The Duties of High-Priesthood

5. Special Regulations

6. The Emoluments

7. Importance of the Office

B. History of the High-Priesthood in Israel

1. In the OT

2. In the NT

LITERATURE

1. Institution of the High-Priesthood.—Temples with an elaborate ritual, a priesthood and a high priest were familiar to Moses. For a millennium or two before his time these had flourished in Egypt. Each temple had its priest or priests, the larger temples and centers having a high priest. For centuries the high priest of Amon at Thebes stood next to the king in power and influence. Many other high-priesthoods of less importance existed. Moses' father-in-law was priest of Midian, doubtless the chief or high priest. In founding a nation and establishing an ecclesiastical system, nothing would be more natural and proper for him than to constitute a priestly system with a high priest at the head. The records give a fairly full account of the institution of the high-priesthood.

Aaron, the brother of Moses, was chosen first to fill the office. He was called "the priest" (ha-kohen) (Ex 31.10). As the office was to be hereditary and to be preserved in perpetuity in the family of Aaron (Ex 29.9.20), he is succeeded by his son Eleazar (Nu 20.28; Dt 10.6), and he in turn by his son Phinehas (Nu 25.11). In his time the succession was fixed (Nu 26.12.13). In Lev 4 3.5.16; 6 22 he is called "the anointed priest." Three times in the Pent he is spoken of as "great priest" or "high priest" (Lev 21.10; Nu 35.25.28).

The first of these passages identifies him with the anointed priest.

The ceremonies by which he was installed in his office are recorded in Ex 29.20ff. Seven days of special solemnities were spent. The first consecration was by Moses; it is not said who performed the others. There was special washing and anointing with oil (Ps 133.2). Much new high priest must wear the holy garments, as well as be specially appointed (Lev 21.10).

Every day a libation for a sin offering must be offered for atonement; the altar also must be cleansed, anointed for,
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Priest, High

Priest, Christ as

Priest, High

Priest, Christ as
and anointed, the high priest offering a sacrifice or min", "ah (for Lev 6:24 ff).

Besides the twenty prescribed dress of the priests, the high priest must wear the robe of the ephod, the ephod, and the breastplate upon the more headcloth (Lev 8:7–9). The robe of the ephod seems to have been a sleeveless tunic, made of blue, purple, and fine linen interwoven with gold (Ex 25:6–8; 39:2–5). This distinguishing sign of the high priest, fastened at the shoulders by two clasps of sheshbon stone, upon each of which was engraved the names of six tribes of Israel (Ex 28:9–14). Over the ephod and upon his breast he wore the breastplate, a four-cornered kohen tishah suspended by chains. Set in it were twelve precious stones, having engraved upon them the names of the twelve tribes of Israel. This breastplate must have contained a pock of some kind inside, for in it were deposited the Urim and Thummim, which seemed to be fabled objects of some kind (Ex 39:8–21). The mitre or headress was of fine linen, the plate of the crown of pure gold, and inscribed upon it the words, "Holy to Jehovah." (Ex 28:36–38; 39:36–31). When entering the Holy of Holies he must be dressed wholly in linen, but in his ordinary duties in the dress of the priests; only when acting as high priest he must wear special robes. See Priest.

In addition to his regular duties as a priest, the high priest was to enter the Holy of Holies on the day of atonement (Lev 16:8–15, 33).

1. Duties (34). He must also officiate at the of the High-ceremony of the two goats, when one Priesthood is sent into the wilderness to Azazel, and the other slain to make atonement for the sins of all the people (Lev 16:8–10; 19:7). He alone could make atonement for the sins of the people, and his own house (Lev 4:3ff; 9:8ff; 16:6; Nu 15:25). He must offer the regular meal offering (Lev 6:15). He must share with the people the fat of the sacrifice and the fat of the breast (Ex 27:21). He must assist in arranging the shewbread (Ex 25:30). When he carried the breastplate with the names of the tribes inscribed thereon he acted as mediator between Israel and God (Ex 28:29). He alone could consult the Urim and Thummim before Jeh, and according to his decision Israel must obey (Nu 27:21).

An office so important required certain special regulations. He must be free from every bodily defect (Lev 21:6–15). He must not marry only a virgins of Israel, not a widow, nor a divorced woman, nor a loose one (Lev 21:14). He must not observe the external signs of mourning for any person, and never to the same table with a news carrier, the death of even a father or mother (ver 10–12). He must not dye the beard or the hair of his person, or his hair grow long or rend his clothes as a sign of mourning (ver 13). If he should bring guilt upon the people he must present a special offering (Lev 4:3ff). Sins affecting the priesthood in general must be expiated by the other priests as well as himself (Nu 18:1). He must eat nothing that died of itself or was torn by beasts (Lev 22:8). He must wash his feet and hands when he went to the tabernacle of the congregation and when he came near to the altar to minister (Ex 30:19–21). If first Aaron was to burn incense on the golden altar every morning when he dressed the lamps and every evening when he lighted them (Ex 27:21), but in later times the common priests performed this duty. He must abstain from any uncleanness (Lev 22:1–3), or if he should become leprous (ver 4ff). He was to eat the people’s meat offering with the inferior priests in the holy place (Lev 22:10). He must ascend to judge the cases of leprosy in the human body and garments (Lev 13:2–69) and in adjudicating legal questions (Dt 17:12). When there was no Divinely inspired leader, the high priest was the chief ruler till the time of David and again after the exile. See Priest.

The emoluments were not much greater than those of the priests in general. He received no more inheritance among the tribes than any other Levite, but he and his family were maintained upon certain fees, offerings, and perquisites which they enjoyed from the common fund. In Nu 18:28 the priests were to receive a tithe of the tithe paid in to the Levites. Jos says this was a common fund (Ant, IV, iv, 4), but the high priest was probably charged with the duty of distributing it. In general the family of the high priest was well-to-do, and in the later period became very wealthy. The high priest and his family were among the richest people of the land in the time of Christ, making enormous profits out of the sacrifices and temple business.

The importance of the high priest’s office manifested itself first. The high priest Eleazar is named in the first rank with Joshua, the prince of the tribes and successor of Aaron. His sons were regarded as belonging to the people (Lev 4:32). He acted with Moses in important matters (Nu 26:1; 31:29). The whole congregation must go or come according to his word (Nu 27:20ff). His death was a national event, for then the manslayer was free to leave the City of Refuge (Nu 35:25,58). He had no secular authority, but was regarded generally as the leading religious authority. Later, he became also the leading secular authority in the land (Mal 4:5).

II. History of the High-Priesthood in Israel.—In general the present writer accepts the historical records of the OT as true and rejects the critical views of a fictitious or fabricated history (20:30–31; Lev 16:8–10). There are subjective reasons to support them and are based upon a naturalistic evolutionary view of the development of Israel’s religion. As Moses was the founder of the high-priesthood in Israel he anticipated a perpetuation of the office throughout the history (Dt 26:3). The high priest appears frequently. Eleazar officiated with Joshua in the division of the land among the twelve tribes (Josh 14:1). The law of the man-slayer shows that he was an important personage in the life of Israel (Josh 20:6). He seemed to have the power to distribute the offices of the priests to those whom he would, and poor priests would appeal to him for positions (1 S 2:36). The office seems to have been confined to the family only. Eleazar was the son of Eli, when, because of the wickedness of his sons, the family was destroyed and the position passed into the family of Ithamar (1 S 21–34). A descendant of that family officiated at Nob in the times of Saul and David (1 S 26), and who a priest, Abiathar, escaped from the slaughter, and later seems to have succeeded his father and to have been chief priest throughout David’s reign (1 S 26:20–23; 29:5; 30:7). Zadok seems to have had almost equal privilege (2 S 17; 1 Ch 18:16; 24:6 almost certainly by eunuchs’ error, transpose Abiathar and Ahimelech; Mk 2:26 may be based on this reading. See Abiathar, etc). Because he joined the party of Adonijah rather than that of Solomon, Abiathar was deposed and banished to Anathoth, where he spent all the days of his days (1 K 2:26,27). Zadok was put in his place (ver 35). He seems to have been a descendant of Eleazar. Under Jehoshaphat, Amariah was high priest (2 Ch 13:11) and was the leading authority in all religious matters. In the time of Athaliah, during the minority of Josiah and almost his entire reign Jehoahaz was high priest and chief adviser. He seems to have been the most influential man in the kingdom for more than half a century (2 K 11:4ff; 12:1–26; 2 Ch 24:4–27). Zadok was made high priest in the days of Uzziah and Hezekiah (2 Ch 26:20; 31:10; Urijah in the reign of Ahaz (2 K 16:10–16), and the latter priest seems to have been a friend of Isaiah (Isa 8:2). Hilkiah held the office in the days of Josiah when the Book of the Law
was discovered (2 K 22 4; 23 4; 2 Ch 34 9); Zephaniah in the time of Jeremiah (Jer 29 25 f); Serahiah in the days of Zechiah, who was put to death at Riblah by Nebuchadnezzar (2 K 25 18; Jer 52 24). At the time, mention is made of a priest of the second rank (2 K 23 4; 25 18) and Zephaniah fills that office (Jer 52 24). It is doubtful whether this is the same Zephaniah mentioned in Jer 29 25. This 'second priest' was doubtless a deputy or assistant to take the high priest's place in case anything should prevent his performing the duties of the office. Lists of high priests are given in 1 Ch 6 1–15; 6 50–53. The first of these gives the line from Levi to Jehozadak who was carried away in captivity under Nebuchadnezzar. The second traces the line from Aaron to Ahimaz, and is identical so far with the first list.

There could have been no place for the functions of the high priest during the captivity, but the family line was preserved and Joshua the son of Jehozadak was among those who first returned (Ezr 3 2). From this time the high priest becomes more prominent. The monarchy is gone, the civil authority is in the hands of the Persians, the Jews are no longer independent, and hence the civil power tends to center in the high-priesthood. Joshua appears to stand equal with Zerubbabel (Hag 1 12.14; 2 24; Zec 3 18; 4 14; 6 11–13).

He is distinctly known as high priest (hasō-kōhen ha-sadōk). He takes a leading part in establishing the ecclesiastico-civil system, particularly the building of the temple. In the vision of Zechiah (Zec 3 1–5) Satan accuses the high priest who is here the representative proper of the nation. The consummation of the Messiah could not be completed without the cooperation of the high priest who is crowned with Zerubbabel, and sits with him on the throne (Zec 6 13). The prophet makes him to be "the man of the sign," alluding to the coming Messiah who is to be taken away from one day (Zec 3 9 f). The promise is made to Joshua that if he will walk in Jehovah's ways and keep his house, he shall judge Jehovah's house, i.e., Israel, keep his court and have a place to walk among those who stand before Jehovah (3 7). He is appointed equally with the prince of the royal line, for the two sons of oil (4 14) almost certainly refer to the royal Zerubbabel and priestly Joshua who are to be joint inspirers of Israel in rebuilding the temple.

This exaltation of the high priest is very different from the state of things pictured by Ezekiel (Ezk 40–42). In that picture no place is left for a high priest; the prince seemed to be the chief personage in the ecclesiastical system. Ezekiel's vision was immediately secular, and the institutions and conditions of the past were carried out rather than the visions of the prophet. In the time of Nehemiah, Eliashib was high priest (Neh 3 120). For abusing his office by using a temple chamber in the interests of his family he was reprimanded (13 4–9). The list of high priests from Joshua to Jaddua is given in Neh 12 10. According to Jos (Ant. XII, viii, 5) Jaddua was priest at the time of Alexander the Great (332 BC), but it is practically certain that it was Judas Maccabaeus' grandson, Simon, who was then priest (see W. J. Beecher, Reasonable Bib. Criticism, ch xviii). Thus is preserved the unbroken line from Aaron to Jaddua, the office still being hereditary. No essential change can be found after this. The Book of Baruch was written in or some time during this period, uses the three names, ha-kōhen, ha-kōhen ha-ro'ah, ha-kōhen ha-gadalōh. The word rō'ah ("prince") is also used, and he is called "the ruler of the house of God" (1 Ch 9 11). This same term is used in the later Jewish writers to denote any person invested with power. Usually the Chronicler in both Ch and Neh uses the term "the priest." The line of Eleazar doubtless continued until the time of the Maccabees, when a decided change took place. The Syrian Antiochus deposed Onias III and put his brother Jason in his place (174 BC), who was soon displaced by Menelaus. About 153 BC Jonathan the Hasmonean was appointed by King Alexander, and thus the high-priesthood passed to the family of the Maccabees, the last of whom reigned to 1 Mac 18–21. Whether the family of Joiarib was a branch of the Zadokites or not cannot be determined. After the appointment of Jonathan, the office became hereditary in the Hasmonean line, and continued thus until the time of Herod the Great. The latter set up and destroyed the high pile at his pleasure. The Romans did the same, and changed so frequently that the position became almost an annual appointment. Though many changes were thus made, the high priest was always chosen from certain priestly families. From this group of deposed priests arose a class known as "chief priests." The anointing prescribed in the law of Moses was not always carried out in later times, and in fact was generally omitted. The Mish speaks of high priests who were installed in office simply by putting on their special robes (Schürer, II, i, p. 217, note 24).

In NT times the high priest was the chief civil and ecclesiastical dignitary among the Jews. He was chairman of the Sanhedrin, and the head of the political council of the Rom government. It is not clear just how far he participated in the ceremonies of the temple. No doubt he alone entered the Holy of Holies once a year on the Day of Atonement, and discharged the duties of the week. What other part he took in the work was according to his pleasure. Jos says that he officiated at the Sabbath, the New Moon and yearly festivals. The daily min'ah (Lev 12 f) of which he was often charged was offered by the high priest in person, but he was required to defray the expense of it. This was a duty which, according to Ezekiel's vision, was to be performed by the prince. The Jews had many contentions with the Romans as to who should keep the garments of the high priest. When Jesus fell into the hands of the Romans, the robe of state also fell into their hands.

In the time of Christ, Annas and Caiaphas were high priests (Lk 2 2; 7 15), in the apostolic times, Caiaphas alone acted as such. Annas had probably been deposed, yet retained much of his influence among the priestly families. For particulars see AHNAYAH; JEHOSADAK; JESUS CHRIST. These two were also the chief conspirators against Jewish liberty. In the case of the council Caiaphas doubtless advised them to put to death the prophet for the sake of "saving the nation" (Jn 11 51). He was also chairman of the council which tried Jesus (Lk 22 53; Mt 27 1; Mk 14 61.53.66.63.65; Lk 22 53; Jn 12 14-19; 24.28). They were also leaders in the persecution of the apostles and disciples after Pentecost (Acts 4 6; 5 17; 21). Saul sought letters from the high priest to Damascus to give him authority to bring any Christians he might find there bound to Jerusalem (Acts 9 2). He presided at the council which tried Paul (Acts 25 11; 22 21). See PAUL, THE APOSTLE.

In the Ep. to the Hebrews the doctrine of the priesthood of Jesus is fully and carefully elaborated. Jesus is here called the great High Priest, as well as priest. The opening words of the Ep. contain the essential thought: "When he had made purification of sins" (1 3). The title of high priest is first introduced in 1 2, 3 a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God; and in 5 1, "the high priest of good things confirmed." Having thus fairly introduced his great theme, the writer strikes the keynote of his great argument. Having thus paved the way, he now proceeds to state his qualifications: (1) He is appointed by God to His office (5 1). (2) He is well fitted for the office by His experiences and participation (Lk 4 15–22; 2 Cor 4 6–18). (3) He undergoes a Divine preparation (5 7–9). The subject of qualifications is then continued. It is after the order of Melchizedek (10 10). This is an eternal one (6 20); royal or kingly (7 1–3); independent of birth or family (ver 3); it is timeless (ver 5); superior
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to that of Levi (vs 4-10); and new and different from that of Aaron (vs 11-13). It is also indissoluble (ver 16); immutable (ver 24); with all the general and special qualifications He is completely fitted for His work (ver 26). That work consists in offering up Himself a sacrifice for the sins of the people (ver 27); entering within the veil as a forerunner (ver 28); presenting a sacrifice in the presence of God (ver 27); thus obtaining eternal redemption (ver 12); ratifying the new covenant (ver 15-22). The result of this high-priestly work was a change from all sin (ver 9); a possibility of full consecration to God and His service (ver 10); an ultimate peace being made (ver 14); and full access to the throne of grace (ver 10, 21, 22). See Christ, Offices of; Priest; Priesthood in the NT.

LITERATURE: Many books have been written on the priesthood in general, with references to the high priest in HDB, HUG, EB, BS, TDOT, Smith, Hackett, Kittel, Baentsch, Schaff-Herzog, Baudissin, and many other authors. See also an article on 'High Priest' only for the history, Brentan, History of Egypt; Schürer, History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, II, I, 207-99; Jos, Ant, XV, XVIII, XX. For works on the priesthood from the radical viewpoint, see Graf, S. I. Curtius, Jost, Graetz, Kautzsch, Bugge, Benesch, Benzing, Büchler, Meyer, Wellhausen. For a more moderate position see Baudissin, Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Priestersystems untersucht. For a more conservative position see A. Van Hoornacker, Le serviteur divin dans la loi et dans l'histoire des Hébreux. On the high-priesthood subsequent to the return from Babylon, see B. Piek, Lutheran Church Rev, 11:1, 379-74; 12:1, 125-26; 14, 656-54; and the comm's on the passages cited.

James Josiah Reeve

PRIESTHOOD, priesthood:

1. Priesthood an Office
2. In the OT
3. Hereditary Priesthood
4. In the NT
5. Conclusions

LITURGY: Liturgy is of the same order as the priestly office.

All worship is based on priestly service, for the priestly office is an essential part of salvation. Christianity itself has its glorious Priest, the Lord Jesus Christ, and it is through His one supreme offering that we are brought into saved relations with God and enjoy fellowship with Him. The priesthood of Christ, as the representative of God to men, its mighty influence in the body of Christ, and the high priestly offices of the Epistle to the Hebrews, are here called out from the various passages of Scripture.

Priesthood is a real office, definite and specific. It is not for us to say on this fact, for the noun word "priest", has been misappropriated and misapplied, so that its intrinsic import has been impaired. There is a certain literary slang indulged in by some who talk of the "priesthood of art", and similar abstractions. The idea of priestly office has any definite meaning, can have no place in literature or science or art or in anything of the kind. For it belongs to the realm of grace, pertaining as it does to the Divine purpose to remove it. Hugh Martin writes that He "would as soon transfigure the language of geometry and of algebra to botany and talk of the hypothesis of a flower and the square root of a tree, or the differential coefficient of a convolvulus, as to speak of the priesthood of nature or letters." Priesthood is an office, embracing very specific duties and functions.

Priesthood in some form appears to have existed from the earliest times, even from the beginning of the history of our race. In patriarchal times the office was held and its duties were discharged by those who occupied some sort of headship, and particularly by the father or the chief of the family and of the tribe. Thus Noah in his capacity as priest and in behalf of his household "built a altar unto Jeh, and took of every clean beast, and of every clean bird, and offered burnt-offerings on the altar" (Gen 8 20). Abraham offered the ram "for a burnt-offering in the stead of his son" (Gen 22 13). In like manner Job offered burnt offerings for his children, and likewise by Divine direction for the three "carrion eaters" when the great trial passed (Job 1 5; 42 8). In these and the like instances there was priestly action no less certain than in that of Aaron or of any regularly appointed priest in Israel. Melchizedek was "priest of God Most High" (Gen 14 18), Isaac "blessed an altar there and called upon the name of Jehovah" (Gen 26 25), as did Jacob (Gen 33 20). In these cases priestly acts were performed by the patriarches in their capacity as fathers of the family or heads of clans. From the beginning, priesthood with its acts of expiation and mediation was organized as a Divinely instituted office. But in pre-Mosaic times there was no special class of priests recognized.

Regular priestly succession in a single family was established by Moses (Ex 29 1-6). From this point of time onward the priesthood in Israel was confined to the family of Aaron. No hereditary priesthood seems to have prevailed in patriarchal times. According to the Ep. to the He, Melchizedek, a priest of the highest rank, had neither predecessor nor successor in his great office. By Divine direction Moses designated the Aaronic family as the priestly family in Israel, and he prescribed the garments they should wear, the sacrifices they should offer both for themselves and for the congregation, their maintenance, their domestic relations, and their conduct toward their fellow-Hebrews.

In the appointment of the priest there is no trace of Egyptian influence. Yet we know that Joseph married the daughter of the priest of On (Gen 41 50). But this fact had no bearing on the selection of Israel's priestly family. The Aaronic priesthood had nothing in common with that of Egypt; it claimed to be of God's origin and not a successor to old oracles and powers in no way contradict the claim. The witness of an Egyptian archaeologist (Dr. M. G. Kyle) may be here introduced touching one essential element in the duties of the priestly office, viz. the sacrifices. It is not claimed that the whole of worship was thus retained, but that the whole or nearly the whole of the sacrifice was retained, and this because the order of sacrifice of the ancient Egyptians was derived from that of the Hebrews. Thus did Gideon in a time of great straits in Israel (Jgs 6 24-26); thus the men of Beth-shemesh (1 S 6 14,15); the prophet Samuel (1 S 7 9); David (2 S 6 13,17); Elijah (1 K 18 22-32). The chosen people appear to have felt free to offer sacrifices and to engage in priestly functions when occasion required, until the central sanctuary was established on Mt. Moriah. When the Temple was built and dedicated, priestly action was confined to Jesus and to the regularly priestly household. When Pharisaism, with its rigid legalism, with its intolerable burdens, became dominant, all liberty of worship and spontaneous service largely disappeared. The religious life of Israel stiffened into a dreadful monotony.

All priesthood reaches its climax in that of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is because of the perfection of His person that the "priesthood of the many" under Melchizedek and Aaron was effective, and fulfilled the end for which it was appointed. The one and the other was a type and antitype, as prediction and fulfillment. Christ's priesthood is insisted upon to us in the Ep. to the He (3 14, 18: 4 14-16: 5 1-10; 7 9,10,18). Two fundamental truths touching His priesthood are made very prominent in the Ep.: the He is High Priest, and the He is the one Perfect Priest. By the order is meant the rank or grade of the Priest, and by the duties the various functions of His
ministry. Christ's order as Priest is that of Melchizedek, not at all that of Aaron: He 7:27 makes this fact perfectly clear. Likewise above Melchizedek, He is Priest, having no predecessor in the great order. Herein He stands absolutely alone, peerless and perfect forever. He executes the duties or functions of it after the pattern of Aaron, as He 9:11 clearly espouses. The priest and the high priest are functions of Jesus only.

The point is raised and discussed with some keenness in our day. Did Christ execute the office of priest during His earthly ministry? It would be strange if He has exercised the office only in heaven? A full discussion of this interesting subject would be inappropriate. However, let it be noted (1) that the Lord Jesus appointed a Priest no less certainly than was Aaron (He 5:4). In the words, "Thou art holy, and I have not seen thee," there appears to be a reference both to His incarnation (Lk 1:32; He 1:2) and also to His resurrection (Ac 13:31). In He 2:17 we are told that it was "unto all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might have compassion on the sins of the people." The assumption of human nature was needful that He might be such a priest. John the Baptist saw this truth, and said, "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world" (Jn 1:29).

There was certainly priestly action in His death. Twice we are told that He "offered up himself" (He 7:27). "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do." For all this, when He offered Himself. This strong term, "offered," is sacrificial and indicative of the office here described for the benefit of the people. His own action in it must not be overlooked; it was He Himself who presented the offering; He was the Priest and put it forth as a martyr and humble offering. Nothing could escape the doom that came upon Him—nay, He Himself offered Himself in He 9:14 we find these significant words: "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot unto God, ... shed for sin?" No one can escape the consequences of his actions, and if any one have sincerely sought to escape the consequences of sin, he has made himself altogether worse off. Another thing to remember is that Christ did not change in the action of His great offering. He was at once both sacrifice and priest. Never was there anything more solemn than the act of our Lord in giving His life for His people.

It is worth while to remind ourselves that the words employed in Scripture to express theoffice of His being the Priest are those which denote the person of the priest. In Old Testament times, Matthew has, He "yielded up [dismissed] his spirit" (Mt 27:50). He was "gave his spirit" (Lk 23:46). He was "gave up the ghost" (Jn 19:30). Mk 15:37 and Lk 23:46 both have the same words: He "gave up the ghost." He died, not because He was mortal as we are, nor because He could not deliver Himself, but because He gave Himself for our sins that we might be forgiven and saved (Jn 10:18). The voluntary act of His offering is the very essence of His priestly act. See Christ, OFFICER, V.

Priesthood springs out of the deepest need of the human soul. Men universally feel that somehow they have offended the Power to whom they are responsible, to whom they give account for their deeds.

They long to appease their offended Lord, and they believe that one who is authorized and qualified to act in their behalf may secure for them the abrogation of penalty and the pardon they seek. Hence priesthood connects itself most closely with guilt and its removal. The heart craves the intervention and intercession on their behalf of one who has liberty of access to God, and whose ministry is acceptable. In short, the priest is the representative of the sinners, the sin offerings pertaining to God. He is the mediator whose office it is to meet and satisfy the claims of God upon those for whom he acts, and who secures the pardon and the favor which the offender must have, if he is to enjoy fellowship with God. An offender, and more than that, the ransom in our Great High Priest, the Lord Jesus Christ.

Liturature.—P. Fairbairn, Typology of Scripture, II: Tolstoy, Exposition of the Tabernacle, the Priesthood, Martin, Monument; Moorehead, Moses Institutions, art. "Priest;"
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PRIESTHOOD IN THE NT:

1. The Jewish Priesthood

2. The Priesthood and High-Priesthood of Jesus Christ

3. The Priesthood of Believers

In the NT ἱερεύς, hierévous (1 Pet 2:5,9), "priesthood," is not found with reference to the Jewish priesthood, but ἵερος, hieréros, and ἅρπιερος, archiereís, "high priest," frequently occur. As until the fall of Jesus the activities of the priests were carried on in careful accordance with the Priesthood OT, there is nothing new or striking in the numerous NT references to their work. Perhaps the information of the greatest interest is found in Lk 1 5-9 to the effect that Zacharias was of the course of Abijah, the 8th of the 24 courses into which the priests were divided (cf 1 Ch 24:7-18), and that in these courses the priests divided their work by lot. In the Gospels the archiereis are mentioned oftener than are the hieréous, the power of the priesthood seeming to have been absorbed by a sort of priestly aristocracy. As under the political pressure of that time the office of high priest could seldom be retained until the death of the holder, there might even be several lives at the same time who had for a while held this office which made a man the head of the nation, not only ritually, but also politically, since the high priest was ex officio presiding officer of the Sanhedrin. Not only would these ex-high priests retain the title belonging to their former dignity, but probably the name had come to include as well other members of the same families or of families of equal position, so that it seems that "chief priests" is a more exact tr of ἱερεῖς than ἱερέων. Of course, the reference of archiereus is usually, if not invariably, to the individual who at the time given was holding the unique office of high priest. The word hieréus is of course employed in its ordinary signification, the word hiero being used in the NT to corresponding ministers of other religions, as to the priest of Zeus (Acts 14:13) and also to Melchizedek (He 7:1).

Only in He is the activity of Jesus set forth as priestly and high-priestly, but in this Ep, great emphasis is laid on these aspects of His work. Interpreters seldom distinguish between these two aspects of His work, and it is plain that sometimes at least the author himself made no effort sharply to distinguish them. Christ

But certain considerations make it probable that they were not really confused or even accounted for by the author himself. For example, it is to be noted that the priesthood of Jesus is declared to be after the order of Melchizedek, and consequently radically unlike that of the Levitical priests. On the other hand, the Aaronic high-priesthood is regarded as having been analogous to that of Jesus, so that in spite of its inferiority, comparison is frequently made with it. It is readily seen that the work of the high priest, both because of his entry into the Most Holy Place and because he bore the sin offerings, did not find a parallel in Israel in the breastplate of judgment for a memorial before Jeh continually, far more suitably than that of the ordinary priests typified the atoning and intercessory work of Jesus (Ex 28:12).

Attempting then to treat separately the priestly and high-priestly functions of Jesus, we note that most of what is said of the priestly functions is involved in the declaration that He is a priest after the order of Melchizedek, and this thought is handled in He 7 in such a way as to make plain the superiority of the priestly functions of Melchizedek, and thus to confirm the superiority of Christianity over Judaism, the great theme of the book. Historically the blessing bestowed upon Abraham and the reception of tithes from him prove the superiority of Melchizedek. Lev 27:30-36 will more to the priestly descendants of Levi (7:4-10).
Further, Jesus became priest not on the ground of a "carnal commandment," i.e. in an order based on descent and inheritance, but by "the power of an endless life" (7 16), of which fact Melchizedek reminds us, since Scripture is silent alike as to his birth and his death. Again, unlike the Levitical priests, Christ is inducted into his office by the oath of God (7 20; 21; cf Ps 110 4). Finally, while the priests of the Levitical line were hindered from permanence in office by their death, Jesus holds His priesthood untransmitted and intransmissible (7 23-24). This discussion of the priesthood of Christ "after the order of Melchizedek" occupies almost all of ch 7, but at ver 25 His high-priesthood is suddenly introduced, and after that point, while His work is more than once contrasted with that of the temple priests (8 4-5; 9 6; 10 11), no further reference is made in any way made to Melchizedek.

After having twice merely given the title of high priest to Jesus (2 17; 3 1), the writer of the Ep. to the He at 4 14 begins a statement of the resemblance between Jesus and the Jewish high priest, such "as was Aaron," finding the resemblance to reside (1) in His Divine appointment to His work (5 3), (2) in His experience of suffering (6 7-8; of 4 15; 6 2), and (3) in His saving work suggested by the Levitical sacrifice (6 9), which, however, it far transcends in value and effect. But (4) later the work of the high priest and that of Jesus are contrasted as to place where done, the high priest going into the second tabernacle, i.e. the Holy of Holies (7 9), while Christ passes through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, "heaven itself" (9 11.24). A similar contrast is (5) drawn between the sacrifices respectively offered, the ancient sacrifices being the blood of sin "offered without blemish unto God" (8 9), "his own blood" (9 12), "the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God" (9 14). The author also accepts and urges without argument or even explanation (6) the truly sacrificial character of this self-immolation of Jesus. Nor is this fact nullified by the emphasis which once is laid on doing God's will in an antithesis copied from the Ps (10 5-9; cf Ps 106 6). For here the contrast drawn is not between sacrifice and obedience on the one hand, but rather between the sacrifice of animals dying involuntarily and wholly unconscious of the sacrificial significance of their death, and the offering of Jesus for the people. It is an intelligent purpose to carry out the will of God, by which means the body of Jesus Christ is the only acceptable offering (10 10). Further the author urges (7) the actual effectiveness of Christ's work, his argument being that it had already been repeatedly performed if this single offering had not been sufficient for all time, "once for all" (7 27; 9 26). Finally is asserted (8) the intercessory work of Christ, which, though not explained, seems to be a figurative presentation of his idea that men are blessed because Christ died, i.e. this was an indispensable condition of God's manifestation of His merciful love, and that the grace consequent on the death of Christ does not merely grow out of a fact, but self-sacrificial activity of Christ, and providence for believers are exercised, neither automatically or impersonally, but in virtue of a constant personal sympathy for varying temptations and needs, a sympathy intensified by the earthly experience, temptation, suffering of Him who had been and is, not only the Divine Son, but the Son of Man. Thus the salvation of the believer is certain and complete, and the priestly and high-priestly work of Jesus reaches its consummation.

The priesthood of believers is an idea which finds formal expression less frequently in the NT than has been the case in Protestant theology. But it does not follow that there has been a corresponding divergence from the thought of the apostles. It only shows that a thought which is accorded to the apostolic teaching has been taken by successive generations of Christians, and which, if not constant, yet sufficiently clear expression in this figurative fashion, has, in consequence of errors which have developed, to receive in the controversies of later centuries stronger emphasis than it did at first. It may well be noted first that this conception of the priesthood of believers, standing by itself, is in no way related to the various priestly activities which are also figuratively attributed to them. The writer of the Ep. to the He, who does not speak of the priesthood of believers, knowing no Christian priesthood but that of Jesus Himself, yet calls "praise," "to do good and to communicate, sacrifices" (13 15). So Paul bids the Romans present their bodies "a living sacrifice" (Rom 12 1), and Peter calls Christians "a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices" (1 Pet 2 5). But this figurative usage is entirely distinct from the subject of the present paragraph. Also the conception of the Christian priesthood has the NT attaches itself merely to the ministry of the Christian church, whatever may be held as to its orders or tasks. In no sense has the church or any church an official priesthood. Nor is it any part of the NT conception of the priesthood of believers that any individual should act in any respect for any other. Though the intercessory supplication of believers in behalf of other persons has of late often been represented as a priestly act, as being, indeed, that activity which is especially essential to the establishment of believers, (Consult 10 19), the NT thought is quite different, and is to be thus conceived: In ancient times it was held that men in general could not have direct access to God, that any approach to Him must be mediated by some member of the class of priests, who alone could approach God, and who must accordingly be employed by other men to represent them before Him. This whole conception vanishes in the light of Christianity. By virtue of their relation to Christ all believers have approach to the Father, and consequently, as this right of approach was formerly a priestly privilege, priesthood may now be predicated of every Christian. That none needs another to intervene between his soul and God; that none can thus influence the Father that only his own soul may and must stand for itself in personal relation with God—such are the simple elements of the NT doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. (Consult treatises on NT theology, and comm. on the Ep. to the Hebrews.)

David Foster Estes

PRISTES AND LEVITES (1752, kōhēn, "priest"); nothing is definitely known as to the origin of the word; נְבֵית, "Levite," on which see Lev.}

I. DIFFERENT VIEWS OF THE HISTORY
1. The Old View
2. The Graf-Wellhausen View
3. Mediating Views
4. An Alternative View

II. THE DATA OF P IN THE PENTATEUCH
1. The Levites
2. Aaron and His Sons

III. THE OTHER PORTIONS OF THE PENTATEUCH
1. From Moses to Malachi
1. The Sources Other than Ezekiel
(1) The Custody of the Ark
(2) The Son of Man
(3) The Son of Man in the Philistines
(4) In Ahab's House
2. Ezekiel

VI. LEGAL PROVISIONS LITERATURE
1. The Sources Other than Ezekiel
2. Aaron and His Sons
3. The Custody of the Ark
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5. The Son of Man in the Philistines
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VI. LEGAL PROVISIONS LITERATURE
1. The Sources Other than Ezekiel
2. Aaron and His Sons
3. The Custody of the Ark
4. The Son of Man
5. The Son of Man in the Philistines
6. In Ahab's House
7. Ezekiel
In some Mosaic inscriptions found at El-Old, dating back about 1200-500 BC (Hommel in Hilpich, Explorations in Bible Lands, 719), certain priests and priestesses of the god Wadd are designated by the term lavit, fem. lavit'at (op. cit., 740). It is generally known whether this is due to Jewish influence.

1. Different Views of the History.—There are great divergences of opinion among modern writers as to the true course of history and the manner in which the various documents were taken as literal history, correctly representing the true meaning of the complete law. See Criticism.

The old belief was that the whole of the Pentateuchal laws were the work of Moses, that the account of the subsequent history given in the Books of Ch was correct, that Ezekiel's vision, if taken literally, could not be reconciled with the other known facts and was inexplicable, and that in the case of all other discrepancies harmonistic explanations should be adopted.

The modern critical school have traversed every one of these beliefs. The Chronicler is declared to be in constant and irreconcilable conflict with the older authorities, harmonicistic explanations are uniformly rejected, the Pent is denied to Moses and split up into a variety of sources of different ages, and Ezek gains a place of honor as representing a stage in a continuous and normal development. The subject is thus inextricably linked with the Pentateuchal problem, and reference must be made to the art. P. von Rad (afterward Wellhausen) for an explanation of the supposed documents and a consideration of the analysis with its nomenclature. On the other hand the present article and the art. S. q.v. explain and discuss the most widely held theory of the historical development into which the history of the supposed Pentateuchal sources has been fitted.

The dominant theory is that of Wellhausen. According to this, °Levite° was originally a term denoting professional skill, and denoted the tribe of the Levites, but professional priests. Anybody could sacrifice. For a simple altar no priest was required, but only for a house which contained a sacred image; this demanded watching and attendance (see B.C.L.E. 147). The whole Levitical Law was unknown and the distinction between priests and Levites unheard of. There were few great sanctuaries and one influential priesthood, that of Shiloh (afterward at Nob). With the monarchy the priesthood became more important. The royal priests at Jerus grew in consequence and influence until they overshadowed all the others. Dt recognized the equal priestly rights of all Levites, and Josiah's reformation placed the sons of Zadok, who were the priests of Jerus, and not the descendants of Aaron, in a position of decisive superiority. Then Ezek drew a new and previously unknown distinction between the °priests the Levites, the sons of Zadok° who are °keepers of the charge of the altar,° and the other Levites who were made °keepers of the charge of the house° as a punishment for having ministered in the high places. The PC takes up this distinction and represents it as being of Mosaic origin, making of the sons of Zadok °sons of Aaron.° In this way arose the sequence of Josiah's reformation, the distinction between priests and Levites. With Ezek this distinction is still an innovation requiring justification and sanction; with the PC it is a °statute forever,° although even yet not absolutely undisputed, as appears from the priestly version of the story of Korah's company. For all Judaism subsequent to Ezra, and so for Christian tradition, the PC in this matter also has been authoritative. Instead of the Deuteronomistic formula °the priests the Levites,° the Chronicler uses °the priests the Levites,° particularly in Ch° (op. cit., 147). From that time onward the priests and Levites are two sharply distinguished classes. It is an essential part of this theory that the Chronicler meant his work to be a literal history, correctly representing the true meaning of the complete law. See Criticism.

There have been various attempts to construct less thoroughly theories on the same data. As a rule these views accept in some form the documentary theory of the Pentateuchal Views and seek to modify the Wellhausen theory in two directions, either by attributing earlier dates to one or more of the Pentateuchal documents—esp. to the PC—or else by assigning more weight to some of the statements of Ch (interpreted literally). Sometimes both these tendencies are combined. None of these views has met with any great measure of success in the attempt to make headway against the dominant Wellhausen theory, and it is likely that all later attempts will make shipwreck on certain portions of the evidence.

The independent investigations on which the present article is based have led the writer to a view that diverges in important particulars from those of these, and it is necessary to state it briefly before proceeding to the evidence. In one respect it differs from all the rival schemes, not merely in result, but also in method, for it takes account of all evidence and of the state of the texts. Subject to this it accepts the Mosaic authenticity of all the Pentateuchal legislation and the clear and consentent testimony of the Law and the Prophets (i.e. of the two earlier and more authoritative portions of the Heb Canon), while regarding Ch as representing a later interpretation, not merely of the history, but also of the legal provisions. In outline the story of the priesthood is then as follows: Moses consecrated Aaron and his sons as the priests of the desecrated tribe of Levi, because of the tribe of Levi as a body of sacred porters for the period of wanderings, but in the legislation of Nu he made no provision whatever for their performing any duties after the sanctuary obtained a permanent localization. For this reason much of the priestly teaching requiring for its administration in settled conditions a numerous and scattered body of priests, such as the house of Aaron alone could not have provided immediately after the entry into Canaan. To meet this, Dt—the last legislative work of Moses—contains provisions enlarging the rights and duties of the Levites and conferring on them a priestly position. The earlier distinction was thus largely obliterated, though the high-priestly dignity remained in the house of Aaron till the time of Solomon, when it was transferred from the house of Eli to that of Zadok, who, according to Ezekiel's testimony, was a Levite (but see below, IV, 1). So matters remained till the exile, when Ezekiel put forward a scheme which together with many ideal elements proposed reforms to ensure the better application of the Mosaic principle of the distinction between holy and profane to greatly altered circumstances. Taking his inspiration from the wilderness, he constitutive a fresh division in the tribe of Levi, giving to the sons of Zadok a position similar to that once held by the sons of Aaron, and degrading all other Levites from the priesthood conferred on them by Dt to a lower rank. The duties now assigned to this class of °keepers of the charge of the house°
were never even contemplated by Moses, but Ezekiel applies to them the old phrases of the Pentateuch which he invests with a new significance. As a result of his influence, the distinction between priests and Levites makes its appearance in post-exilic times, though it had been unknown to all the writers of the second division of the Heb Can. At the same time a meaning was read into the provisions of the Law which their original author could not have contemplated, and it was this interpretation which is presented (at any rate to some extent) in ch. 33, and has given us the current tradition. Many of the Chronicler's statements are, however, not meant to be taken literally, and could not have been so taken by his original public.

II. The Data of P in the Pentateuch.—To arrive at an objective conclusion it is necessary, in the first instance, to examine the facts

1. The Levites—without such bias as any view put forward by any author, ancient or modern, sacred or profane, might impart. Every legislator is entitled to be judged on his own language, and where he has, so to speak, made his own dictionary, we are compelled to read his meaning into the terms used. The very first of the material references to the Levites drives this truth home, viz: "The Levites shall bear the tabernacle, and over all the furniture thereof" (Nu 3, 30). It is necessary to consider whether such expressions are to be read in a wide or a narrow sense. We learn from 13, 3 that death would be the result of a Levite's bearing any of these vessels, and it therefore appears that these words are meant to be construed narrowly. "They shall bear the tabernacle, and all the furniture thereof; and they shall minister unto it," are the next words (150). Every legislator is entitled to the words who were to bear it that "they shall not touch the sanctuary, lest they die" (15). This shows that the service in question is strictly limited to a service of portership after the articles have been wrapped up by Aaron and his sons. By no possibility could it include such a task as cleaning the vessels. It is then further directed that the Levites are to take down and set up the dwelling and camp round about it. All these are desert services and desert services only. But some phrases are so used as to make them appear to have a significance which is not in such words. (1) Technical phrases.—We hear that the Levites are "to serve the service of the tent of meeting," and this looks as if it might refer to some general duties, but the context and the kindred passages always forbid this interpretation. Nu 7, 5ff is an admirable instance. Six wagons are there assigned to the Levites for this service, two to the Gerizimites and four to the Merarites. "But unto the sons of Kohath it was given none, because the service of the sanctuary belonged unto them; they bare it upon their shoulders." Here service is transport and nothing else. Again we read of the charge of the Levites in the tent of meeting, e.g. 425ff. If we look to see what this was, we find that it consisted of transporting portions of the tent that had been packed up. The "in" of EV does not represent the meaning of the Hebrew fairly; for the context makes it clear that the legislator means "barring none." "But they shall not go in to the sanctuary even for a moment lest they die" (20). In Eng. idiom we cannot speak of the transport of portions of a dismantled tent as service in that tent. One other expression requires notice, the phrase "keep the charge" which is distinguished in 36 from "doing service." The exact meaning cannot be determined. It appears to denote something kindred to service, but of a less exacting nature, perhaps the camping round the tent and the guardianship of the articles on the march. We shall see hereafter by comparison with other books that in Ps it does not bear the same meaning as elsewhere. (2) Other legal provisions.—The Levites were to act under the orders of Aaron and his sons, who were to assign to each man his individual functions (Nu 3, 4, etc). They were to undergo a special rite of purification (3, 4, 8), but the law of consecration which they were to undergo in the case of the firstborn (Nu 3). The age for beginning service is given in ch 4 as 30 years, but in 24 as 25, if the text be sound. The age for ceasing to serve was 50. In many passages the VSS suggest that a good many phrases are textually doubtful, and it is probable that when a critical text of the Pent is formed on scientific principles, a good many superfluous expressions will be found not to be original; but there is no reason to suppose that any real difference in the meaning of the passages would be revealed by such a text.

The story of Korah is easily misunderstood. It appears from Nu 16, 3 that his real object was to put himself on an equality with Moses and Aaron, and this is what the Levites contended (Nu 15, 3). The scene is repeated again in Nu 16, 27-30. Nu 18 reinforces the earlier passages. It is noteworthy as showing that in the conception of the legislator the Levites were not to come near the vessels or the altar (ver 3). The penalty is death for both Levites and priests.

(3) Contrast with Ezek and Ch. —The impression as to the meaning of P which may be gathered from the examination of its statements is powerfully reinforced when they are tested by reference to Ezek and Ch. For instance, Ch. 43, 18—39, 9-15 tells us that the Levites some service as gatekeepers, the slaying of burnt offering and sacrifice for the people and a keeping of "the charge of the house, for all the service thereof," which in the light of vs 7f appears to mean in his terminology, not a service of transport, but an entry into the house and the performance of certain duties there. P, on the contrary, knows nothing of gatekeepers, guards the slaying of the burnt offering and sacrifice as the duty of the individual sacrificant (Lev 1, 4), and—if, as Wellhausen thinks, it really refers to the temple—visited with death a Levite who was present in the places in which Ezek requires him to minister. Similarly for the Levites being 'for the service of the house ... and the courts and the chambers, and over the cleansing of every holy thing' (1 Ch 23, 28, but P knows nothing of any chambers, would not have allowed the Levites to touch (much less clean) many of the holy things, and regarded service simply as portership. In 1 Ch 23, 31 the Levites are to offer burnt offerings on certain occasions; in P their approach to the altar would have meant death both to themselves and the priests (Nu 19, 3). Other instances will be found in Ps, 281f.

(4) What the foregoing proves.—In view of these facts it is impossible to hold that the Levites in P represent a projection of the Levites of the second temple or any post-Mosaic age into the desert period. To P they are a body of sacred porters. The temple of course could not be carried about, and it cannot be asserted that in this respect the legislation mirrors later circumstances. Secondly, the net result of such a scheme would be to create a body of Levites for use during the desert and weavings and never thereafter. As soon as the desert age was over the whole tribe would find their occupation gone. How can we conceive that any legislator deliberately sat down and invented such a scheme centuries
after the epoch to which it relates, well knowing that in so far as his scheme purported to be a narrative of events it was fictitious from beginning to end and would meet with acceptance only. Thirdly, P neither embodies the views of Ezek nor finds an accurate reflection in Ch. The facts are such as to enable us to say definitely that P is not in line with them. It is impossible to assume that he accentuated the duty for certain acts if performed by Levites because he must have used the Levites to perform those acts" (PS, 241 f).

P also speaks of Aaron the priest and the sons of Aaron the priest. It is doubtful whether the expression "the sons of Aaron the priests," which occurs frequently in the and His Sons expression is nowhere supported by all the authorities. "The phrase 'Aaron the high priest' is entirely unknown to P. Where the high priest is mentioned the only qualifying apposition possible in his usage is 'the priest.' Aaron and his sons, unlike the Levites, were consecrated, not merely purified. At this point two features only of the legislation need to be considered: the make-up of the staff to post-conquest conditions and the signs of date. For example, the leprosy laws (Lev 13 f) postulate the presence of priests to inspect and isolate the patient. 'Remembering that on the critical theory P assumes the capital at Jerusalem as self-evident, we must ask how such provisions were to work after the conquest. During the desert period nothing could have been simpler, but what was to happen when the Israelites dwelt all over Canaan from Beersheba to Dan?" (PS, 246). The difficulty is immensely increased if we postulate an exilic or post-exilic date, when the Jewish center of gravity was in Babylonia and there were large colonies in Egypt and elsewhere. And 'What are we to say when we read of leprosy garments (Lev 13 f)? Was a man to make the pilgrimage from Babylonia to Jerusalem and consult a priest about a doubtful garment? And what about the leper's offerings in ch 14? Could they conceivably have been meant to be made in a tent? The case is no better with the law of leprous houses, which is expressed to apply to the post-conquest period (Lev 14 33-53). The notification to the priest and his inspections require a priesthood scattered all over the country, i.e. a body far more numerous than the house of Aaron at the date of the conquest. Such instances could easily be multiplied from the legislation; one more only will be cited on account of its importance to the history of the priesthood. According to P the individual virtual sacrifice is to kill the victims and flay the burnt offerings. How could such procedure be applied to such sacrifices as those of Solomon (1 K 8 63)? With the growth of luxury the sacrifices would necessarily become too large for such a ritual, and the wealth would grow in refinement and object to performing such tasks personally. This suggests the reason for later abuses and for the modifications of Ezek and the representations of the Chronicler.

The evidence.—Thus the evidence of P is unfavorable alike to the Wellhausen and the mediating views. The indications of date are consistent Moses, and it seems impossible to fit the laws into the framework of any other age without reading them in a sense that the legislator can be shown not to have contemplated. On the other hand P is a torso. It provides a large body of Levites who would have nothing to do after the conquest, and a corpus of legislation that could not have been administered in settled conditions by the house of Aaron alone.

III. The Other Portions of the Pentateuch.—In Ex 19 22-24 we read of priests, but a note has come down to us that in the first of those verses Aquila had "elders" not "priests," and this appears to be the correct reading in both places, as is shown by the prominence of the elders in the early part of the chapter. In Hebrew the words differ by only two letters. It is said by Wellhausen that in Ex 33 7-11 (E) Joshua has charge of the ark. This rests on a mistranslation of Ex 33 7, which should be rendered (correcting EV), 'And Moses used to take a [or the] tent and pitch it for himself without the camp.' It is inconceivable that Moses should have taken the tent of the ark and removed it to a distance from the camp for his private use, leaving the ark barred and ungarded. Moreover, if he had done so, Joshua could not have been in charge of the ark, seeing that he was in this tent while the ark (ex hypothes) remained in the camp. Nor had the ark yet been made. In fact a priest or the guardian of the ark in E: (1) in the Book of Jos E knows of priests who carry the ark and are quite distinct from Joshua (3 f); (2) in Dt 31 14 (E) Joshua is not resident in the tent while the ark is present in E: (3) in Ex 32 26-29, and the Levitical priesthood is the only one recognized (Dt 33 10); (4) there is no hint anywhere of Joshua's discharging any priestly duty whatsoever. The whole case rests on his presence in the tent in Ex 33 7-11, supposing a Pentateuch (q.v.), this passage should stand after Ex 13 22.

Then it is said that in Ex 4 14; Jgs 17 7, 'Levite' denotes profession, not ancestry. In the latter passage the youth whom Micah made a priest was of Levitical descent, being the grandson of Moses (Jgs 17 13), and the case rests on the phrase, 'of the family of Judah.' Neither of the Septuagintal translations had this text (Field, Hexapla, ad loc.), which therefore cannot be supported, since it cannot be suggested that Moses belonged to the tribe of Judah. As to Ex 4 14, the phrase "Aaron thy brother the Levite" is merely an adaptation of the more usual, "Aaron, son of Amram, the Levite," rendering a phrase for the brother Moses is the person addressed. The Wellhausen theory here is shown to be untenable in PS, 250 and KE, XI, 418.

Ex 32 26-29 foreshadows the sacred character of Levi, and Dt 10 6 (E) knows the hereditary Aaronic priesthood. In D the most important passage is Dt 13 6-8. In ver 7 three Septuagintal MSS omit the words 'the Levites,' and if this be a gloss, the whole historic sense of the passage is changed. It now contains an enactment that any Levite coming to the religious capital may minister there as "all his brethren do, who stand there," etc. i.e. like the descendants of Aaron. "The Levites" will then be the explanation of a glossator who was imbued with the latest post-exilic ideas, and thought that "his brethren" must mean those of his fellow-Levites who were not descended from Aaron. The passage is supplemented by 21 5, giving to the Levites judicial rights, and 24 8 assigning to them the duty of teaching the leprous regulations. In Lev 27 together with 32 30 (E), 'they gave to Jacob and the law to Israel: they shall put incense in thy nostrils and whole burnt-offering on thine altar,' these passages complete the provisions of P in giving to the Levites an occupation on place of the daily burnt offering.
when the Israelites were no longer massed together in a single camp, but scattered over the country. We shall see in the next section that this view of the meaning of the Law was taken by every writer of the second part of the Canon who touched on Levitical matters. Everywhere we are confronted with the legitimacy of a Levitical priesthood; nowhere is there any mention of an exclusive Aaronic right. Smaller points which cannot be discussed here are examined in PS. It only remains to notice that the LXX fully explains the frequent Deuteronomic locution, "the priests the Levites." One other remark must be made. Though it is not expressly stated, we may assume that consecration would be necessary in the case of any Levite acting on the provisions of Josh 18:16-18. And was not mentioned because in Heb antiquity it went without saying that every priest must be consecrated (cf Jgs 17).

IV. From Moses to Malachi.—Josh adds but little to our information. In 18 7 the priesthood is called the inheritance of the Levites, and it is singular that the Wellhausen sources do not redact, though such a writer as Josiah might be jealous Prof. Pritchard withheld the priesthood from the Levites. It is very interesting to find that in Josh 3, 4, all the different critical documents speak in exactly the same terms of the priests that bear the ark. The priestly writer, as we shall see, on the Wellhausen theory, to have said "the Levites." The expression "the priests the Levites" is found alternating with the expression "the priests." All this points to the construction put upon these phrases by the preceding section, and finds fresh confirmation in Jgs, where we see Micah rejoicing at having a Levite as a priest (17 13), thus showing that the sacred character of the tribe was recognized in the earliest periods of Moses. The lay sacrifice in this and the following books are explained under SACRIFICE (q.v.).

The period of the early kings shows us kings blessing the people (e.g. 2 5 6 18). It is claimed that this is the priestly blessing, but without evidence of which we have no more reason to see special priestly rights here than in David's blessing his household (2 5 20), or the frequent blessings of the Bible (e.g. Gen 49:12, esp. "in thee will God be established"). In 49 6 the priestly blessing is read, but it seems that we actually have the words of the blessing delivered on one of these occasions by Solomon, and it is quite unlike the blessing of the priests (Nu 6 22 ff).

Textual criticism disposes of the supposed priesthood of certain non-Levitical persons. In 2 S 18 the MT makes David's sons "priests," but this reading was unknown to the LXX, Symmachus and Theodotion (Field, ad loc.). The LXX has "ushers," i.e. chamberlains. That this represents a different Hebrew word is proved by the Septuagint text of 2 K 24 6 (not in extant in Heb), where we read that Benoah, son of Jehohada, was "over the armoury and over the brick-making." It cannot be suggested that this represents an original Heb "over the priesthood and over the brick-making" if we must exclude the existence of some secular court office which was rendered by this Gr phrase. Hoffig and Cheyne conjecture that "priest in the temple" should be read for "ushers; kohanim. This word gives the sense required (see 1sa 22 15, RV "steward"). In 1 20 26 we read that the priest "of the side that was set forward by lot of the sanctuary" was a priest and the SYR supported by Lucian and 23 reads עמד, ha-malakh ("the man that stood forward") In 1 K 8, Nathan's son is described as "priest friend of the king," but LXX reads only "friend of the king" (of esp. 1 Ch 23 31). And another period Nathan's son held the kindred secular office of king's counsellor (1 Ki 21 10, a task that is certainly unfavourable to the view that he ever held priestly office). There can therefore be no doubt that the word "priest," kohanim, has arisen through diglossy of the preceding word "ushers, kohanim, Nathan.

Various dealings with the ark in the age of Samuel require notice. As a boy Samuel himself is given into the service of Eli. It has been argued that he really officiated as a priest, though probably not (if the Chronicler's data are sound) of Levitical descent. The answer is to be found in his age. Weaning sometimes took place at as late an age as three, and accordingly the boy may have been as much as four years old when he was taken to Shiloh (1 S 1 24). That we do not mind him used the cloak (1 S 2 19) every year, and this notice also shows his extreme youth. In view of this it cannot seriously be contended that he performed any priestly service. He must have been a sort of page, and he performed some duties as the door-keeper of the temple of the years at Shiloh (1 S 3 15).

(1) The custody of the ark.—When the ark was captured by the Philistines, it was in the charge of priests. When David brought it to Jerusalem, it was again placed in priestly custody, but there is an interregnum of some 20 years (1 S 7 2).

It must be remembered that whatever may have happened during this period of great national confusion, the possession of all records of history and the ark for 700 years, is uniform and would far outweigh any irregularities during so short and troubled a period.

(6) On the Levites.' The difficulty arises on 1 S 6 14 15. In the second of these verses the Levites come up after the ark was lost. It is finished, and, in Wellhausen's words, "proceeded as if nothing had happened, lift the ark from the now no longer existing cart, and set it up again. If the sacrifice is already burning" (Prolegomena, 125). It is therefore suggested that ver 13 is a gloss. But there is difficulty in ver 14 which tells of the breaking up of the cart, etc., without explaining what happened to the ark. The trouble was not met by a change, but by a gloss: "’Aa And the cart came into the field, . . . . and stood there, there was a great stone: 14b and the Levites took down the cart, etc., and put them on the great stone: 14c and clave the wood of the cart,' etc., followed by 15a This makes perfect sense.

(5) In Abinadab's house.—The second difficulty is made by 1 S 6 20, where we read that the ark was brought to the house of Abinadab and Eleazar his son they sanctified to guard it'. Its old abode, the house at Shiloh, had apparently been destroyed (Jer 7 12 14, 26 6 9). There it enjoyed considerable importance, for Pools is unquestionably right in identifying the Gilbeah of God (1 S 10 6) with the Gilbeah (hill of the ark, thus there was a high place there and a Philist garrison over 1 S 13 3, where LXX and TS have "Gilbeah"). There remains the difficulty caused by the guardianship of Eleazar. Pools may be right in reading "כָּהָנִים", we 'eth דָּקַד, "and Eleazar his son," but in the entire absence of information, alike as to Eleazar as to Eleazar's son, 1 K 24 6 8 nothing can be said to be definite. The narratives of the slaughter among the Beth-shemith and the fate of Uzzah make it certain that the temple's custody could not be separated from its respectful distance from it. When David took the end of this period removed the ark, it was first taken in a cart. This proved fatal to Uzzah, and the ark was deposited in the house of Obed-edom the Gittite. The text of 8 knows nothing of any guardianship of the ark by Obed-edom. Probably he took very good care not to run near it in view of Uzzah's fate. Then it was transported to Jerusalem by bearers (2 S 6 13)—presumably of Levitical descent. No further irregularities are to be found.

More important is the change of priesthood; 1 S 2 27 36 clearly threatens Eli, whose house had been chosen in Egypt, with a transference of the high-priesthood to another line. Careful comparison with 1 K 2 27 makes it certain that the prophecy was fulfilled when Zadok was placed by Solomon in the place of Abiathar. Who was Zadok? According to Ch (1 Ch 6 5 33; 24 3; 27 17) he was descended from Aaron through Eleazar, and this is accepted by Orr, Van Hoozacker and many others, who take him as having a priestly sense. According to Ezek he was a Levite (40 46; 44 19), and it is noteworthy that throughout the prophetic books we always hear of the Levitical priesthood, not the Aaronic (see esp. 1 K 12 31; Jer 33 18 22; Mal 2), and the "father's house" of 1 S 2 27 36 that was chosen in Egypt could only be the house of
Aaron, not of Ithamar, if the passage is to be taken in its natural sense. On this view Zadok's appointment could only have fulfilled the prophecy if it terminated the Aaronic succession. It would seem therefore that the high-priesthood was transferred to a family of non-Aaronic Levites. For the alternative view see Zadok.

The prophet's speech in 1 S 2 27-36 is also important for the light it throws on the organization of the priesthood. The high priest has in his gift a number of priestly offices with pecuniary and other rewards. This postulates a far more advanced hierarchy than that of P.

The reference to "the priests and the Levites" in 1 K 8 4 was unknown to the LXX, but in other passages the Books of K show further advances in hierarchical organization. There is not merely the high priest—generally like Aaron in P called "the priest," but sometimes the high priest—but also the second priest (2 K 25 18; Jer 52 24; 2 K 23 4, according to the Tg), three keepers of the threshold (sbi supra, and 2 K 12 10) and "elders of the priests" (2 Ch 13 11; "elders" or "chiefs" of the Levites, perhaps also Jer 19 1). See also Jer 20 1 f.; 29 26 for priestly organization and jurisdiction in the temple precincts. All this contrasts strikingly with the simplicity of the Pentateuchal organization.

Ezekiel is entirely in line with the other sources for the period: he seeks to institute certain reforms. He writes, "Her priests 2. Ezekiel have done violence to my law, and have profaned my holy things: they have made no distinction between the holy and the common, neither have they caused men to discern between the unclean and the clean," etc (Ezk 22 26). If these words have any meaning they signify that he was acquainted with a law which followed the very words of Lev 10 and other passages of P, and was intended to reach the people through the teaching of the priests. In chs 40-48, there is a vision of the future which stands in the closest relation to the Pent. Three views have been held of this. The old view was that Ezek could not be reconciled with the Pent at all, and that the difficulties presented were insoluble. Wellhausen and his followers maintain that the prophet is prior to P, and here introduces the distinction between priests and Levites for the first time. The thing shown is that Ezekiel was familiar with P and drew from it the inspiration to make a fresh division among the Levites, giving the sons of Zadok a position similar to that occupied by the sons of Aaron in the wilderness period, and reenacting with slight modifications the legislation applicable to the sons of Aaron, this time applying it to the sons of Zadok. The crucial passage is 44 6-16, from which it clearly appears that in Solomon's temple aliens had performed sundry tasks that should have been performed by men of holy persons, and that Ezekiel proposes to degrade Levites who are not descended from Zadok to perform such tasks in the future as a punishment for their misdirections to idols in high places. Either of the two latter views would explain the close connection that evidently exists between the concluding chapters of Ezek and P, and, accordingly, in choosing between them, the reader must consider four main points: (1) Is P shown on the internal evidence to be early or late? Is it desert legislation, or is it accurately restored to its point at which it has already been discussed in part and is further treated in Pentateuch (q.v.)? (2) Is the theory of the late composition of P psychologically and morally probable? On this see Pentateuch and POT, 292-99. (3) Is there any evidence of the existence of institutions of P that are held by Wellhausen and his followers to be late—e.g. more national offerings than the rituals allow? On this see EPC, 200 ff., and passim; POT, 305-15, and passim; SBL and OP passim, and art. Pentateuch. (4) Does Ezekiel himself show acquaintance with P (e.g. in 22 26), or not? On this see SBL, 96; PS, 291 f.

With regard to the non-mention of the high-priesthood and certain other institutions in Ezekiel's vision, the natural explanation is that in the case of these the prophet did not desire to institute any changes. It is to be noted that Ezekiel does not codify and consolidate all existing law. On the contrary, he is rather supplementing and reforming it. In his temple the prince is to provide the statutory national offerings (45 17), i.e. those of Nu 28, 29. Apparently the king had provided these earlier (2 K 15 13). But in addition to these there has grown up a "king's offering," and it is probably to this only that 45 22 ff.; 46 2-15 relate. In 46 13 LXX, Syr, Vulg, and some Heb MSS preserve the reading 'he' for "thou." V. Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles.—Whatever theodian view, there is general agreement that in these books a distinction between priests and Levites is established (see e.g. Neh 10 37 f.; 12 1 f). We also find singers and porters (Neh 13 6, etc), Nethinim and the sons of Solomon's servants (Ex 28 7 f.; 29 20; 31 3, etc). It must not be assumed that these classes were new. The story of the Gibeonites (Josh 9) gives us the origin of some of these grades, and the non-mention of them in many of the earlier books is easily explained by the character of those books. We know from such passages as Am 5 23 that there were musical services in far earlier times (e.g Neh 12 42).

Ch presents an account of the earlier history of the priests and Levites that does not tally with the older sources. Many modern writers think that the author's views of the past were colored by the circumstances of his own day, and that he had a tendency to carry back later conditions to an earlier period. On the other hand it is impossible to deny fairly that he used some sources which have not been preserved to us elsewhere. Again, there is good evidence to show that his work is by no means that of a single hand, but seems to have been taken for history and would not have been so regarded by his contemporaries. Talmudic authorities held some such view as this. The historical value of his work has yet to be appraised in more critical and impartial spirit than is possible in any of the current discussions. For the present purpose it is only possible to notice the effect of some of his statements, if interpreted literally. As there are passages where he has clearly substituted Levites for the less holy personages of the older sources (contrast e.g. 2 K 11 4-12 with 2 Ch 23 1-11), it may be that Levites have also been substituted by him for other persons in notices of which no other version has survived.

David and Solomon recognized the hierarchy. The former king instituted the musical services (1 Ch 6 3 ff.; 16 4 ff.; 25). The Le.

2. His Data vites were divided into courses (1 Ch 25 6) and were rendered liable to service from the age of twenty by his enactment (ver 27). There were also 24 courses or divisions of priests, 16 of the sons of Eleazar and 8 of the sons of Ithamar (ch 24). The courses were divided by lot. In Neh 12 1-7 we read of "chiefs of the priests," but these are only 22 in number, while the number of priests is 281 in the version of John (ver 30). But not much importance can be attached to such lists, as names could easily fall out in transmission. According to 1 Ch 9 26 the four chief porters were
Levites, and Levibred were also over the things baked in pans and the shewbread (vs 31 f.). This of course is not in accordance with the Law, but is found elsewhere in Ch. In 1 Ch 23 the Levites from 30 years of age and upward, of whom 21,000 oversee the work of the house of the Lord, 6,000 were officers and judges, 4,000 were doorkeepers and 4,000 were musicians. David altered the age of beginning service to 20, and an account of their functions is given in 1 Ch 23:27-32 (see, further, Music). All these arrangements were confirmed and enforced by Solomon (2 Ch 8:14 ff). There is often uncertainty as to whether the Chronicler identifies priests and Levites in particular cases or not, e.g. in 2 Ch 30.27, "the priests the Levites" bless the people according to the ordinary text, but many authorities read "the priests and the Levites." Hezekiah appears to have undertaken some reorganization (2 Ch 29-31), but the details are not clear. Jehoshaphat established in Jerus a court composed partly of Levites and priests (19:8-11). Previously he had sent priests and Levites and others to teach the Law in Judah (ch. 17). In 29:34 it is clearly the duty of the priests to flank burnt offerings (Lev 1). It is impossible to draw any consistent picture from the Chronicler because he gives different data for different periods; it is doubtful whether he meant his statements to be taken as historical, e.g. in 1 Ch 26 we find Levites whose names (= "I have dedicated") are really words forming part of a prayer, and it is difficult to believe that either the Chronicler or his public intended this chapter to be interpreted in any but a spiritual sense (see Ps 284-56). 

In Ezra 2:40 the number of Levites who returned with Zerubbabel is given as 71, against 973 priests (ver 36), 128 singes (ver 41), 139 children of the porters (ver 42), 392 Nethinim and children of Solomon's servants (ver 58), and the figures are the same in Neh 7, except that there the singers number 148 (ver 44) and the porters 138 (ver 45). When Ezra went up, he was at first joined by no Levites (8:15), but subsequently gathered 38 Levites and 220 Nethinim (vs 18-20). We get glimpses of the organization in Neh 12:44-47 and 13:10 ff. It appears that in this period genealogies were carefully scrutinized in the case of doubtful claims to priestly descent (Ezr 2:61 ff; Neh 7:60 ff). In Ezra 6:19 ff the Levites are represented as killing the Gibeonites. 

Of these books no satisfactory account can be given in the present state of textual criticism and Bib. science generally. Some writers, e.g., hold that the Chronicler had before him a source to which the Levites were entirely unknown, others that he invented freely, again others that he reproduces trustworthy preexisting information. The student has only an assortment of theories from which to choose. The bedrock fact is that the stories reflect the beliefs of their natural meaning, convey an entirely different impression from the statements of the earlier books construed similarly. Modern research has not yet been seriously addressed to the question whether all the statements were really intended to be interpreted as mere history.

VI. Legal Provisions.—Aaron and his sons underwent consecration to fit them for their duties. Ex 28 ff prescribes their garments and consecration (see DRESS; BREASTPLATE; EMBROIDERY; ROBE; COAT; MITRE; GIRDLE; URIM AND THUMMIM), and the account of the latter may be read in Lev 8 f. In individual sacrifices brought to the religious capital the priests performed the part of the ritual which related to the altar (sprinkling, burning, etc) (Lev 1:1-17). A priestly function was the duty of teaching the people the law of God (Lev 10:11; 14:54-57; Dt 24:8; 33:10; cf Ezk 44:23; Hos 4:1-6; Hag 2:11 ff, and many passages in the Prophets). The priests were subject to special laws designed to keep their purity (Lev 21 f.; cf Ezk 44). The rules aim at preventing defilement through mourning (save in the case of ordinary priests for a near relation) and at preventing those who were physically unfitness from performing certain functions, and who were for any reason unclean from approaching the holy things. See further STRANGER. They performed several semi-judicial functions (Nu 5:5 ff). etc; see JUDGE. They also blessed the people (Nu 6:25; cf Dt 10:8, etc.) See Blessing. On their dues see SACRIFICE; TITHES; FIRSTLINGs; FIRST-FRuits; LEVITICUS CITIES; AGRARIAn LAWS; see further CHEMARIM; NETHINIM; Sons of Solomon’s SerVants; Singers; Doorkeepers; Serving-Women; Judge.

LITERATURE.—Wellhausen, Prolegomena, ch iv, for the Orel-Wellhausen view; Wiener, P.S., 230-89, for the view taken above; S. I. Curtius, Lexical Priests, for the conservative view. This writer afterward changed to the critical view. James Orr, POT; A. Van Hoozanoop, De Levitische bondeling in het oudtestamentischen; see also and Levites' in HDB, IV, for mediating views. The best account in Kinch's of the details is contained in Baedersch's art., where a further bibliography will be found.

HAROLD M. WIEI'NER

PRIMOGENITURE, pri-mó-jen-tür (Gr. πρότοκος, prótokos). The right of the firstborn to inherit the headship of the family, carrying with it certain property rights and usually such titles as those of the high-priesthood or kingship. The writings of the Hebrews take for granted the recognition of a doctrine of primogeniture from the earliest times. In the most ancient genealogies a distinction is drawn between the firstborn and the other sons (Gen 10:15; 22:21; 25:13; 35:23; 36:15). In the bestowal of parental blessings in patriarchal times great importance was attached to preferring the firstborn (Gen 25:31; 27:29; 48:15; 49:3). The feud between Jacob and Esau (Gen 27:1-28:21) grew out of the stealing of the firstborn's blessing by the younger brother. Joseph was displeased when, in his blessing, Jacob seemed to prefer Ephraim to Manasseh, his other son. The father in such cases seems to have had the right to transfer the birthright from one son to another, from the days of Abraham in the case of Ishmael and Isaac, through those of Jacob in the matter of Reuben and Joseph and in the matter of Ephraim and Manasseh, down to the days of David in the selection of a successor to the kingship. Nevertheless the Mosaic code, which declared (rather than enacted) the law of primogeniture, prohibited the abuse of this parental privilege in the case of a younger son by a favorite wife (Dt 21:16 f). The manner of acknowledging the firstborn incidentally referred to in Dt is "by giving him a double portion of all that he hath" (Dt 21:17), that is to say, double the share Double of each of the other brothers. Jewish Portion tradition (Brkho, 46a, 47b, 61a, 51b; Ballah' Bathah' 122a, 122b, 123a, 124a, 142b) accepts and elaborates on this right of the firstborn son. Thus, it applies to the paternal and not the eldest surviving son; it does not apply to daughters; it has reference only to the paternal estate and not to the inheritance left by a mother or other relative, nor to improvements or acquisitions made to an estate after the death of the father.
The object of the doctrine may be that the eldest son might be enabled to preside over the affairs of family with proper dignity, or that he might assume additional responsibilities such as this sort of unnatural care of his younger sisters. Hence one’s birthright could be waived or sold (Gen 25:31).

On the other hand it may be based in the ultimate analysis on the primitive feeling of favoritism for the firstborn reflected in the disappointment of Jacob, when he speaks of Reuben as his firstborn, his mind, and the beginning of his strength (כָּחֲלָה הַנַּע, Gen 49:3; cf. Deut 21:17). This theory would be in accord with the right of the parent to transfer the right to a younger son. The suggestion of favoritism conveyed by the Heb בְּקָהוֹר is manifested in its figurative use of: Israel (Ex 4:22), of Ephraim (Jer 31:9), of one dearly beloved (Zec 12:10); (cf. figurative usage in the NT; Rom 8:29; He 12:23; 1:6; Rev 1:5).

Light is thrown on the attitude of the ancient world toward the firstborn, and hence on the history of primogeniture, by the language used in connection with the plague of the firstborn: “from the first-born of Pharaoh’s house even unto the first-born of the maid-servant that is behind the mill” or “the captive that was in the dungeon.”

Apparent no more dreadful catastrophe for a class of society could be thought of than this slaying of the firstborn (Ex 11:5; 12:29). The misguided fervor of the ancient Semites who offered their firstborn as the thing most dearly beloved as a sacrifice to their gods must be understood in this light, whether it appears among the Moabites, the Phoenicians or the Hebrews themselves (Jer 32:35; Ezek 20:26-31; 2 Ch 28:3). It is difficult to predicate a connection between the basis of the doctrine of primogeniture and that of the Redemption of the Firstborn, other than that both are ultimately based on the importance of a firstborn son and the fondness of his parents for him. It is interesting to note, however, that the tradition of redemption and the law of primogeniture are kept so distinct that, while the latter has reference only to the firstborn of a father, the former has reference only to the firstborn of a mother (בְּקָהוֹר, viii, 1, 46a; cf. peter rehen, whatsoever openeth the womb, Ex 13:2). In a polygenrous society such as the Israelites, that is, it is natural to suppose that the distinction between paternal and maternal primogeniture would be clearly before the minds of the people. See Birthright; Firstborn.

NATHAN ISAACS

PRINCE, prinṣ: This word occurs quite frequently in our Eng. Bible, mostly in the OT. While it is never used to denote royal parentage (cf 1 Ch 29:24), it often indicates actual royal or ruling power, together with royal dignity and authority. As a rule, the name is prefixed to it and so distinguished that, while the latter has reference only to the firstborn of a father, the former has reference only to the firstborn of a mother (בְּקָהוֹר, viii, 1, 46a; cf. peter rehen, whatsoever openeth the womb, Ex 13:2). In a polygenrous society such as the Israelites, that is, it is natural to suppose that the distinction between paternal and maternal primogeniture would be clearly before the minds of the people. See Birthright; Firstborn.

In Mt 2:6 the word rendered “princes” might be tr in “princely cities”; at least, this seems to be implied. Here the term is rendered הָגִים, הָגִים, “leader,” “ruler,” “prince,” is used, undoubtedly to hint at the fact that Bethlehem was the native city of a great prince. In the other NT passages the word ἀρχήν, ἀρχήν, “a potentate,” “a person in authority,” “a magistrate,” often with some additional attribute, is used. 11:9 12:24; 20:25 [RV “ruler”]: Mk 3:22; Jn 12:31; 14:30; 16:11; 1 Cor 2:6.8 AV; Eph 2:2; Rev 1:5 [RV “ruler”]. In most of these instances the term “prince” refers to the devil.

In Acts 5:15; 5:31, the word ἀρχήν, ἀρχήν, “leader,” is employed referring to Christ as the author of life and salvation (cf He 12:2, where the term ἀρχής is rendered “author” [RV] or “captain” [RVm]).

The OT contains a number of different words mostly rendered “prince” or “princes” in the KJV. (1)נָר, nari: In Josh 5:14 the mysterious armed stranger seen by Joshua near Jericho calls himself the “prince of the host of Jeh”; a high military title applied to a superhuman being. In Isa 9:6, the name is given to the child representing the future Messiah. The term “Prince of Peace” denotes the eminent position and the peacefounder of the Messianic king: the highest human title in its most ideal sense. Dn 8:11: here, again, as in Josh 5:14, occurs the phrase “prince of the host.” In Dn 8:25 “the prince of princes” refers to God Himself: the highest human title in its absolute sense applied to God. Dn 10:21: “Michael your prince.” Michael the archangel is here called the prince of the Jewish people. He is the prince representative of God’s people in the sight of God, a royal title suggesting high power and alliance with God in the divine struggle with evil. Dn 12:2: “the prince of Persia” (cf ver 20, “the prince of Persia,” “the prince of Greece”), the expression is used in the same general sense as in Dn 10:21. Each individual nation is represented as guided by a spiritual being that may or may not be an ally of God in His combat with the devil. In the majority of cases, though, the term sar is applied (a) to men exercising royal or ruling power; Prov 8:16: “By me princes [in or “rulers”] rule”; Isa 32:1: “Behold, a king shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in justice.” Judicial power is included (cf Ex 2:14: “Who made thee a prince and a judge over us?” and Ps 148:11: “princes and all judges of the earth”). In some passages the word sar, having been rendered “prince,” stands for “chief” (cf Jgs 8:14; 1 S 29:4; 2 S 10:3, etc). (b) To royal officers of a high rank: Gen 12:15: “the princes of Pharaoh” (cf 2 K 24:14: “Jerus and all the princes of the land”) 1 Ch 29:29; Jer 36:21; 52:10; Hos 5:10, etc. “Ambassadors” (Jer 36:14): “governors” (1 K 20:14: “By the young men [in or, servants]” of the princes of the provinces); cf Est 3:14, the seven princes”); “the chief of the eunuchs” (Dn 6:3, the chief eunuch), “priest” (Jer 51:59): “Seraiah was chief chamberlain” (in or, quartermaster). AV renders it “a quiet prince,” i.e. a prince having rest, instead of procuring rest (םָנָשַׁי לֵו, sar me’alakh, “a sar of rest”). In post-exilic times: Ezr 9:1: “The princes drew near unto me.” They were the political leaders of the people (cf Isr 1:23: “the princes and the elders”); Neh 9:38: “our princes, our Levites, and our priests”; Neh 11:1: “the princes of the people dwelt in Jerusalem”; Neh 13:31: “the princes of Judah.” Of course, they were all subject to the authority of the high priests. (c) To the priesthood: 1 Ch 24:5: “princes of the sanctuary, and princes of God” (cf Isa 43:28). (d) On account of great achievements: 2 S 3:38: “know ye not that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel?”—an honorary title generally speaking, a prince is a wealthy man (cf Job 34:19: “That respecteth not the persons of princes, nor regardeth the rich more than the poor”), and he is a prominent man embodying true, although mortal, manhood (of Ps 82:7: “Nevertheless ye shall die like men, and fall like one of the princes).
(2) נָאָשׁ, nāsh: usually derived from נָאשּׁ, nāš, "to lift," hence "exalted"; otherwise: a "speaker."
(a) An honorary title (cf Gen 23:6: "Thou art a prince of God among us."). The distinction is conferred upon Abraham by the children of Heth.
(b) A name given to the heads of the Israelitic tribes, from which they held 
the title "prince," e.g.: "the prince of the fathers' house of the Gershonites" (cf vs 30. 35); 3:32: "Eleazar . . . shall be prince of the prince of the Levites, and have the oversight of them that keep the charge of the sanctuary"; Nu 4:14: "the prince of the congregation. They are to be identical with the "rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens" (cf Ex 18:21; Nu 16:2). 7:2: "the princes of Israel, the heads of their fathers' houses, and the princes of the tribes" (cf 17:26; 34:18; Josh 22:41; 1 Ch 4:38).
(c) Equivalent to chief or king: Gen 17:20: "Twelve princes shall he beget" (cf 15:16); Gen 34:2: "Shechem the son of Hamor the Hivite, the prince of the land". Nu 25:15: "Cain, the daughter of the prince of Midian" (cf Josh 13:21); 1 K 11:34: "I will make him prince all the days of his life." This was said of Solomon, which shows the term equivalent to king. Of special note is the use of the word nāsh in Ezek. The name is given to the Jewish king (cf 12:10: "This burden concerneth the prince in Judah"). Then, again, it is applied to the future theocratic king (cf 34:24; 37:25, etc., and esp. chs 45, 46). It is also used of foreign potentates and high officers (cf 25:16: "the prince of the sea"; 28:2: "the prince of Tyre"); 30:13: "a prince from the land of Egypt"); 32:29: "Edom, her kings and all her princes and, likewise, of high Jewish officers (51:12)." (d) A title bestowed upon Shebah-bazzar (Est 1:8).
(3) נָזִי, nāziḥ: 1 S 2:8: "To make them sit with princes" (cf Ps 113:8). The original meaning of the term is willing or obliging; then generous ("liberal"); cf Prov 19:6: "Many will entreat the favor of the liberal man"; yet, it might safely be rendered here "prince" (mil) or noble-minded; a gentleman, a nobleman, a person of rank, a prince. Job 13:21: "He poureth contempt upon princes" (cf Ps 107:40); Job 21:28: "Where is the house of the prince? whose dwelling is in the north where the wicked dwell?" The context here suggests the thought of a wicked prince, a tyrant. Ps 47:9: "The princes of the peoples are gathered together" (cf Ps 115:9; 146:3; Prov 17:7; 25:7; Cant 7:1).
(4) נָאָשׁ, nāsh: According to Gesenius, this term may be either a high-minded person (cf the preceding word, nāziḥ) or a speaker, a spokesman; then, a prince, a king. 1 S 13:14: "Jeh hath appointed him to be prince of his people" (cf 2 S 5:2). "Thou shalt be prince (RVA "leader") over Israel"; 6:21; 7:8; 1 K 1:35; 14:7; 16:2; Job 29:9; 31:37; Ps 76:12; Prov 28:16; Ezek 23:2: "prince of Tyre"); Dn 9:25: "the anointed one, the prince," AV the "Messiah the Prince"); Dn 9:26: "the prince that shall come"); the Roman emperor?); 11:29: "the prince of the covenant" (either a high priest or some Egyptian king, Ptolemaeus Philometor?).
(5), (6) נָזִי, nāziḥ, and נָאָשׁ, nāsh, "a high official," "a prince," usually associated with the word "king" or "judge." Prov 14:28: "In the multitude of people is the king's glory; but in the want of people is the destruction of the prince." (nāziḥ); 2 S 5:3: "Hear, O ye kings; give ear, O ye princes (nāziḥim); Prov 8:15: "By me kings reign, and princes (nāziḥim) decree justice." (cf 31:4; Hab 1:10; Isa 40:25: "that bringeth perdition upon nothing; that maketh the judgements of the earth as vanity."

(7) נָאָשׁ, nāsh, derived from נָאָס, nāš, "to install a king" (cf Ps 2:6); hence a prince: Josh 13:21: "the princes of Sihon" (cf Ps 83:11); Ezek 32:30: "the princes of the north"); Mic 5:5: RV "princely men." RVA "princes among men"); Dn 11:8: RV "molten images," RVA "princes.

(8) נָאָשׁ, nāsh: "a judge," "a military leader," "a prince"); Dn 11:18: "A prince [RV 'prince' (captain') shall cause the reproach . . . to cease" (probably a Rom consul; a Rom general).

(9) נָאָשׁ, nāsh: "shall cause the reproach . . . to cease" (probably a Rom consul; a Rom general).

(10) נָאָשׁ, nāsh: "a judge," "a military leader," "a prince"); Dn 11:18: "A prince [RV 'prince' (captain') shall cause the reproach . . . to cease" (probably a Rom consul; a Rom general).

PRINCES, prin'zes, eiz, THE SEVEN. See Prince, (1), (6).

PRINCESS, prin'ses: The Heb term is נָאָשׁ, nāshār (of src, prince, and "Sarah"); it means (1) a queen (Isa 49:23, AV and RV both "queen"); (2) the consort of a king contrasted with his concubines (1 K 11:3, "He had seven hundred wives, princes, and three hundred concubines"); (3) the wife of a prince (Est 1:18: "the "princesses of Persia and Media"); (4) it is metaphorically used of the city of Jerusalem (Jer 1:1).

PRINCIPAL, prin'si-pal: Appears in AV as a tr of nine Heb words (fewer in RV), in one case (Isa 28:25) being used quite wrongly and in 2 K 25:19 (Jer 52:25): 1 Ch 24:31 gives a wrong sense (all corrected in RV). In 1 K 4:5, "prince of officers" (AV "chief minister") is an arbitrary tr of קְלִיָּן to avoid "priest" (so ERV; cf 2 S 18:18).

PRINCIPALITY, prin'si-pal'i-ti: In the OT the word occurs but once (Jer 18:18: "principalities shall come down"). Here AVN "head tires" is properly preferred by RV for נָאָשׁ, נָאָשׁ, נָאָשׁ "hands, head, chief"

In the NT "principality" occurs for ἄρχων,ARCHê, "rule," generally in the pl., referring (a) to men in authority (Tit 3:1, "Put them in mind to subject [AV, 'in submission,' RV] to principalities [AV, rulers,' RV], and powers [AV: 'to authorities,' RV]); (b) to superhuman agencies, angelic or demonic (Rom 8:38; Eph 3:10; 6:12; Col 1:16; 2:10,15). Paul was keenly sensible of the dualism of mind and body and of the law in his members warring against the law of his mind (Rom 7:23), and of the temporary victory of the evil, residing in the flesh, over the good of the spirit (vs 14ff). This dualism was objectified in Zoroastrianism, and among the Babylonians the several heavenly bodies were regarded as ruled by spirits, some good, some evil. The same belief, appropriated by the Jews during the captivity, appears also in Gr thought, as e.g. in Plato and later in the Stoics. The higher spheres, which hold the even tenor of their way, were in general regarded as ruled by good spirits: but the sublunary sphere to which the earth belongs, ill-regulated motions prevail, which must be due to evil spirits. The perversities of human conduct, in particular, thwarting, as was thought, the simple, intelligible Divine plan, were held to be subject to rebellious powers offering de-
PRINCIPIES, prin'si-plé: Found twice (He 5 12; 6 1). The Gr word στοιχεῖον, στοιχεῖα is also τέρας in AV as "elements" and "rudiments." As rendered in Hebrew, its meaning is clearly related to the elementary knowledge of Christian truth or doctrine. See Elements; Rudiments.

PRINT, print, PRINTING, prin'ting, PRINTED, prin'ted: Printing is the art of multiplying records—the "art of writing with many pens" (Jew Enc, XI, 295), or wholesale writing.

The art of making original records is writing. This, however, is a slow process. It involves tracing each letter and part of a letter through from beginning to end by the moving point of chisel, pen, or other instrument, and this process must be repeated with every copy. As soon, therefore, as occasion arose for frequently repeating the record, man develed the labor of forming each symbol separately. All these ways involve making a character or a series of characters on a single surface and transferring as a whole to another surface. Neither "pressure," as some say, nor "ink," as others, is essential to the process, for printing from a photographic negative takes no pressure, and printing for the blind takes no ink. Any process which transfers a whole surface is printing.

The earliest use of printing seems to have been for painting the face or body with ownership, tribal, trophy, or ceremonial marks for worship, war, mourning, etc. This paint might be temporary or pricked in by the tattoo process. Tattooing itself is rather a writing than a printing process, but may be distinguished according as the color is laid on by drawing or by the "pintadera." The "pintadera" or "stamp used to impress patterns upon the skin" is best known from the Mexican and South American examples, but in recent years it has been found in depots all over the Neolithic region (southern Italy, Austria, Hungary, Mycenae, Crete, Egypt) and in Borneo at least. Many of these specimens are from the Neolithic or Copper Age. Both in South America and in Neolithic Liguria, some of these stamps were cylindrical and "were used like a printer's roller" (Moses, The Dawn of Mediterranean Civilization, 254-61, with many illustrations, and Frobenius, Childhood of Man, fig. 31, "Dayak block for painting the body").

The invention of wove paper (Heb 19 28) is a tool ("print") is commonly, and probably rightly, in view of the Heb word, supposed to refer to the permanent marks of tattooing which may or may not have been made by this printing process. Job 13 27 AV, which speaks of printing upon the head or sole of the feet, has been quite widely in AV, and, if the idea is one of printing at all, it refers rather to branding than stamping with color.

The use of the inkhorn in setting the mark upon the forehead (Ex 9 4-6) certainly points to marking with color rather than branding. See Inhorn. This may, of course, have been drawing rather than printing, but, on the other hand, the sealing of the servants of God on their foreheads (Rev 7 4; 9 4) necessarily means printing rather than drawing, and probably printing rather than branding, for the use of the seal with color had long been common. The marks of the beast upon the forehead and upon the hand in Rev 13, 14, 16, 19 and 20, more likely refer to branding, as the Gr word pointed to labeling or marking rather than stamping. The stigmata of Gal 6 17 may also point to branding. Branding was at all events also a common method of printing characters on the flesh in Bib. times (Isa 3 24: perhaps Ex 21 25: a branding on the forehead, CH § 120; branding of a slave §§ 229, 232). The reference in Jn 20 25 is, of course, to the clearly visible marks or scars left by the nails in the hands. See Mark.

The use of seals is a true printing process, whether they are used with color, as they were both in Crete and Egypt almost from the beginning of history, or impressed on clay, wax, or other plastic substances. Mention of seals is frequent in the Bible (see Seal). A new interest has been given to this aspect of the matter by the sealings discovered in Ahab's palace and other excavations throughout Pal, which are forming one of the most useful classes of modern inscriptions.

Both stamp and seal were used throughout the Middle Ages, last in the latter abundantly, and the stamp at least occasionally, for stamping the capital letters in Bibh. and other MSS, as well as for various other purposes.

Modern printing begins with the carving of whole pages and books on blocks of wood (xylography), or metal plates for printing (chalcography). This method was quite early practised by the Chinese, and began to be common in Europe in the early 15th cent., most of the books printed by it having to do with Bibh. topics (Biblia pauperum, etc.).

It was only with the invention of movable type about the middle of the 15th cent. that the multiplying of books by writing began to come to an end. The printing with movable type is also closely associated with Bibh. study, the Gutenberg Psalter and the Gutenberg Bible standing with most for the very beginning of modern printing.

For the printed edd. of the Heb and Gr originals, and the various VSS, see arts. on TEXTUAL CRITICISM and allied topics in this encyclopedia, with their literature. The art, on "Typography" in Jew Enc is of unusual excellence, and the general literature of printing given in Enc Bril, at the end of the first part of the art, on "Typography," is full and good. Compare also Books on Engraving and Print-Making, esp. Hortzschansky, supplementing the bibliography of Enc Brit.

The earliest occurrence of the word “prison” in AV is found in the narrative of Joseph’s life in Egypt (J). The term used, viz. sōbar, means perhaps “round house” or “tower.” It seems probable that among the Hebrews there were no special buildings erected as “jails” in the pre-monarchical period, and perhaps not before the post-exilic period, when the adoption of the civic institutions and customs of surrounding nations prevailed. In Egypt and Assyria, on the contrary, there were regular public buildings corresponding to our modern jails. Among the Hebrews, rooms in connection with the royal palace or the residence of prominent court officials would be used for the purpose.

According to one narrative (J) in Gen, the prison in which Joseph was confined had a “keeper,” while according to another narrative (E) 3. Joseph, the offending members of the royal house, viz. the royal butler and the royal baker, were placed “in ward” with the “captain of the guard,” in charge, i.e. in some part of the royal palace. This is still more probable if, instead of “captain of the guard,” we should translate “chief of the cooks,” i.e. superintendent of the royal kitchen.

It was often necessary to restrict the liberty of individuals who for various causes were a menace to those in authority, without inflicting any corporal punishment, e.g. Joseph’s brethren were kept “in ward” three days (Gen 37 22); Scripture was forbidden to pass beyond the boundary of Judas (1 K 2 36); the person who caught gathering sticks on the Sabbath was put “in ward” pending his trial (Nu 15 34). In the monarchical period, prisoners were to be tried by a public judge, e.g. Micaiah by Ahab (1 K 22 27), Hanani by Asa (2 Ch 16 10). Hoshea, after his abortive effort to institute an alliance with So or Seve, king of Egypt, was shut up in prison by Shalmaneser (2 K 17 4); cf also 2 K 25 27 (Jehoiachin in Babylon); Jer 52 11 (Zedekiah in Babylon).

The Book of Jer throws considerable light on the prison system of Judas in the later monarchical period. The prophet was put “in ward” that were in the upper gate of Benjamin, which was in the house of Jehoiakim (20 2). Mere imprisonment was not adequate punishment for the prophet’s announcement of Judah’s doom; it was necessary to have recourse to the pillar. During the siege of Jerus Jeremiah was confined in the “court of the guard, which was in the king of Judah’s house” (32 2, etc.). The “court of the guard” was evidently the quarters of the sentries who guarded the royal palace. According to the narrative of 37, the prophet was arrested on a charge of treachery and put in prison “in the house of Jonathan the scribe” (37 15). This verse does not necessarily mean that a private house was used as a prison. The words are capable of another interpretation, viz. that a building known as the “house of Jonathan the scribe” had been taken over by the authorities and converted into a jail. We read in the following verse that the house had a “dungeon” (lit. “house of the pit”) and “cabins” or “cells.”

The data are not sufficient to enable us to give any detailed description of the treatment of prisoners. This treatment varied according to the character of the offence. The Treatment which led to incarceration. Samson of Prisoners during the period of his imprisonment was compelled to remain four years in the prison (Jgs 16 21). Gridding was the occupation of women, and marked the depth of Samson’s humiliation. Dangerous persons were subjected to various kinds of physical mutilation, e.g. Samson was deprived of his sight. This was a common practice in Assyria (2 K 25 7). The thumbs and great toes of Adoniabeez were cut off to render him incapable of further resistance (Jgs 1 6).

Various forms of torture were in vogue. Hanani the seer was put into the pillory by Asa (for “in a prison house” we should render “in the stocks,” see RVm). In Jer 29 26 for “prison,” we should render “stocks” (so RV) or “pillory,” and for “stocks,” “collar” (as in RVm). AV renders a different Heb word by “stocks” in Job (13 27; 33 11). There was a special prison (1 K 22 27), as well as a prison garb (2 K 25 29).

There are other Heb words rendered “prison” (sometimes incorrectly) in AV. In Ps 142 7, the word which is translated “prison” means “torture,” and is derived from a root which denotes, for instance, the isolation of the leper (Lev 13 5 c; cf Isa 34 22; 47 7). In Isa 43 8 “oppression” not “prison” is the correct rendering, while in Isa 61 1 “opening of the eyes,” rather than “opening of the prison.” Prisoners are promised “light after darkness, gladness after gloom.”

In the NT “prison” generally occurs for the Gr word φυλακή, phulakē, which corresponds to the Heb word מַפְרִיק, mishmār, referred to 8. In the 20 to above (Mt 5 25; Mk 6 17; Lk 3 20; NT Acts 5 19; 1 Pet 3 19). In Rev 18 2, AV renders this word by two different words, viz. “hold” and “cage”; RV employs “hold” in the case of Peter and “cage” in the case of Paul and Silas (Acts 16 20). But the more common term is also found in these narratives. In Acts 12 17 “prison” renders a Gr word which means “dwelling.” In Acts 5 18 AV, “prison” is the rendering for another Gr word, viz. τίθεσις, tithēsis, “watching,” or “ward” (RV “ward”). In Acts 4 3, AV employs “hold” as the rendering for the same word. This would correspond to the modern “police station” or “lock-up.” See also Punishments.

T. Lewis

PRISON GARMENTS. See preceding article.

PRISON, SPIRITS IN: The phrase occurs in the much-discussed passages 1 Pet 3 18–20, where the apostle, exhorting Christians to endurance under suffering for well-doing, says: “Because Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God; being put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the spirit; in whom also he was made and predestined unto the spirits in prison, that aforetime were disobedient, when the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, where-in, few, that is, eight souls, were saved through
water." It is plain that in this context "the spirits in prison" (τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν, τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ ψυχίσσαι) denote the generation who were disobedient in the days of Noah, while the words "spirits" and "in prison" may refer to their present disembodied condition in a place of judgment in the unseen world (cf 2 Pet 2 4-9). The crucial point in the passage lies in what is said of Christ's preaching to these spirits in prison. The interpretation which strikes one most naturally is that Christ, put to death in the flesh, and made alive again in the spirit, went in this spiritual (disembodied) state, and preached to these spirits, who once had been disobedient, but are viewed as now passed with many of His message. This is the idea of the passage taken by the majority of modern exegetists, and it finds support in what is said in 1 Pet 4 6. "For unto this end was the gospel preached even to the dead, that they might be judged indeed according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit." On this basis is now often reared a mass of doctrine or conjecture respecting "second probation," "restoration," etc.—in part going back to patristic times—for which the passage, even so taken, affords a very narrow foundation. In this respect the passage, while important in the spiritual world; the word "made alive" does not exegetically refer to a disembodied state, but to the resurrection of Christ in the body, etc. Another line of interpretation is therefore preferred by many, who take the words "in which also he went," to refer, not to a disembodied manifestation, but to the historical preaching to the antediluvian generation through Noah while they yet lived. In favor of this view is the fact that the apostle in 1 11 regards the earlier prophetic preaching as a testifying of "the Spirit of Christ," that God's long-suffering with Noah's generation is described in Gen 6 5, which Peter has doubtless in his mind, as a striving of God's Spirit, and that in 2 5 he uses another expression, and Noah is described as "a preacher of righteousness." The passage, 1 Pet 4 6, may have the more general meaning that Christians who have died are at no disadvantage in the judgment as compared with those who shall be alive at the Parousia (cf 1 Thess 4 15-18). (For an exposition of this view, with a full account of the interpretations and literature on the subject, of Salmond's Christian Doctrine of Immortality, 4th ed, 364-87.) See also Eschatology of the NT.

JAMES O'BRIEN

PRIVY, priv'ī, PRIVILY, priv'i-li: These words are obsolete in modern Eng. and are replaced by "secret," "secretly," rather than by the cognates "private," "privately." RV usually has not altered AV's use of the word, but in Ps 112 2 has substituted "in darkness" and in Jgs 9 31 uses "craftily," in "in Tormah" (see TORMAH). In Ezek 21 14, AV "entereth into their privy chambers," "privity" is a gloss, omitted in RV. In Ps 48 11 (RV "a place of darkness"; Acts 2 28) is simply "to know it; in Wind 3 4, RV has changed the phrase into "be initiated into."
Under the Republic the influence of the equestrian class was chiefly exerted in the financial transactions of the companies which farmed the variable revenues. The importance of the publicani was greatly reduced under the Empire, but the emperors maintained the loss of opportunity by intrusting them with a great variety of administrative functions. Military service as prefect or tribune was the preliminary step in the official equestrian career. The highest positions held by members of the equestrian class were called préfectures, and included the prefecture of the guard, of Egypt, of the grain-supply, of the watchmen in Rome, and of the fleet. But between these extremes the title procurator was applied generally to the functionaries whose positions were of imperial origin.

The administration of the fiscus or imperial treasury at Rome and of the finances in the imperial provinces, as well as the collection of fiscal revenues in the senatorial provinces, was in the hands of procurators. They occupied many positions which, on account of their intimate relationship with the person of the monarch, could be safely intrusted only to those whose limited prestige precluded individual ambition. (Tiedemann, Geschichte Romes, 7th ed., Part I, 132-43.) Finally, several provinces, where the conditions were unfavorable to the introduction of the ordinary administrative system and Rom public law, were governed as imperial domains by officials of the equestrian class as the emperor's representatives. In Egypt the title prefect (praefectus) was employed permanently as the appellation of the viceregal, and while the same term may have been used originally to denote the governors of this class generally, when their titular capacity was creased into the civil functions, yet the designation procurator became at an early date the term of common usage to designate them (Hirschfeld, 382).

Mauretania, Rhnetia, Noricum, Thrace, Cappadooa, Judaea and some smaller districts were all, for a time at least, governed by procurators (Tacitus Hist. i.11; Dio Cassius lvi.17).

The question concerning the original title of the ROM governors of Judaea has arisen because the NT speaks of the governor (Acts xxvi.20; 13); Acts 26:20; 26:30), which corresponds with the Latin term praesidus, which might be considered synonymous with either procurator or praefectus (Hirschfeld, 354). There is in fact some historical evidence to establish the nomenclature of the rulers of Pal before the time of Vespasian, and Hirschfeld is of the opinion that a certain passage in Tacitus (Ann. xv.44) where Pilate is called procurator is not sufficient proof in view of this writer's carelessness in details of this sort. Josephus (Ant. XX, i., 2), however, employs epístrope (procurator) for the time of Claudius, and it is convenient to follow common usage and assume that this title was current from the time of Augustus. It was evidently the intention of Augustus that membership in the equestrian class should be a necessary qualification for the procurators who were appointed to govern provinces. But Claudius appointed a freedman, Antonius Felix, brother of the famous minister of finance, Pallas, as procurator of Judaea (Suetonius Claud. xxviii; Tacitus Hist. v.9). This remained, however, an isolated instance in the annals of Pal (Hirschfeld, 380), and it is evident, moreover, that Felix was raised to equestrian rank before the governorship was conferred upon him.

The following list of the procurators of Judaea is based on Marquardt (Romische Staatsverwaltung, I, 409, 412) and Schürer (Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes, I, 455-455)

PROFANE, pró-fān' (vb. ἁμαρτάνω, ἁμαρτάνω, ἁμαρτάνω, ἁμαρτάνω, ἁμαρτάνω); From profanus, "before [i.e. outside] the temple," therefore unholy, polluted, secular, is of frequent occurrence (vb. and adj.) in both the OT and the NT. It occurs as the tr of hōl in AV only in Ezek 16:22, 26, RV "common"; 42:20; 44:23; 48:15, RV "or (common use);" as the tr of ἐλεήμονας in Lev 21:7, 14, RV "polluted;" and Ezek 21:25, where, for AV "thou profane wicked prince of Israel," RV has "thou, O deadly wounded wicked one, the prince of Israel." "To profane" (ḥāleform is seen in Lev 18:11; 19:8; Neh 13:17, 18; Ps 89:39; Isa 43:28; Ezek 22:26, etc. "Profaneness" in Jer 23:15 (חָנַעְפָד) is in ARV "ungodliness." In the NT "profane" occurs in the sense of unholy, godless, regardless of God and Divine things (1 Tim 1:5; 4:7; 6:20; 2 Tim 2:16; He 12:16), and "to profane," or violate, in Mt 12:5; Acts 24:6. The vb. is frequent in Apc in 1 Macc 1:43-46:3; 3:34; etc. also in 2 Macc 8:2; 10:5; of 2 Esd 16:5; Jdt 4:3:12; 1 Macc 1:45; 2 Macc 4:13). In numerous cases RV substitutes "profane" for other words and phrases in AV, as for "to prostitute" (Lev 19:29), "an hypocrite" (Isa 9:17), "pollute" (Nu 18:32; Ezek 7:21), etc. W. L. Walker

PROFESS, pró-fes', PROFESSION, pró-fesh'un ("nāghadh; ὁμολογω, ὁμολογω, ὁμολογω, ὁμολογω; "Profess" means lit. "to own before," hence to make open or public announcement; it occurs only once in the OT as the tr of nāghadh, "to put before; often "to tell," "to show," "to declare" (Dt 26:3); in the NT it is the tr of homolōgeō, "to speak or say together in common," "to assent," "to confess publicly" (Mt 7:23, "Then will I profess unto them, I never knew you"); 1 Tim 6:12, RV "didst confess the good confession"; Tit 1:16, "They profess that they know God;"); of epangellomai, "to announce one's self," "to make profession" (1 Tim 2:10; 6:21); of phēskō, "to say," "to assert" (Rom 1:22), "Profession" is the tr of homologō (2 Cor 9:13; 1 Tim 6:12; He 3:1, AV "the High Priest of our profession[ of our confessed faith]; 4:14; 10:23; in each instance RV has "confession"), "Profess" occurs in AV of Eccles 3:25, but the verse is omitted by RV; in "Most authorities omit verse 25." W. L. Walker

PROGNOSTICATORS, prog-nos-ti-kā-dēr, MONTHLY. See Astrology, 6.

PROLOGUE, pró-log, pró-log (πρόλογος, πρόλογος, "foreword," "preface," "introduction"); The word occurs in the preface to Eccles (Sir), and is con-
PROLONG, prô-long' ( Heb, 'arakh, ἀράχ, masbakh): “Prolong,” “prolonged” are the tr. of 'arakh, “to make long” (Dt 4:26) and frequently, “prolong days”; 4:40, etc; Job 6:11 AV; Prov 28:16; Eccl 7:15; 8:13; Isa 53:10; of masbach, “to draw out” (Isa 13:22; Ezek 25:25 AV); of yashaph, “to add,” “to increase” (Ps 61:6; Prov 10:27); of ndhah, “to stretch out,” “to stretch out to” (Job 32:9, “neither shall he prolong the perfection thereof upon the earth,” AV “neither shall their possessions be extended on the earth,” m “their produce bend to the earth”; ERV reverses text and margin); of ‘arakhah (Aram.) (Dtn 7:12; Yet their lives were prolonged,” AV “A prolonging in life was given them”), “Prolong” occurs in Exch 29:5, “prolong the time” (paraleksetai); 38:14, “prolong life,” RV “maintenance of life” (emboisin); 30:22, “prolongeth his days,” RV “length of days” (makroemereusa); 37:31, RV “shall prolong” (prostathe). W. L. Walker

PROFESS, prom'is (most frequently in the OT תָּרָא, dabbah, “speaking,” “speech,” and תָּרָא, dabbah, “to speak,” also תָּרָא, ἀμαρ, “to say,” once in Ps 77:8, ὀμηρ, “speech”; and in the NT ἐγγέγονα, epangegna, and the Heb. ἐγγέγονα, epangegnon, and compounds): Promise holds an important place in the Scriptures and in the development of the religion that culminated in Christ. The Bible is indeed full of “precious and extending great promises” (2 Pet 1:4), although the word “promise” is not always used in connection with them. Of the more outstanding promises of the OT may be mentioned: (1) the proto-evangelium (Gen 3:15); (2) the promise to Noah no more to curse the ground, etc (Gen 8:21, 22: 9-17; (3) most influential, the promise to Abraham to make him a great nation in whom all families of the earth shall be blessed, to give to him and his seed the land of Canaan (Gen 12:2, etc), often referred to in the OT (Ex 12:12; Dt 1:8; 11; 6:28; etc), the promise to David to make his house a throne (2 S 7:12,13.28; 1 K 2:24, etc); (5) the promise of restoration of Israel, of the Messiah, of the new and everlasting kingdom, of the new covenant and outpouring of the Spirit (Isa 2:2-5; 4:2; 56:5; 66:13; Jer 31:3; 33:10-12; 37:17-27; Ezk 36:24-32; 37:11; 39:25, etc). In the NT these promises are founded on, and regarded as having their true fulfillment in, Christ and those who are His (2 Cor 1:20; Eph 3:6). The promise of the Spirit is spoken of by Jesus as “the promise of my Father” (Lk 24:49; Acts 1:4), and this was regarded as fulfilled at Pentecost. The promise of a Saviour of the seed of David is regarded as fulfilled in Christ (Acts 13:23. 32:26; Rom 1:2; 4:13; 9:3). Paul argues that the promise to Abraham that he should be “heir of the world” (visualized to him before circumcision, is not confirmed to Israel, but is open to all who are children of Abraham by faith (Rom 4:13-16; cf Gal 3:16. 10:29). In like manner the writer to the Hebrews goes back to the original promises, giving them a spiritual and eternal significance (1:6, 17; 11, 9, etc). The NT promises include manifold blessings and hopes, among them “life,” “eternal life” (1 Tim 4:8; 6:19; 2 Tim 1:1; Jas 1:12), the “kingdom” (Jas 2:5), Christ’s “coming” (2 Pet 3:8, etc), “new heavens and a new earth” (2 Pet 3:13), etc. For “promised” and “promised” in AV, RV has frequently other terms, as “word” (Ps 105:42), “spake,” “spoken” (Dt 10:9; Josh 9:21; 22:4; 23:5, etc), “consented” (Lk 2:11, etc). References to the promises occur repeatedly in the Apro (Bar 2:34; 2 Mace 2:18; Wisl 12:21; cf 2 Esd 3:15; 5:29).

PROPER, prop'er; For AV “proper” (child), in Heb 11:23, RV substitutes “holyly,” in 1 Chr 29:3; 1 Cor 7:7, RV “own” is employed, and for the too emphatic “their proper tongue” in Acts 19 “their language” is written. But none of the AV forms are really obsolete.

PROPER NAMES. See Names, Proper.

PROPERTY, prop'er-ti. See Agrarian Laws; Jubilee; Poor; Portion; Primogeniture; Wealth.

PROPHETIC, prof'esi, prof'es-i, PROPHETS, prof'es-ta.

I. The Idea of Biblical Prophecy.

1. The Seer and Speaker of God.
2. Prophetical Character of Prophecy.
3. Relation to Dreams.
6. The Fulfillment.

II. Historical Development of the Prophetic Office.

1. Abraham.
4. Schools of Prophets.
5. Period of the Kinees.
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III. Historical Development of Prophecy.

1. Contents of Prophecy.
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3. Becoming the Exile (through Judgments to Deliverance).
4. Analogous Ideas among Heathen Peoples.
5. During the Exile (Ezekiel, Deutero-Isaiah, Malachi).
6. After the Exile (Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi).
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8. Partial Character of Prophecy.
9. Intermission of Prophecy.

IV. Analogous Phenomena among the Gentiles.

1. Necromancy and Technical Witchcraft.
2. The Magic Art.
3. Contents of Heathen Oracles.

LITERATURE

I. The Idea of Biblical Prophecy.

—According to the uniform teaching of the Bible the prophet is a servant of God, and speaks— but come from a higher source. For God he is at the same time, also, a seer, who sees things that do not lie in the domain of natural sight, or who sees things which human ears do not ordinarily receive: cf 1 S 9:9, where nabhah, “speaker,” and râ'eh, “seer,” are used as synonymous terms. Jer 23:16 and Ezek 13:2 are particularly instructive in this regard. In these passages a sharp distinction is made between those persons who only claim to be prophets but who prophecy “out of their own heart,” and the true prophets who declare the word which the Lord has spoken to them. In the latter case the contents of the prophetic speech are not originally in their own reflection or calculation; and just as little is this prophecy the product of their own feelings, fears or hopes, but, as something extraneous to man and independent of him, it has with a Divine certainty entered the soul of the prophet. The prophet has seen that which he prophesies, although he need not have seen it in the form of a real vision. He can also “see” words with his inner eyes (Isa 2:1, and often). It is only another expression for this when it is frequently said that God has spoken to the prophet. In this case too it is not necessary that
there must have been a voice which he could hear phonetically through his natural ear. The main thing is that he must have been able sharply to distinguish the contents of this voice from his own heart, i.e., from his personal consciousness. Only in this way is he capable of speaking to the people in the name of God and able to publish his word as that of Jeh. In this case he is the speaker of Jeh (nabī',) or the mouth of the Lord (cf Ezek 7 1 with 4 16). Under these conditions he then regards it as absolute compulsion to speak, just as a person must be filled with fear when he hears a lion roar nearby (Am 3 8). The words burn in his soul until he utters them (Jer 20 7 9).

The Divine power, which comes over a human being and compels him to see or to hear things which otherwise would be hidden from him, is called by various terms expressive of inspiration. It is said that the Spirit of God has come over someone (Nu 24 2; or has fallen upon him (Ezk 11 5); or that the hand of Jeh has come over him and laid hold of him (2 K 3 15; Ezek 1 3; 3 14.22, and often; or that the Holy Spirit has been put on him as a garment, i.e., has been incorporated in him (1 Ch 12 18; 2 Ch 24 20; or that the Spirit of the Lord has been seised upon him (Nu 11 25 f; 2 K 2 15; Isa 11 2; 61 1); or that God has given this Spirit of His (Nu 11 29; Isa 42 1); or pours Him out upon man (Joel 2 28 f [Heb 3 1 f]). But this inspiration is not such that it assures the human consciousness of the recipient, so that he would receive the word of God in the state of sleep or trance. But rather the recipient is in possession of his full consciousness, and is able afterward to give a clear account of what happened. Nor is there the individuality of the prophet eliminated by this Divine inspiration; unconsciously this individuality cooperates in the formal shaping of that which has been seen and heard. In accordance with the natural peculiarity of the prophet and with the contents of the message, the psychological condition of the recipient may be that of intense excitement or of calmness. As a rule the inspiration that takes possession of the prophet is evidenced also by an exalted and poetical language, and an unusual and rhythmically characteristic form, but is not bound to a narrow and mechanical meter. It is, however, also possible that poetical utterances find their expression in plain prose. The individual peculiarity of the prophet is also an aspect of the revelation which comes to him. In the one prophet he may find a preponderance of visions; another prophet has no visions. But the visions of the future which he sees are given in the forms and the color which have been furnished by his own consciousness. All the more the form in which the prophet gives expression to his word of God is determined by his personal talents and gifts as also by his experiences.

In a certain respect the dream can be cited as an analogous phenomenon, in which also the ideas that are slumbering in the soul uninvited are put in their appearance without being controlled by consciousness and reason.

The other hand, prophecy differs specifically from dreams, first, because the genuine prophetical utterance is received when the prophet is clearly conscious, and, secondly, because such an utterance brings with it a much greater degree of certainty and a greater guaranty of its higher origin that the Spirit of God imparts by a dream, which seems to be prophetical. In Jer 23 25 f it is declared that these two are entirely dissimilar, and the relation between the two is compared to straw and wheat. The Moslem Arabs also put a much lower estimate on the visionary dream than on the prophetical vision in a waking condition.

Because this Spirit of God acts with full freedom, He can select His organs at will from among every station, age or sex. The Spirit is not confined to any priestly class or organization. In any case it was the case of a spiration times that a prophet gathered disciples around himself, who could themselves in turn also be seized by his spirit, although the transmission of this spirit was a difficult matter. Yet it may be supposed that this spiration continued to be at all times a free gift of the sovereign God. Amos (7 14 f) appeals expressly to this fact, that he did not himself choose the prophet's calling nor was the pupil of a prophetical school, but that he had been directly called by Jeh from his daily occupation as a shepherd and workman. In the same way we indeed find prophets who belonged to the priestly order (Jeremiah, Ezekiel and others), but equally great is the number of those who certainly did not belong. Further, age made no difference in the call to the prophetical office. Even in his earliest youth Samuel was called to be a prophet (1 S 3 1 f), and it did not avail Jeremiah anything when he excused himself because of his youth. Even the uninvited, who is not conscious that he is seiz

2. Prophetic inspiration. It is said that the Spirit of God has come over someone (Nu 24 2; or has fallen upon him (Ezk 11 5); or that the hand of Jeh has come over him and laid hold of him (2 K 3 15; Ezek 1 3; 3 14.22, and often); or that the Holy Spirit has been put on him as a garment, i.e., has been incorporated in him (1 Ch 12 18; 2 Ch 24 20); or that the Spirit of the Lord has been seized upon him (Nu 11 25 f; 2 K 2 15; Isa 11 2; 61 1); or that God has given this Spirit of His (Nu 11 29; Isa 42 1); or pours Him out upon man (Joel 2 28 f [Heb 3 1 f]). But this inspiration is not such that it assures the human consciousness of the recipient, so that he would receive the word of God in the state of sleep or trance. But rather the recipient is in possession of his full consciousness, and is able afterward to give a clear account of what happened. Nor is there the individuality of the prophet eliminated by this Divine inspiration; unconsciously this individuality cooperates in the formal shaping of that which has been seen and heard. In accordance with the natural peculiarity of the prophet and with the contents of the message, the psychological condition of the recipient may be that of intense excitement or of calmness. As a rule the inspiration that takes possession of the prophet is evidenced also by an exalted and poetical language, and an unusual and rhythmically characteristic form, but is not bound to a narrow and mechanical meter. It is, however, also possible that poetical utterances find their expression in plain prose. The individual peculiarity of the prophet is also an aspect of the revelation which comes to him. In the one prophet he may find a preponderance of visions; another prophet has no visions. But the visions of the future which he sees are given in the forms and the color which have been furnished by his own consciousness. All the more the form in which the prophet gives expression to his word of God is determined by his personal talents and gifts as also by his experiences.

In a certain respect the dream can be cited as an analogous phenomenon, in which also the ideas that are slumbering in the soul uninvited are put in their appearance without being controlled by consciousness and reason.

The other hand, prophecy differs specifically from dreams, first, because the genuine prophetical utterance is received when the prophet is clearly conscious, and, secondly, because such an utterance brings with it a much greater degree of certainty and a greater guaranty of its higher origin that the Spirit of God imparts by a dream, which seems to be prophetical. In Jer 23 25 f it is declared that these two are entirely dissimilar, and the relation between the two is compared to straw and wheat. The Moslem Arabs also put a much lower estimate on the visionary dream than on the prophetical vision in a waking condition.

Because this Spirit of God acts with full freedom, He can select His organs at will from among every station, age or sex. The Spirit is not confined to any priestly class or organization. In any case it was the case of a spiration times that a prophet gathered disciples around himself, who could themselves in turn also be seized by his spirit, although the transmission of this spirit was a difficult matter. Yet it may be supposed that this spiration continued to be at all times a free gift of the sovereign God. Amos (7 14 f) appeals expressly to this fact, that he did not himself choose the prophet's calling nor was the pupil of a prophetical school, but that he had been directly called by Jeh from his daily occupation as a shepherd and workman. In the same way we indeed find prophets who belonged to the priestly order (Jeremiah, Ezekiel and others), but equally great is the number of those who certainly did not belong. Further, age made no difference in the call to the prophetical office. Even in his earliest youth Samuel was called to be a prophet (1 S 3 1 f), and it did not avail Jeremiah anything when he excused himself because of his youth. Even the uninvited, who is not conscious that he is seiz

4. Freedom confined to any priestly class or organization. In any case it was the case of a spiration times that a prophet gathered disciples around himself, who could themselves in turn also be seized by his spirit, although the transmission of this spirit was a difficult matter. Yet it may be supposed that this spiration continued to be at all times a free gift of the sovereign God. Amos (7 14 f) appeals expressly to this fact, that he did not himself choose the prophet's calling nor was the pupil of a prophetical school, but that he had been directly called by Jeh from his daily occupation as a shepherd and workman. In the same way we indeed find prophets who belonged to the priestly order (Jeremiah, Ezekiel and others), but equally great is the number of those who certainly did not belong. Further, age made no difference in the call to the prophetical office. Even in his earliest youth Samuel was called to be a prophet (1 S 3 1 f), and it did not avail Jeremiah anything when he excused himself because of his youth. Even the uninvited, who is not conscious that he is seiz

5. Supernatural teachers of religion and morals, as visions of the Future. The prophets are regarded as enthusiastic natural teachers of religion and morals, as warm patriots and politicians, to whom they ascribed nothing but a certain gift of the ability of guessing the future. But this was no explanation of the facts in the case. The prophets were themselves conscious of this, that they were not the intellectual authors of their higher knowledge. This consciousness is justified by the fact that they were, in a condition to make known things which lay beyond their natural horizon and which were contrary to all probability. These cases are particularly instructive in this respect which beyond a doubt were recorded by the prophets themselves. Ezekiel could indeed, on the basis of mere human and religious reflections, such as conviction that Zeckiah of Jerusalem would not escape his punishment for his political treachery and for his disobedience to the word of Jeh; but he could
never from this source have reached the certainty that this king, as the prophet describes the case in 12 8 ff, was to be taken captive while trying to escape from besieged city and was then to be blinded and taken to Babylon. Just as little could he in Babylon know the exact day when the siege of Jerus began (24 2). If this prophet had learned of these things in a natural way and had afterward clothed them in the form of prophecy, he would have been guilty of a deception, something unhind-erable in the case of so conscientious a preacher of morality. But such cases are frequently met with. Jeremiah predicts to Hananiah, that he would die during the year (28 16), but it is not only such matters of detail that presuppose a extraordinary wisdom of the prophet. The whole way also in which Jeremiah predicts the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jerusalemites, and to the desires of his own heart, shows that he was speaking under Divine compulsion, which was more powerful than his own reflections and sympathies. On any other proposition his conduct would have been reprehensible cowardice. The case of Isaiah is exactly the same. We must yield to the word of God as a guaran- tpy that the Syrians and the Ephraimites would not capture Jerus (7 4 ff), and when he promises Hezekiah that the Assyrians would not shoot an arrow into the city, but would return without having ac-complished their purpose (22 ff). These things were so much in contradiction to all the proba-bilities of the course events would take that he would have been a frivolous adventurer had he not received his information from higher sources. Does it not seem that these predictions which estab-lished and upheld the influence of the prophets. Thus in the case of Amos it was his prediction of a great earthquake, which did occur two years later (1 1); in the case of Elisha, the prediction of the long dealth (1 K 17 1); in the case of Elisha, the undertaking of the enemies (2 K 6 12), and in other cases. It is indeed true that the contents of the prophetic discourses are not at all confined to the future. Everything that God has to announce to mankind, revelations concerning His will, admonitions, warnings. He is also to announce the message of the prophet. But His determinations with reference to the future as a rule are connected with prophetical utterances of the latter kind. The prophets are watchmen, guardians of the people, who are called to the nations. They see the dangers and the judgments approaching, which must put in their appearance if the Divine will is disregarded. The prophets interpret also for the people that which is happening and that which has occurred, e.g. the defeats which they have suffered at the hands of their enemies, or the gang-rif, pestilence (Joel), or a famine. They lay bare the inner reason for external occurrences and explain such events in their connection with the providential government of God. This gives to prophecy a powerful moral unity, notwithstanding the great differences of times and surrounding circumstances. It is prophecy which the Heb people must thank for their higher conception of history. This people know of a Highest Author of all things and of a plan, to which all things that transpire must serve. God's plan has for its purpose to bring about the complete supremacy of His will among the children of men.

In genuine prophecy, according to Bib. concep-tions, the form it takes constitutes an integral part. It is set up by Dt 18 21 f as a proof of the genuineness of a prophet-utterance. The prophetic word "falls to the ground" (4 3 19) if it is not "raised up" ('ποτερίζω, kēstīn, "fulfil," for which we

more rarely find ιήσω, "fulfil," but regularly in the NT ποτερίζως, πληροισθαί, "being fulfilled") by the course of events. It would remain an empty word if it did not attain to its full content through its realization. In fact, in the case of a genuine prophet itself there dwells a Divine power, so that at the moment when he speaks the event takes place, even if it is not yet visible to man. This realization is also not infrequently represented symbolically by the prophet in confirmation of his prediction. Thus in a certain sense it is the prophet himself who through his word builds up and pulls down, plants and roots out (Jer 1 10; 25 15 ff). But the fulfilment can be judged by the contemporary, in the sense of extraordinary Divine vision of the prophet. The whole way also in which Jeremiah predicts the destruction of Jerusalem as inevitable, in direct contrast to the hopes of the Jerusalemites and to the desires of his own heart, shows that he was speaking under Divine compulsion, which was more powerful than his own reflections and sympathies. On any other proposition his conduct would have been reprehensible cowardice. The case of Isaiah is exactly the same. We must yield to the word of God as a guaran- tpy that the Syrians and the Ephraimites would not capture Jerus (7 4 ff), and when he promises Hezekiah that the Assyrians would not shoot an arrow into the city, but would return without having ac-complished their purpose (22 ff). These things were so much in contradiction to all the proba-bilities of the course events would take that he would have been a frivolous adventurer had he not received his information from higher sources. Does it not seem that these predictions which estab-lished and upheld the influence of the prophets. Thus in the case of Amos it was his prediction of a great earthquake, which did occur two years later (1 1); in the case of Elisha, the prediction of the long dealth (1 K 17 1); in the case of Elisha, the undertaking of the enemies (2 K 6 12), and in other cases. It is indeed true that the contents of the prophetic discourses are not at all confined to the future. Everything that God has to announce to mankind, revelations concerning His will, admonitions, warnings. He is also to announce the message of the prophet. But His determinations with reference to the future as a rule are connected with prophetical utterances of the latter kind. The prophets are watchmen, guardians of the people, who are called to the nations. They see the dangers and the judgments approaching, which must put in their appearance if the Divine will is disregarded. The prophets interpret also for the people that which is happening and that which has occurred, e.g. the defeats which they have suffered at the hands of their enemies, or the gross-hopper plague (Joel), or a famine. They lay bare the inner reason for external occurrences and explain such events in their connection with the providential government of God. This gives to prophecy a powerful moral unity, notwithstanding the great differences of times and surrounding circumstances. It is prophecy which the Heb people must thank for their higher conception of history. This people know of a Highest Author of all things and of a plan, to which all things that transpire must serve. God's plan has for its purpose to bring about the complete supremacy of His will among the children of men.

In genuine prophecy, according to Bib. concep-tions, the form it takes constitutes an integral part. It is set up by Dt 18 21 f as a proof of the genuineness of a prophet-utterance. The prophetic word "falls to the ground" (4 3 19) if it is not "raised up" ('ποτερίζω, kēstīn, "fulfil," for which we

more rarely find ιήσω, "fulfil," but regularly in the NT ποτερίζως, πληροισθαί, "being fulfilled") by the course of events. It would remain an empty word if it did not attain to its full content through its realization. In fact, in the case of a genuine prophet itself there dwells a Divine power, so that at the moment when he speaks the event takes place, even if it is not yet visible to man. This realization is also not infrequently represented symbolically by the prophet in confirmation of his prediction. Thus in a certain sense it is the prophet himself who through his word builds up and pulls down, plants and roots out (Jer 1 10; 25 15 ff). But the fulfilment can be judged by the contemporary, in the sense of extraordinary Divine vision of the prophet. The whole way also in which Jeremiah predicts the destruction of Jerusalem as inevitable, in direct contrast to the hopes of the Jerusalemites and to the desires of his own heart, shows that he was speaking under Divine compulsion, which was more powerful than his own reflections and sympathies. On any other proposition his conduct would have been reprehensible cowardice. The case of Isaiah is exactly the same. We must yield to the word of God as a guaran-
to face” with Moses (Nu 12 6 ff; Dt 34 10; cf Ex 33 11). Moses was the permanent organ through whom Jeh brought about the Egypt plagues and through whom He explained what these meant to His people and also to the world. He led the people in their journey through the desert, with God as their leader. The voice of Moses too had to explain to them the Divine signs in the desert and communicate to them the commandments of God. The legislation of Moses shows that he was not only filled with the Spirit of God occasionally, but that he abode with God for longer periods of time and produced something that is a well-ordered whole. A production such as the Law is the result of a continuous association with God.

Since that time revelation through prophecy was probably never entirely wanting in Israel (Dt 18 15). But this fountain did not always flow with the same fulness or clearness. Yet Deborah enjoyed a high rank as a prophetess, and for a long time pronounced decisions of justice in the name of the Lord before she, through her prophets, publicly pronounced the people to rise up against their oppressors. What is said in 1 S 3 1 concerning the times of Eli can be applied to this whole period, namely that the word and vision of the prophet had become rare in the land. All the mouths of the people were turned to the affairs of Samuel, while yet a boy received Divine revelations (1 S 3 1 ff). He was by the whole people regarded as a “seer” whose prophecies were always fulfilled (3 19). The passage 9 6 ff shows that the people obeyed the prophets and the word of God. His spirit was thus a prophetic one, and we find the story of the prophet Samuel in the Bible. This is the case when the prophet was working in the court of David (1 S 10 20). The school of David was a real school of prophetic instruction and education. The prophets were a true school of religious knowledge and education. The prophet was not only a religious teacher, but also a moral guide and a political counselor. The prophet was a true school of religious instruction and education. The prophet was a true school of religious knowledge and education.
are generally of a benevolent character. In connection with these he exhibits a remarkable degree of the gift of prophetical foresight (2 K 4 16; 5 26; 6 8 ff.; 7 1 ff.; 13 14-22; 19). Jonah, too, the son of Amittai, had at that time a favourable message for the Northern Kingdom (2 K 14 25).

However, the flourishing condition of the kingdom under Jeroboam II had an unfavorable influence on its spiritual development.

6. Amos, Soon Amos and Hosea were compelled to announce to this kingdom its impending destruction through a great world-power. These two prophets have left us books in which anticipation and necessities in written form had already been introduced before this. At any rate, many scholars are of the conviction that the prophecies of Obadiah and Joel belong to an earlier period, although others place them in the post-exilic period. In any case, the expectation of a day of settlement by Jeh with His people already was in the days of Amos common and current (5 18 ff.). As the writing of individual prophecies (Isa 8 1; 30 5; Hab 2 1 ff.) had for its purpose the laying of these words in a permanent and authentic form and to later on convince the reader of their wonderful fulfillment, the writing down of larger collections of prophecies had for its purpose to intensify the power of the prophetical word and to secure this as a permanent possession of the people (Jer 30 2; 36 1 ff.). Pupils of the prophets assisted them in this writing and in preserving their books (cf Jer 36 4; Isa 8 16).

It is to this custom that we owe our knowledge of the very existence of the utopian prophecies of many of the prophets of a later period. In addition to the larger books of Isa, Jer, Ezk, we have a number of smaller prophetic books, which have been united into the Book of the Twelve Prophets. These utterances as a rule exhibited an elevated form of language and are more or less poetical. However, in modern times some scholars are inclined to go too far in claiming that these addresses are given in a carefully systematized metrical form. Hebrew meter and ish is a freer form of expression than is Arabic or Sanskrit meter, and this is all the more the case with the discourses of the prophets, which were not intended for musical rendering, and which are expressed in a rhythmically unrhymed rhetoric, which appears now in one and then in another form of melody, and often changes into prose.

In the kingdom of Judah the status of the prophets was somewhat more favorable than it was in Ephraim. They were indeed forced to contend against the in Ephraim. They were indeed forced to contend against the injustices of the part of the ruling classes and against immorality of all kinds. But in this kingdom there were at any rate from time to time found kings who walked more in the footsteps of David. Thus Asa followed the directions of the prophet Azariah (2 Ch 15 1 ff.). It is true that the prophet Hanani censured this king, but it was done for a different reason. Jehoshaphat also regularly consulted the prophets. Among those who had dealings with him Elisha is also mentioned (2 K 3 14), as also some other prophets (cf 2 Ch 19 2; 20 14-37). The greatest among the prophets during the period of the Assyrian invasions was Isaiah, who performed the duties of his office for more than 40 years, and under the kings Jotham, Ahaz, Hezekiah, and possibly too under Manasseh, through his word exercised a powerful influence upon the king and the nation. Although a preacher of judgments, he at critical times appeared also as a prophet of consolation.

Nor did he despise external evidences of his prophetical office (cf 7 11; 38 22, 8). His contemporary Micah is in full agreement with him, although he was not called to deal with the great of the land, with kings, or statesmen, as was the case with Isaiah. Nahum, Zephaniah and Habakkuk belong rather to the period of transition from the Assyrian to the Chaldaean periods. In the days of Josiah the prophetess Huldah had great influence in Jerus (2 K 22 14). Much more important under this same king was the prophet Jeremiah, who was called by God for a great mission. This prophet during the siege and destruction of Jerus and after that time spoke as an unyielding yet deeply feeling exponent of the prophetical utterances and called again and again to dash to the ground the false hopes of the patriots, whenever these arose. Not so firm was his contemporary and fellow-sufferer Uriah (Jer 26 20).

In the time of the exile itself we find the period of the activity of Ezekiel. It was significant that this prophet became the recipient of Divine revelations while on Bab territory. His work was, in accordance with the condition of things in the Babylonian captivity, that of a poet and a literary man. He seems also to have been a bodily sufferer. His abnormal conditions became symbolical signs of that which he had to proclaim. Deuter-Isaiah, too (Isa 40 ff.), spoke during the Babylonian Exile, as Hosea had done, and prepared for the return. The peculiar prophecies of Daniel are also accorded to a prophet living during the exile, who occupied a distinguished position at the court of the heathen rulers, and whose apocalyptic utterances are of a kind different from the discourses of the other prophets, as they deal more with the political condition of the world and the drama of history, in so far as this tends toward the establishment of the supremacy of Jeh. These prophecies were collected in later times and did not receive their final and present form until the Gr period at the beginning of the 2nd cent. BC.

After the return from Babylonia the Jews were exhorted by Hagga and Zechariah to rebuild their temple (about 520 BC). At that time there were still to be found prophets of the Exile who took a hostile attitude to the men of God. Thus Nehemiah (Neh 6 6–14) was opposed by hostile prophets as also by a prophetess, Huldah. In contrast to these, Malachi is at all times in accord with the canonical prophets, as he was an ardent advocate for the temple cultus of Jeh, not in the sense of a spiritless and senseless external worship, but as against the current indifference to Jeh. His style and his language, too, evidence a late age. The lyrical form has given way to the didactic. This is also probably the time when the present Book of Jonah was written, a didactic work treating of an older tradition. Malachi is regarded by the Jews as the last really canonical prophet. While doubtless there was not a total lack of prophetically endowed seers and speakers of God also in the closing centuries of the pre-Christian era, nevertheless the general conviction prevailed that the Spirit of God was no longer present, e.g. in the times of the Maccabees (cf 1 Mac 4 46; 9 37; 14 41). It is true that certain modern critics ascribe some large sections of these books to the work of later hands, even to a period as late as the Gr. But this is refuted by the fact mentioned in Eccles (beginning of the 2nd cent. BC) that in the writer’s time the prophetical Canon appeared already as a closed collection. Dnl is not found in this collection, but the Book of the Twelve Minor Prophets is. It was
during this period that apocalyptic literature began
to flourish, many specimens of which are found
among the Apoc and the Pseudepigrapha. These
books consist of eschatological speculations, not
the product of original inspiration, but emanating
from a store of the prophetic. The prophetic name Pseudepigrapha shows that the author issued
his work, not under his own name, but under the
pseudonym of some man of God from older times,
such as Enoch, Ezra, Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah,
Baruch, and others. This fact alone proves the
secondary character of this class of literature. See
**Apocalyptic Literature**.

Malachi finds a successor in John the Baptist,
whose coming the former had predicted. John is
the greatest of the prophets, because

12. **Prophecy**
he could directly point to Him who completed
the NT in the NT
filled its promises. All that we know in addition concerning the times of
Jesus shows that the prophetic gift was yet thought of as possibly dwelling in many, but that
prophecy was no longer the chief spiritual guide of the people (cf. e.g., Jos, 
Ant, 
XIII, xi, 2;  
XX, 
X, 5, among the Essenes, or in the case of Hyrcanus, op. cit., 
XIII, ii). Jos had to live with the prophetic gifts at times (cf. 
Bd, III, viii, 9). He is thinking in this connection chiefly of the prediction of some
details. Such "prophets" and "prophetic
esse" are reported also in the NT. In Jesus Christ Himself the prophet office reached its highest
stage of development, as He stood in a more
intimate relation than any other being to His Heavenly Father and spoke His word entirely and at all times.

In the Christian congregation the office of prophecy is again found, differing from the proclamation of the
gospel by the apostles, evangelists, and teachers.
In the NT the terms **prophētēs**, **prophetēs**, **prophētēa**, **prophetēia**, **prophetēs**, **prophetēdua**, signify speaking under the extraordinary influence of
the Holy Ghost. Thus in Acts 11:27 (prophecy of a famine by Agabus); 21:10 f (prediction of the sufferings of 
Paul); 13:1 f (exhortation to mission work); 21:9 ff (prophetic gift of the daughters of 
Philip). Paul himself also had this gift (Acts 16:6; 18:11). See how all Jewish public services of the church, prophecy occupied a prominent
position (see esp. 1 Cor 14:14). A prophetic book in a special sense is the Apocalypse of St. John. The gift of prophecy was claimed by many also in later times of the church, and more as the Christian church more and more developed on the historical basis of revelation as completed in Christ. Esp. in spiritually aroused eras in the history
of the church, prophecy again puts in its appearance. It has never ceased altogether, but on account of its frequent misuse the gift has become
discredited. Jesus Himself warned against false prophets, and during the apostolic times it was often found necessary to urge the importance of trying spirits (1 Jn 4:17; 1 Cor 12:10; 14:29).

III. **Historical Development of Prophecy.** —The contents of prophecy are by no means merely
predictions concerning the future. That
1. Contents
which is given by the Spirit to the spirit of prophecy can refer to the past and to the
present as well as to the future. However, that which is revealed to the prophet finds its inner unity in this, that it all aims to estab-

lish the supremacy of Jeh. Prophecy views also the detailed events in their relation to the Di-
vine plan, but for the latter has the absolute establishment of the supremacy of Jeh in
Israel and eventually on the entire earth. We are accustomed to call those utterances that predict this final purpose the Messianic prophecies. How-
ever, not only those that speak of the person of the

Messiah belong to this class, but all that treat of
the coming of the kingdom of God.

The beginnings of the religion of Israel, as also
the chief epoch in its development, emanated from
prophetic revelations. The prophecy of the tribal religion into
of the

a national religion, and at the same
time taught the people to regard the
religion of the fathers more ethically, spiritually and vitally. Samuel crowned the earthly
form of theocracy in introducing an "Anointed of Jeh" in whom the covenant relation between Jeh and Israel was concentrated personally. The Anointed of the Lord entered into a much more
intimate relationship to Jeh as His Son or Servant
than it was possible for the whole people of Israel
to do, although as a people they were also called
the servant or the son of God (cf Ps 2 7ff; 110).
The Ps of David are a proof of this, that this high
destiny of the kingdom was recognized. David
himself became a prophet in those hymns in which he describes his own unique relation to Jeh. But
the actual kings of history as a rule corresponded
too imperfectly to this idea. For this reason the
word "prophetic" already in David's time directs
to the future and shall be more perfectly realized (2 S 7 12 ff; cf. David's own
words, 2 S 23 4 ff). See **Messiah**.

Solomon completed the external equipment of the
theocracy by the erection of the temple. But
it was only a temporary thing, the turning-point, from which time on
the Exile
the prophets begin to emphasize the judgment to come, i.e. the dissolution of the external existence of the kingdom of Jeh. Yet prophecy begins to prepare the way
that a kernel of the Divine establishment on Zion
remains intact. The Divine establishment of the
sanctuary and the kingdom cannot be destroyed;
all that is necessary is that they be restored in
greater purity and dignity. This can be seen also in
Amos, who predicts that the fallen tabernacle of
David shall be raised up again (Am 9 11ff), which
shall then be followed by a condition of undis-
turbed blessing. The same is found in Hosea, who
sees how all Israel is again united under "David"
the king of the last times, when between God and the people, between heaven and earth, an unbroken covenant of love shall be made (Hos 2 1ff); and also in Isaiah, who predicts that during the |j| period of the country by the Gentiles a Son of David shall be born in a miraculous manner and attain supremacy (Isa 7 14; 
9 2ff; 11 1ff), and who speaks constantly of that
Divine establishment on Zion (cf the quiet waters of Shiloah, 8 6), the foundation stone that has been laid by Jehovah (28 16, etc.). Micah, his contemporary, does the same, and in an entirely similar manner predicts that the radical judgment of destruction which shall
come over the temple and the royal palace shall be followed by the wondrous King of Peace from Beth-
lehem (5 1ff). Possibly even a little later, in
the date Zec 9 9 described this future ruler in similar
terms. In general it is not probable that Isaiah and
Micah were the first to speak so personally of this
King. They seem to presuppose that their con-
temporaries were acquainted with this idea.

In recent times scholars have pointed to the fac-
that in the old Orient, among the Egyptians, the
Babylonians and elsewhere, the ex-
ppectation of a miraculously born King
of, when this promise is to be
more people and to all nations salvation
and peace, was entertained at an early
er period. Yet so much is certain, that
Isaiah and Micah did not base their
hopes on the vague dreams of the gentle world, but
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upon the prophetic establishment of a Divine sanctuary and kingdom of Zion. The personal figure of the Son of Man is not so much in the foreground as in the other prophets, and is brought down to the suffering Man, the exile. These prophets mention only casually the Good Shepherd, e.g. Jer 23 1 ff.; 33 12 ff.; Ezek 34 23 f. But after that time this Messianic expectation became a permanent element in the hopes of Israel. The Messianic, prophecy had thrown much light on the ways of God, which prepare for His kingdom on earth. Even long before Amos (5 18 ff.) the idea of a “day of Jehovah,” which was to be a day of revelation, on which God makes a settlement with the world, had already been known, since Amos is already compelled to protest against the abuse of this expectation. But hand in hand with this settlement we find also and at all times the expectation of the exaltation and of the salvation of Israel. Yet the prophets have all emphasized that Israel and Judah must first be thoroughly purified by a judgment, before the land could, through God’s grace, be glorified and richly blessed. The judgment which the preexilic prophets are continually predicting is, however, only a means to an end. This judgment is not the final word of the Lord, as Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah and Habakkuk constantly teach. They announce that return to Jehovah and obedience to His commandments is the way to salvation. Thus, Isa 40 1 ff., 24 f. However, the prophets know that the people will not turn again to God, but that first the Jewish state must be entirely overthrown (Isa 6). It is particularly deserving of notice, that believing trust in Jehovah is regarded as the pivot, if not the foundation (Isa 7 9; 30 15; Hab 2 4). It is through this that the ‘remnant’ of the faithful, “the kernel” of the people, is saved. Also in the case of Jeremiah, whose work it was to predict the immediate destruction of Judah, there is not about a kind of an esoteric book of consolation. His battle cry for the future is “Jehovah our righteousness” (23 6; 33 16). In his case we find a rich spiritualization of religion. The external customs, circumcision and the like, he declares, do no good, if the true state of the heart is lacking. Even the ark of the covenant is unnecessary and is discarded in the enlargement of the sanctuary. Ezekiel, who lays more stress on the external ordinances, nevertheless agrees with Jeremiah in this, that Jehovah together with this temporal destruction of the temple and the prophet in his spirit builds the sanctuary again; notwithstanding the external character of his restoration, there is yet found in his picture a further development of its spiritual character. The ethical rights and the responsibility of the individual are strongly emphasized (Ezek 18, 33). The land becomes transformed; the Gentiles are received into the covenant of God.

Deutero-Isa (Isa 40 66), during the time of the Babylon captivity, enriches prophecy in an extraordinary manner, through the figure of the true "Servant of Jehovah," who in a peaceful way, through his words of instruction and exhortation, his innocent sufferings and his vicarious deeds, converts Israel, the wicked, and the Gentile, and also wins over the gentile world to Jehovah. It was not possible that the picture of a suffering man of God, who through his death as a martyr attains to exaltation, should be suggested to the Jews by the altogether physical figure of a death and resurrection of a Judah God (Ezram zus-Adonai). Since the unjust persecutions of Joseph and David they were acquainted with the sufferings of the just, and Jehovah’s life as a prophet was a continuous martyrdom. But the writer of the second part of Isaiah had before his eyes a vision that far exceeded all these types in purity and in greatness to such a degree as did David’s Son in Isa and Mic surpass His great ancestor Hezekiah to a completion the kingdom of God through the resurrection and spiritualizes and attains to the glory of rulership. In this way He unites the offices of prophet, priest, and king.

After the exile prophecy continues its work. The Messianic expectations, too, are developed further in the meantime by Haggai, and still more by Zechariah.

6. After the Exile.

The Day of Jehovah excites before this a complete purification of the people of God. God Himself will come, and His kingdom will prove known. The last book of Daniel picture the transformation of the world into a kingdom of God. The latter will mark the end of the history of the world. It comes from above; the earthly kingdoms are from below, and are pictured as beasts; the Ruler of the kingdom of God is a Son of man. The latter comes with the clouds of the heaven to take possession of His kingdom (Dan 7 13 ff.). Then the judgment of the world will take place and intervene also each human being, who before the will bodily arise from the dead, in order to enter upon blessedness or condemnation. Here we find indicated a universal expansion of the kingdom of God extending over the whole world and all mankind.

If we survey the character of the kingdom of God and its Divinely blessed Ruler, the Messiah, from a Christian standpoint, we find that a grand Divine unity connects its different elements. The form of this connection is indicated by believers for the character of Prophecy. The prophets were compelled to speak so that their hearers could understand them. Only gradually do they come to be understood. Only gradually do they become spiritualized, e.g. the kingdom of God is still pictured by the prophets as established around the local center of Zion. Mt. Zion is in a concrete manner exalted, in order to give expression to its importance, etc. It is the NT fulfillment that for the first time gives adequate form to Divine revelation. At least in the person of Jesus Christ this perfection is given, although the full unfolding of this kingdom is yet a matter of the future.

A second characteristic feature of prophecy is the partial nature in which the individual utterances and prophetic pictures. One partial picture must be supplemented by the other, in order not to be misunderstood of Prophecy. Thus, e.g. according to Isa 66 13 14; Zec 9 13 ff., it appears that the kingdom of God was to be established by force of arms. But the same prophets show in other utterances (Isa 9 6 f; Zec 9 9 f) that these warlike expressions are to be understood figuratively, since the Messianic King is more than all others a Prince of Peace.

A third feature that deserves attention is the perspective character of prophecy. The prophet sees together and at once upon the surface of the pictures things which are to be fulfilled only successively and gradually. Thus, e.g. Deutero-Isa sees of Prophecy in the near future the return from captivity, and directly connected with this a miraculous glorification of the city of God. The return does not mean a literal fact take place soon afterward, but the glorification of the city in which Jehovah had promised to dwell was yet in the distant future. The succeeding prophets, Haggai and Zechariah, predict that this consummation shall take place in the future. Also in many predictions concerning the future made by Jesus and in the Apocalypse of St. John,
these characteristics of prophecy, its contemporaneous and perspective and at times symbolic features, are not disregarded. The firm prophetic word is intended to give the congregation certain directive lines and distinctive guidance. But an adequate idea of what is to come the Christian church will become compelled to form for itself, when the fulfillment and completion shall have taken place.

IV. Analogous Phenomena among Gentiles—The uniqueness of the Bible, and God's grasp as fully only when we try to find analogies among the gentle peoples. Here we find everywhere the intent of soothsaying, the headquarters for which was Babylon. But with this art the prophecies of the OT stand out in bold contrast (cf. the prohibitions in Lev 19:26; Dt 18:10, prohibitions that refer to necromancy for the purpose of discovering the future). This art was practised through a medium, a person who had an 'abib (Bab. ucb), i.e. a spirit that brought forth the dead in order to question them. The spirits were thought to speak in mumurings or piping sounds (Isa 8:19), which could be imitated by the mediums (vocalist). And the mediums, which forbade this under penalty of death, Saul had tried to destroy those who practised incantations, who generally were women (1 S 28:9). This practice, however, continued to flourish. In addition, the Babylonians and other peoples had also a developed art of interpretation in order to find omens for the future. The was the examination of intestines practised by them. The liver of sacrificial animals particularly was carefully examined, and, from its condition, good or bad news were inferred (cf. Ezk 21:21). See Divination. This art passed over from the Babylonians to the seafaring Etruscans, and from these came to the Romans. But other phenomena also were by the different nations interpreted as prophetically significant and were by those skilled in this art interpreted accordingly. Among these were misarraigns by human beings and animals, the actions of men, horses, the flight of birds, earthquakes, forms of the clouds, lightning, and the like. Further, mechanical contrivances were used, such as casting of lots, stones, sticks, etc.

More spiritual and popular was the interpretation of dreams. It also was the case that mediums interpreted their prophecies into semi-waking trance. In this way the suitable mediums attained to a certain kind of clairvoyance, found among various peoples. This approaches the condition of an ecstatically aroused pseudo-prophet, of whom mention is made above. In Greece, too, oracles were pronounced by the Pythian prophetesses, who by vapors and the like was aroused to a practice of the mantic art. In Dojana it was the voice of the deity in the natural phenomena that were read in the rustling of the trees and the mumurings of the water. How uncertain these sources were was well known to heathen antiquity. The ancients complain of the enigmatical character of the Sibylline utterances and the doubtful nature of what was said. See Greece, Religion of. In contrast to this, Israel knows that it possesses in prophecy a clear word (Nu 23:23).

But the contents also of the Bible prophecies are unique through their spiritual uniformity and greatness. The oracle at Delphi, too, at times showed a certain moral elevation and could be regarded as the conscience of the nation. But how insignificant and meager is that which it offered to those who questioned it in comparison with the spontaneous utterances of the prophets of Israel! Also what has in recent times been said concerning the "prophetic texts" from ancient Egypt (Grasemann, Texte und Bilder, 1910) may, indeed show external similarity to the prophecies of Israel; but they lack the spiritual and religious depth and the strictly ethical dignity of the prophecies of the Scriptures, as also the consistency with which these from century to century reveal the thoughts of God and make known with constantly increasing clearness their purposes and goal.


PROPHECY, GIFT OF. See Spiritual Gifts.

PROPHESYING, prof'esi-ing, FALSE: The distinction between the true and the false prophecy and prophets is very difficult to state. Broadly speaking, the false prophesy, related itself to the national ideal independently by any spiritual equality, while the true prophecy ever kept uppermost the spiritual conception of the national life. Among those given to false prophecy were the ones who spoke after "the deceit of their own heart" (Jer 14:14). These were, in their desire to be in the crowd which the people desired, so in a measure as to be considered worthy of punishment and even death. There were, however, false prophecies by men who honestly believed themselves to have a message from Jeh. These prophecies from self-deceived prophets often led the people astray. The dream of national greatness was substituted for the voice of Jeh. It was against such prophesy, that the true prophets had to contend. The only test here was the spiritual character of the utterance, and this test divine power sought to give. Spiritual utterances and spiritual sense which the people did not always possess. Consequently, in times of moral darkness the false prophets, predicting smooth things for the nation, independent of repentance, consolation and the pursuit of spiritual ends, were looked above the true prophets who emphasized the moral greatness of Jeh and the necessity of righteousness for the nation. In NT times false prophecy did much injury in the church. See Prophecy.

PROPHET, THE OLD. See Old Prophet, THE.

PROPHETESS, prof'et-ës (προφήτις, nœghtês; profetèς, profétès): Women were not excluded from the prophetic office in the OT, and were honored with the right of prophetic utterance in the
PROPITIATION, pro-pish'ah-šun: The word is Lat. and brings into its Eng. use the atmosphere of heaven for winning the favors, or averting the anger of the Deity, and in the OT it represents a number of Heb. words—ten, including derivatives— which are sufficiently discussed under ATONEMENT (q.v.), of which propitiation is one aspect. It represents in LXX the Gr. terms ἱλαστήριον, ἱλασις (like, hila, and καταλαγή, katalagē), with derivatives; in the NT only the latter, and is rarely used. Propitiation needs to be studied in connection with reconciliation, which is used frequently in some of the apocryphal sentences of the OT, esp. in the newer VSS. In Hebrew 2 17, ERV and ARV have both changed “reconciliation” of AV to “propitiation,” to make it correspond with the OT use in connection with the sacrifice on the Day of Atonement. Hebrew 8 13 (“God, our merci[m "the propitiator"] to me the sinner” [AVm]); Hebrews 11 12 (quoted from LXX); and Hebrews 10 22 (an idiomatical asseveration like Eng. “mercy on us”) will help in getting at the usage in the NT. In LXX hilastrarion in the same term for the “mercy-seat” or “lid of the ark” of the covenant which was sprinkled with blood on the Day of Atonement. It is employed in exactly this sense in Hebrew 9 5, where later VSS have in the “propitiatory.”

Elsewhere in the NT this form is found only in Romans 3 25, and it is here that difficulty and difference are found extensively in interpreting. Greek fathers generally and prominent modern scholars understand Paul here to say that God appointed Christ Jesus to be the “mercy-seat” for sinners. The reference, while primarily to the Jewish ceremonial in tabernacle and temple, would not depend upon this reference for its comprehension, for the idea was general in religious thought, that some place and method had to be provided for securing a friendly meeting with the Deity, offended by man’s sin. In Hebrews, particularly, as elsewhere generally, Jesus Christ is presented as priest and sacrifice. Many modern writers (cf Sanday and Headlam), therefore, object that to translate Him the “mercy-seat” here complicates the figure still further, and so would understand hilastrarion as “expiatory sacrifice.” While this is not impossible, it is better to take the word in the usual sense of “mercy-seat.” It is not necessary to complicate the illustration by bringing in the idea of priest at all here, since Paul does not do so; mercy-seat and sacrifice are both in Christ. Δωρεάν, δοσιμαζότος, is found in the NT only in 1 Corinthians 15 10. Here the idea is active grace, or mercy, or friendliness. The teaching corresponds exactly with that in Romans. “Jesus Christ the righteous” is our “Advocate [in ‘Helper’] with the Father,” because He is active mercy concerning (ἐμπιστεύεσθαι our sins and those of the whole world. Or (4 10), God “loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation [or ‘mercy-seat’] (as a necessary compensation to) our sins.” This last passage is parallel with Romans 3 25, the one dealing with the abstract theory, and so Christ is set forward as a “mercy-seat,” the other dealing with experience of grace, and so Christ is the mercy of God in a concrete expression.

The basic Heb. term is that of covering what is offensive, so restoring friendship, or causing to be kindly disposed. The Gr. terms lack the physical reference to covering but introduce the idea of clearing away sin, and so forgiveness would be natural; hence graciousness.

2. Theological

Propitiation: Naturally, therefore, the idea of expiation entered into the concept. It is esp. to be noted that all provisions for this friendly relation of the four fathers of God and offending man find their initiation and provision in God and are under His direction, but involve the active response of man. All heathen and unworthily conceptions are removed from the Christian notion of propitiation by the fact that God Himself provided, or ‘set forth,’ the gift. He was the one who did this in the supreme expression of ultimate love. God had all the while been merciful, friendly, “passing over” man’s sins with no apparently adequate, or just, ground for doing so. Now in the blood of Christ sin is condemned and expiated, and God is able to establish and maintain His character for righteousness, while He continues and extends His dealing in gracious love with sinners who exercise faith in Jesus. The propitiation originates with God, not to appease Himself, but to justify Himself in His universal kindness to men deserving harshness. Cf also as to reconciliation, as in Romans 5 11–12; 2 Corinthians 5 18 ff. See also JOHANNINE THEOLOGY, V. 2.

LITERATURE.—Besides the comm., the literature is the same as for Atonement, to recent works on which add Stalker, The Atonement: Workman, At One, or Reconciliation with God, Moberly, in Foundations, Christian Belief in Terms of Modern Thought.

WILLIAM OWEN CARVER

PROPORTION, pro-pör-shun: Occurs once in the sense of “space” as the tr of Heb. נפח as translated in 1 Chronicles 22 11 (KJV “the third part” or “open space”) (1 Chronicles 7 30, AVm “Heb. naktedness,” RV “space”); once in the obsolete sense of “form” as the tr of ארכה, “array,” or “row” (Job 41 12, RV “frame”); and once in the sense of “measure” as the tr of analogia, “proportion,” or “equality” (Romans 12 6, “the proportion of faith,” RV “the proportion of our faith”). “Proportionally” occurs in 1 Corinthians 13 5, analogia, RV “in like proportion,” m “correspondently.”

PROSELYTE, pro-sel-īt, pro-sel-īt-ēs, from prosērekhamō, “I approach”): For 4 1 in the NT. In the LXX it often occurs as the tr of γέρ, the Heb. vb. ger means “to sojourn,” ger accordingly means a stranger who has come to settle in the land, as distinguished on the one hand from ירוה, a “homeborn” or “native,” and on the other from נכרי or ben-vehikkar, which means a stranger who is only passing through the country. Yet it is to be noted that in 2 Chronicles 17 17 those of the native tribes still living in the land as Amorites, Hittites, etc., are also called gerim. In two places (Exodus 12 19; Isaiah 41 1) LXX uses ἀγηγόρας, which is derived from ἀγιορ, the Aram. equivalent for ger. LXX uses προσόκες (the Gr. equivalent for Heb תושב, “a settler”) for ger when Israel or the patriarchs are indicated (Genesis 16 13; 23 4; Exodus 8 22; 18 3; Deuteronomy 23 7; 1 Chronicles 29 15; Psalms 39 12; 119 19; Jeremiah 14 8), and in a few other cases. In Talmudic lit. ger always stands for proselyte in the NT sense, i.e., a Gentile who has been converted to Judaism. Onkelos, who was himself a proselyte, always translates the word in this way.

No difficulties were put in the way of those strangers who wished to settle down in the land of Israel. All strangers, the third generation of Egyptians and Edomites included, and only Ammonites and Moabites excluded, could enter “the congregation of God” without circumcision and without the obligation to keep the ceremonial law.

1. Ger in the OT

No mention is made of such a word in the OT.
The stranger within the gate was free to cut meat which was prohibited to the Israelite (Dt 14.21).
If, however, the stranger wished to take part in the Passover, he must be circumcised. The keeping of the Sabbath and other feasts was regarded rather as a privilege than as a duty (Ex 23.12; Dt 16.11.14); but according to Lev 16.29 the ġēr was obliged to keep the fast of Atonement. He was forbidden on pain of death to blaspheme (Lev 24.16) or to offer children to Moḥeš (Lev 20.2). If he desired to bring a burnt offering, the same law applied to him as to the Israelites (Lev 17.8; 22.18). To the Jewish law he was not a proselyte; and it was probably for this class that tablets of warning in the temple were inscribed in Gr and Lat.

Many gladly frequented the synagogues and kept some of the Jewish laws and customs. Among those were to be found the "men who feared God," spoken of in Acts. They were not called to dispense with the proselytizing propaganda of the Jew.

Many gladly frequented the synagogues and kept some of the Jewish laws and customs. Among those were to be found the "men who feared God," spoken of in Acts. They were neither called to dispense with the proselytizing propaganda of the Jew.

Among the converts to Judaism there were probably few who were circumcised, and most of those who were circumcised submitted to the rite in order to marry Jewesses, or to enjoy the rights and privileges granted to Jews by Syrian and Roman rulers (Jos, Ant, XIV, vii, 2; XX, vii, 1; cf XVI, vii, 6). It would appear from Christ's words (Mt 23.15, "one proselyte") that the number of full proselytes was not large. Hyrcanus forced the Edomites to adopt Judaism by circumcision (129 BC); and on other occasions the same policy of propaganda by force was followed. Jos tells an interesting story (Ant, XX, ii, 1) of the conversion of Queen Helena of Adiabene and her two sons. The conversion of the sons was due to the teaching of a merchant called Ananias, who did not insist on circumcision. Later, another Jew, Eliezer of Galilee, told the young princes that it was not enough to read the Law, but that they must keep it. This was the counsel of both the Pharisees and the Sadducees. From this it is evident that Jewish teachers of the gentile converts varied in the strictness of their teaching.

The word "proselyte" occurs 4 times in the NT; once in Mt (23.15), where Our Lord referred to the proselyting zeal of the Pharisees, and 3 in the NT Acts. Proselytes were present at Pentecost (Acts 2.10); Nicolas, one of the deacons appointed by the primitive church at Jerusalem, was a proselyte (6:5); and after Paul had spoken in the synagogue at Antioch of Pisidia, many devout proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas (13.43). It is to be noted in this last case that the proselytes are called sebōmenoi, a word generally reserved for another class. Certain people are spoken of in Acts as phōbōmenoi tōn theōn, "fearing God" (10:2:22.35; 13:16:26), and as sebōmenoi tōn theōn, "reverencing God," or simply sebōmenoi (13:50; 18:14; 17:4.17,14).

The proselytes were probably as fanatical opponents of Christianity as were the Jews.
From the old strict Pharisaic-Palestinian point of view, circumcision, with the addition of baptism and the offering of sacrifice, was indispensable (so to Paul every circumcised person was a Jew; cf Gal 5:3); and thus their converts had to submit to this whole burden of the Mosaic and traditional law. The rabbinic distinction between gĕr tōshābāh, "a settler," and gĕr ḍeqeṭ, "a proselyte of righteousness," is, according to Schürer, only theoretical, and arose at a later date (Babba' Ḍeqeṭ l. 2:3; Naḥaṭ r. 3 1, et al.).

While the gĕr ḍeqeṭ (or gĕr ḥabba'ah, "proselyte of the covenant") was considered as being in every respect a "perfect Israelite," the gĕr tōshābāh (or gĕr sha'ur, "proselyte of the gate"); cf Ex 20:10 only professed his faith in the God of Israel, and bound himself to the observance of the 7 Noahic precepts, abstaining from blood, idols, homicide, fornication, robbery, eating the flesh of an animal that had died a natural death, and disobedience to (Jewish) authority (Sanh. 56a; cf Acts 15:20,29; 21:23). He was considered more of a Gentile than a Jew.

Three things were required for the admission of a proselyte, circumcision, baptism, and the offering of sacrifice (Bab. Ḍeqeṭ l. 7: 3; Yebḥam. 45a, 45b, 46a, 75a, 'Abbaḥ ḍeqaṭ et al. ). In the case of women only baptism and the offering of sacrifice were required; for that reason there were more women converts than men. Jos (I, II, xx, 2) tells how most of the women of Damascus were addicted to the Jewish religion. Doubt has been expressed as to the necessity of proselytes being baptized, since there is no mention of it by Paul or Philo or Jos, but it is probable that a Gentile, who was unclean, would not be admitted to the temple without being cleansed.

The proselyte was received in the following manner. He was first asked his reason for wishing to embrace Judaism. He was told that Israel was in a state of affliction; if he replied that he was aware of the fact and felt himself unworthy to share these afflictions, he was admitted. Then he received an instruction in some of the "light" and "heavy" commandments, the rules concerning eating and tithe, and the penalties attached to the breach of these. If he was willing to submit to all this, he was circumcised, and after his recovery he was immersed without delay. At this latter ceremony two "disciples of the wise" stood by to tell him more of the "light" and "heavy" commandments when he came up after the immersion, those assembled addressed him saying: "Unto whom hast thou given thyself? Blessed art thou, thou hast given thyself to God; the world was created for the sake of Israel, and only Israelites are called the children of God. The afflictions, of which we spoke, we mentioned only to make thy reward the greater." After his baptism he was considered to be a new man, "a little child newly born" (Yebḥam. 22a, 47a, 48a, 97b); a new name was given him; either he was named "Abraham the son of Abraham," or the Scriptures were opened at hazard, and the first name that was read was given to him. Thenceforth he had to put behind him all his past; even his marriage ties and those of kinship no longer held good (cf Yebḥam. 22a; Sanh. 56a).

Although he was thus juridically considered a new man, and one whose praises were sung in the Talmudic literature, he was yet on the whole looked down on as inferior to a born Jew (Kid. 4:2; Shab. 10 9, et al.). Rabbi Chelbo said: "Proselytes are as a scum." (Yebḥam. 47b; Kid. 70b; cf Phil 3:5). See also STRANGER.

LITERATURE.—See articles on "Proselyte" and "Gĕr" in E.B., HDB, Jew Enc., and RE; Siewert, De proselitu Judaeorum, 1651; A. Bertholet, Die Stellung der Israeliten und der tuden zu den Propheten Jesaja, 1898; H. Hahn, Mischna and Ausleitung des Christentums, 1906, 2 vols. See also Miller, "Israel's proselytes in the Septuagint," Expos, 1894; A. B. Davidson, "They That Fear the Lord," Expos, 7, III (1892), 491 ff.

PAUL LEYERTOFF

PROCKE, ps'r-sî'kô, PROSEACHE, prô'se'ô-kâ, prô'sa'ê-kâ, PROSEACHE: "A place in the open air where the Jews were wont to pray, outside of these cities where they had no synagogue," Acts 16:13 (Thayer). See PROPHECY.

PROSTITUTION, pros-ti't-shûn. See CHIMES; HARLOT; PUNISHMENTS.

PROSTRATION, pros-trô'shûn. See ATTITUDES.

PROTEVANGELIUM, pro-tév-an-vél'li-um, OF JAMES. See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS, I, 1, (2).

PROVE, prov, tôô, bâhôn, tôô; nāgâh; sok-im'ô, dokimâô, piwrâô, peîrâô: Means: (1) to test or try; (2) to establish, demonstrate; (3) to find by experience. It is for the most part in the first (original) sense that the word is found in Scripture. Where the OT it is found as πρὸς προσπελευθερωσάμενον τῶν ἀπαθῶν, primarily "to lift," hence to weigh (Gen 42:15,16, etc.) God is said to "prove" His people, i.e. to test or try them for their good (Gen 22:21; Ex 18:25; Dt 8:16, etc.). The Psalmist prays that God may prove him (Ps 25:2). The word is frequently rendered "tempt." See TEMPT.

The word bâhôn, primarily "to try by heat," has a similar meaning (Ps 17:3, the heart, like metal, purified from dross, Job 23:10; Ps 7:9; Mal 3:2, etc.). In the NT the word most frequently rendered "prove" (sometimes "try") is dokimâô (Lk 14:19; Rom 12:2; 2 Cor 8:22; 13:5; Eph 5:10; 1 Thess 5:21). Peîrâô, "to tempt," "to prove," used in both a good and a bad sense, frequentlytrs "tempt" (q.v.), is rendered "prove" in Jn 6:6, "This he said to prove him." Both Gr words occur frequently in Apoc (Wisdom and Esclus). RV has "prove" for "tempt" (Gen 22:1); for "make" (Job 24:25; Gal 2:18); for "manifest" (Ecc 3:18); for "amazement" (Cor 11:29); for "try" (I Cor 4:13; 1 Jn 4:1), etc.

W. J. WALKER

PROVIDER, prov'erd (Gr prōdor, mādhal, pāropol'h, parabolô, parabol, paropimía; Jrn 16:25:29).

I. FOLK MEANING AND USE

1. The Primitive Sense

2. The Ethnological Origin

3. Animus of Proverbs
II. Literary Development of the Proverbs

1. The Primitive Sense

The earliest cited proverb (I S 10 12, repeated with varied occasion, I S 19 24) seems to have risen spontaneously from the people's observation. That Saul the son of Kish, whose very different temperament everybody knew, should be susceptible to the wild ecstasy of strolling prophets was an astonishing thing, as it were a discovery in Israel. Just as it became a proverb, Is Saul also among the prophets?' A few years later David, explaining his eloquence in sparing the life of the king who has become his deadly foe, quotes from a folk fund of proverbs: I S 24 13. 'As saith the proverb of the ancients, Out of the wicked cometh forth wickedness; but my hand shall not be upon thee.' The prophet Ezekiel quotes a proverb which evidently embodies a popular belief: "The days are prolonged, and every vision falleth"; which he corrects to, "The days are at hand, and the fulfilment of every vision" (Ezk 12 22,23). Both Ezekiel and Jeremiah (Ezk 18 2; Jer 31 29) quote the same current proverb, 'The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge,' in order to announce that the time has come for its discontinuance. These last two examples are very instructive. They show how the body of the people put the inwards of their history into proverb form, as it were a portable lesson for the times; they show also how the prophets availed themselves of these floating sayings to point their own message. Ezekiel seems indeed to recognize the facility with which a situation may bring forth a proverb: Ezek 16 44, 'Every one that useth proverbs shall use this proverb against thee; that thy father and thy mother, and thy brethren and thy sisters, and thy kinsfolk and thy friends; saying, As is the mother, so is her daughter.'

One element of the proverb, which a wide-awake people like the Hebrews would soon discover, was its adaptability for personal portrayal and satire, like a ready-made thrust. Hence of Proverbs the popular use of the name mashal came to connote its animus, generally of sarcasm or scorn. The taunting verse raised against Heshbon, Nu 21 27-30, is attributed to them "that speak in proverbs" (mashalim); and Isaiah's taunt in his burden of Babylon (Isa 14 4-20) is composed in the proverb measure: "Thou shalt take up this proverb (mashal, AV "proverb") against the king of Babylon." Answering to this prevailing animus of them was the increasing susceptibility to their sting and rancle; they were the kind of utterance that most surely found the national and individual self-consciousness. To be a proverb—to be in everybody's mouth as a subject of laughter, or as a synonym for some awful atrocity—was about the most dreadful thing that could befall them. To be "a reproach and a proverb, a taunt and a curse" (Jer 24 9) was all one. That this should be the nation's fate was held as a threat over them by lawyer and prophet (Da 28 37; I K 9 7); and in adversities of experience, both individual and collective, the thing that was most keenly felt was to have become a byword (mashal) (Ps 44 14; 69 11).

II. Literary Development of the Proverb.

The rank of proverb was by no means attributed to every popular saying, however the people might set store by it. If its application was merely local (e.g. 2 S 4 14), or associated with a single individual (how Jeremiah and Ezekiel announce popular sayings as obsolete), it remained in its place and time. About the proverb, on the other hand, there was the sense of a value universal and permanent, fitting it for literary immortality. Nor was the proverb itself a run-wild thing, at the shaping of the crowd; from the beginning it was in the hands of "those who speak in mashalim," whose business it was to put it into skilful wording. The popular proverb, however, and the literate (proverb were and continued two different things. There came a time, in the literary development of Israel, when the value of the mashal as a vehicle of instruction came to be recognized; from which time a systematic cultivation of this type of discourse began. That type, which seems most probable, was the reign of King Solomon, when in a special degree the people awoke to the life and industry and intercourse and wealth of the world around them. The king himself was "large hearted" (I K 4 29), versatile, with literary tastes; "spake three thousand proverbs; and his songs were a thousand and five"; and his whole generation, both in Israel and surrounding nations, was engaged in a vigorous movement of thought and "wisdom" (see the whole passage, I K 4 29-34). For the unit and vehicle of this new thought the old native form of the mashal or proverb was chosen; it became the recognized medium of popular education and counsel, esp. of the young; and the mashal itself was molded to the classic form, condensed, pointed, aphoristic, which we see best exemplified in the Book of Prov 10-22 16—probably the earliest collection of this kind of literature. In this body of proverbs we see also them that instead of merely affirming or denying an assertion of the popular proverb, as it appears in I S 10 12; 24 13, these composers of literary proverbs borrowed the poetic parallelism, or couplet, which in two lines sets two statements in opposition, each with an antithesis or repetition, and cultivated this to its utmost extent in epigrammatic construction. Thus the mashal took...
to itself a literary self-consciousness and became a work of art.

Up to the time of this literary development a proverb was recognized simply as a proverb, with no identification of its form, source, or even of the name of its author. Under the generic term mashal, certain elements were differentiated; not, however, as we are wont to distinguish—parable, fable, apologue, allegory—these were undifferentiated. The most fundamental distinction of classes, perhaps, is given in Prov 1:6: “To understand a proverb, and a figure, the words of the wise, and their dark sayings.” Here it seems the word “proverb” (mashal) and “words of the wise,” paired off with each other, are the generic terms; the other two, the differentiating terms, name respectively the two fundamental directions of the mashal, toward the clear and toward the enigmatic. Both are essential elements. The word tr “figure” (מָשָׁל, mšlḥ) is rather “interpretation,” and seems to refer to the illuminative element of the mashal, and this was mainly analogical. Not only objects, phases of experience, contrasts were drawn in the mashal, to make analogies for life; Solomon’s use of plants and animals in his discourses (1 K 4:33) was not by way of natural history, but as analogies to illustrate his mšlḥim. The word tr “dark sayings” (מִשְׁרָל, mšrʾl) is the word elsewhere tr “riddle” (Samson’s riddle, for instance, was a k’thubh, Jgs 14:13.14), and refers to that quality of the proverb which, by challenging the hearer’s acumen, gives it zest; it is due to an association of things so indirectly related that one must supply intermediate thoughts to resolve them. All of this concurs to justify the proverb as a capital vehicle for instruction and counsel; it has the elements that appeal to attention, responsive thought, and memory, while on the other hand its basis of analogies makes it detached. This is Unit of a strain of literature. Until it reached its classic perfection of phrasing, say during the time from Solomon to

1. From Hezekiah, the formal development of Detachment the proverb was concentricative; the the proverb was concentricative; the subject craved further elucidation, and so a group of several couplets was sometimes necessary to present a case (cf. especially the sluggard, Prov 26:13–16). From this group of proverbs the transition was easy to a continuous passage, in which the snappy parallelism of the proverb yields to the flow of poetry; see e.g. Prov 27:23–27. This is due evidently to a more penetrative and analytic mode of thinking, which can no longer satisfy its statement of truth in a single illustration or maxim.

As the store of detached utterances on various phases of practical life accumulated and the task of collecting them was undertaken, it was seen that they had a common suffusion and bearing, that in fact they constituted a distinctive strain of literature. This field of literature was broad, and recognized (see Prov 1:1–5) as promotive of many intellectual virtues; but the inclusive name under which it was gathered was Wisdom (חכמה, ḫkbnah). Wisdom, deduced thus from a fund of maxims and analogies, became the Heb equivalent for philosophy. With the further history of it this article is not concerned, except to note that the mashal or proverb form held itself to a common frame wherein it extended discourse, or to hold itself in to the couplet form. As to illustrative quality, too, its scope was liberal enough to include a fully developed parable; see for instance Ezek 17:1–10, where the prophet is bidden to “put forth a riddle, and speak a parable (lit. mšlḥ) unto the house of Israel.”

The existence of so considerable a body of proverbs is a testimony to the Heb genius for sententious and weighty expression, a virtue

2. The Differenciation of wisdom the mashal form was borrowed by the later scribes and doctors of the law; we see it for instance in loose and artificial use in such books as Pirke ʿAboth, which gives the impression that the utterance was represented in the Solomonic proverbs had become decadent. It is in another direction rather that the virtues of the mashal reach their culmination. In the phrasal felicity and illustrative lucidity of Our Lord’s discourses, and no less in His parables, employed that the multitudinous “riddles” may see and yet not see (Mt 4:12), we have the values of the ancient mashal in their perfection, in a literary form so true to its object that we do not think of its artistry at all. See also GAMES, I, 6.

PROVERBS, prov ’erbz, BOOK OF:

I. THE BOOK’S ACCOUNT OF ITSELF

1. Title and Headings

2. Authorship or Literary Species?

II. THE SUCCESSIVE COMPILATIONS

1. The Introductory Section

2. The Classic Nucleus

3. A Body of Solicited Counsel

4. Second-over Proverbs

5. The Hezekian Collection

6. Words of Agur

7. Words of King Lemuel

8. An Acrostic Eulogy of Woman

III. MOVEMENT TOWARD A PHILOSOPHY

1. Liberation of the mashal

2. Emancipation of Hebraic Principles

3. The Conception of Wisdom

IV. CONSIDERATIONS OF AGE AND LITERARY KINSHIP

1. Under the Kines

2. The Concentrative Point

3. Its Stage in Progressive Wisdom

The Scripture book which in both the Heb and the Gr arrangement of its words stands between the Pss and the Ps. The Heb Canon it stands second in the final or supplementary division called k’thubhīm (LXX Ἱαπαυσίαν, Paronomais), “writings”; placed there probably because it would be most natural to begin this section with standard collections nearest at hand, which of course would be psalms and proverbs. This book is an anthology of sayings or lessons of the sagas on life, character, conduct; and as such embodies the distinctly educational strain of Heb literature.

I. THE BOOK’S ACCOUNT OF ITSELF.

At the beginning, intended apparently to cover the whole work, stands the title: “The proverbs of Solomon the son of David, king of Israel.” It seemed good to the compilers, however, to retain an older heading, “The proverbs of Solomon” at ch 10, as in some special sense the collection there beginning deserved it; and at ch 26 still another heading occurs: “These also are proverbs of Solomon the son of David, king of Judah copied out.” All these ascribe the proverbs to Solomon; but the heading (30:1), “The words of Agur the son of Jakeh; the oracle,” and the heading (31:1), “The words of king Lemuel; the oracle which his mother taught him,” indicate
that authorship other than that of Solomon is represented; while the mention of "the words of the wise" (1:6; 22:17), as also the definite heading, "These also are sayings of the wise" (24:23), ascribes parts of the book to the sages in general. The broadest possible use of the term "sages" is followed in the whole book. Then we set 7 lays down an initial point, or spiritual bedrock of Wisdom, the fear of Jehovah, a principle repeated toward the end of this introductory section (9:10), and evidently regarded as very vital to the whole Wisdom system; cf. Job 28:12; Ps 111:10. In what sense this book, with its composite structure so outspoken, can lay claim to being the work of Solomon, is hortatory; it is addressed to "my son" (1:8 and often) or "my sons" (4:1; 5:7; 7:24; 8:32), in the tone of a father or a sage, bringing stores of wisdom and experience to the young. The first six verses are preface, giving the purpose and use of the book, but the whole is a spiritual bedrock of Wisdom, the fear of Jehovah, a principle repeated toward the end of this introductory section (9:10), and evidently regarded as very vital to the whole Wisdom system; cf. Job 28:12; Ps 111:10. The most striking feature of the section, besides its general homiletic tone, is its personification of Wisdom. She is represented as calling to the sons of men and commending to them her ways (1:20-33; 8:1-21,32-36); she condescends, for right and purity's sake, to enter into rivalry with the 'strange woman,' the temptress, not in secret, but in open and fearless dealing (7:6-8; 9:1-6,13-18); and, in a supremely poetic passage (8:22-31), she describes her relation from the beginning with God and with the world. The son of man is thus presented as the Heb mind came to set upon the human embodiment of Wisdom. The Heb philosopher thought not in terms of logic and dialectics, but in symbol and personality; and to this high rank, almost like that of a goddess, his imagination has exalted the intellectual and spiritual powers of man. See WISDOM.

The section 10:1-22:16, with the repeated heading "The proverbs of Solomon," seems to have been the original nucleus of the whole collection, like all the other books. All the proverbs in this section, the longest section of the book, are moulded strictly to the couplet form (the one triplet, 19:7, being only an apparent exception, due probably to the loss of a line), each proverb a parallelism in condensed phrasing, in which the second line gives either some contrast to or some amplification of the first. This was doubtless the classic art norm of the Solomonic masha." 

II. The Successive Compilations.—That the Book of Prov is composed of several collections made at different times is a fact that lies on the surface; as many as eight of these are clearly marked, and perhaps subdivisions may be made of each. The book was not originally conceived as the development of a theme, or even as a unity; whatever unity it has was an afterthought. That is true, however, for one homogeneous body of truth, and to receive a name and a degree of articulation as such, will be maintained in a later section (see III, below). Meanwhile, we will take the sections in order and note some of the salient characteristics of each. The introductory section, chaps. 1-9, marks the works of having been added later than most of the rest; and is introductory in the sense of concentrating the thought to the concept of Wisdom, and of recommending the spiritual attitude in which it is to be received. Its style—and in this it is distinguished from the rest of the book—is hortatory; it is addressed to "my son" (1:8 and often) or "my sons" (4:1; 5:7; 7:24; 8:32), in the tone of a father or a sage, bringing stores of wisdom and experience to the young. The first six verses are preface, giving the purpose and use of the book, but the whole is a spiritual bedrock of Wisdom, the fear of Jehovah, a principle repeated toward the end of this introductory section (9:10), and evidently regarded as very vital to the whole Wisdom system; cf. Job 28:12; Ps 111:10. The most striking feature of the section, besides its general homiletic tone, is its personification of Wisdom. She is represented as calling to the sons of men and commending to them her ways (1:20-33; 8:1-21,32-36); she condescends, for right and purity's sake, to enter into rivalry with the 'strange woman,' the temptress, not in secret, but in open and fearless dealing (7:6-8; 9:1-6,13-18); and, in a supremely poetic passage (8:22-31), she describes her relation from the beginning with God and with the world. The son of man is thus presented as the Heb mind came to set upon the human embodiment of Wisdom. The Heb philosopher thought not in terms of logic and dialectics, but in symbol and personality; and to this high rank, almost like that of a goddess, his imagination has exalted the intellectual and spiritual powers of man. See WISDOM.

The section 10:1-22:16, with the repeated heading "The proverbs of Solomon," seems to have been the original nucleus of the whole collection, like all the other books. All the proverbs in this section, the longest section of the book, are moulded strictly to the couplet form (the one triplet, 19:7, being only an apparent exception, due probably to the loss of a line), each proverb a parallelism in condensed phrasing, in which the second line gives either some contrast to or some amplification of the first. This was doubtless the classic art norm of the Solomonic masha. The section seems to contain the product of that period of poetic culture during which the poetic model was a little rigid and severe, not venturing yet to limber up the form. Signs of a greater freedom, however, begin to appear, and the possibility of the closed circuit of the thought. Out of 184 proverbs only 19 do not contain some form of contrast, and 19 of these are in ch.15. In 18-22 16, on the other hand, the prevailing form is the so-called synonymous or amplified couplet, which leaves the thought-circuit more open to illustrative additions. Out of 191 proverbs only 18 are antimetabole, and these contain contrasts of a more subtle and hidden suggestion. As to subject-matter, the whole section is miscellaneous; in the first half, however, where the antithetical proverbs, are the most elemental distinctions of life, wisdom and folly, righteousness and wickedness, industry and laziness, wise speech and foolishness, justice and iniquity, there is a decided tendency to go farther afield for subter and less obvious distinctions, to reflect a growing and refining literary development, the gradual shaping and accumulation of materials for a philosophy of life, as yet, however, not articulated or reduced to unity of principle. 

In the short section 22:17-24:23, the prover literature seems for the first time to have become as it were self-conscious—to regard itself as a strain of wise counsel to be reckoned with for its educative value. See WISDOM. The section is introduced by a preface (22:17-21), in which these "words of the wise" are recommended to some person or delegation, "that thou mayest carry back words of truth to them that send thee" (22:21). The
counsels seem intended for persons in responsible position, perhaps attached to the court (cf 23 1–3), who, as they are to deal officially with men and affairs, need the prudence, purity, and temperance which will fit them for their duties. As to form, the detached couplet appears only occasionally; the favorite form is the quatrains; but proverbs of a greater number of lines are freely used, and one, the counsel on wine drinking (23 29–35), runs to 17 lines. In tone and spirit the collection (chs 1–9), and provokes the conjecture that this latter section, as the introduction to a compiled body of Wisdom, was composed not long after it.

The little compilation (24:25–29) is headed, "These also are sayings of the wise." They refer to wise intercourse and ordered industry.

4. Some Left-over Precepts

The little poem on the sluggard (24:30–34), with its refrain (vs 33, 34), is noteworthy as being apparently one stanza of a poem which is completed with the same refrain in the introductory section (6:6–11). The stanzas are of the same length and structure; and it would seem the latter named was either discovered later or composed as a supplement to the one and supplied a key to the name of one of the descendants of Ishmael (Gen 25:14), presumably a tribal designation. The Heb sages from the beginning were in rivalry and fellowship with the sages of other nations (cf 1 K 4:30–31) and in the Book of Job, the supreme reach of Wisdom utterance, all of the sages, Job included, are from countries outside of Pal. King Lemuel, if an actual personage, was not a Jew; and probably Agur was not. The words of Lemuel are a mother's plea to her royal son for chastity, temperance and justice, the kingly virtues. The form is the simple Heb parallelism, not detached couplets, but continuous.

The Book of Prov ends in a manner eminently worthy of its high standard of sanity and wisdom. Without any heading (it may possibly belong to the "oracle that the mother of Lemuel taught her son") the last 22 verses of the Book, 31:10–31, constitute a single poem in praise of Israel, of her beauty, her excellence, esp. her household virtues.

In form these verses begin in the original with the successive 22 letters of the Heb alphabet; a favorite form of Heb verse, as may be seen in (the original) in several of the Psalms, notably Ps 115, and in chs 1–4 of the Book of Lam.

III. Movement toward a Philosophy.—It has been much the fashion with modern critics to deny to the Hebrews a truly philosophic mind; this they say was rather the distinctive gift of the Greeks; while for their solution of the problem of life the Hebrews depended on direct revelation from above, which precluded that quasi-abeyance of concepts, that weighing of cosmic and human elements, involved in the commonly received notion of philosophy. This criticism takes account of only one side of the Heb mind. It is true they believed their life to be in direct contact with the will and word of Jeh, revealed to them in terms which could not be questioned; but in the findings and deliverance of their own intellectual powers, too, they had a reliance and confidence which merits the name of an authentic philosophy. But theirs was a philosophy not of speculative world-making, but of conduct and the practical management of life; and it was intuitive and analogical, not the result of logical thinking. Hence its name wisdom, the solution itself, rather than philosophy, the love of wisdom, the search for solution. This Book of Prov, beginning with detached maxims on the elements of conduct, reveals in many suggestive ways the gradual emer-
gence of a philosophy, a comprehensive wisdom, as it were, in the making; it is thus the pioneer book of that Heb Wisdom which we see developed to maturing things in the books of Job and Ecc. Some of its salient stages may here be traced.

We may first note it, or the literary preparation for it, in the opening of the third unit, ten verses of a thought, with added elements of illustration, explanation, amplification, a development that bears a close resemblance, in the opening section (the classic, nuce, sec. 2) at about ch 16. The proverbial and antithetic statements contrast a pair of two aspects of truth in such a way as to close the case; there was nothing for it but to go on. This had the good effect of setting over against each other the great element of righteousness and wickedness, of obedience and lawlessness, teachableness and perversity, industry and laziness, prudence and presumption, rectitude and prating, etc., and so far forth it was a matter of analysis of the essentials of individual and social conduct. As soon, however, as the synonymous and illustrative m'shāl prevails, we are conscious of a limbering up and greater penetrativeness of the range of thought: it is open to subtler distinctions and remoter discoveries, and the analogies tend to employ the less direct and less signifying cause and effect. This is increased as we go on, esp. by the greater call upon the imagination in the figurative tissue of the Hebrew section, and the more readily greater facility to the riddling and paradox element. The m'shāl increases in length, and, at the same time, in that by the prolonging of similar subjects and by the enlargement from the close and its quatrain and the developed poem. All this, while not yet a self-conscious philosophy, is a step on the way thereto.

One solid presupposition of the sages, like an axiom, was never called in question: namely, that righteousness and wisdom are identical, that righteousness of any sort is folly without, and righteousness delivereth from death (Prov 10 2). Thus from the outset is furnished an uncompromising background on which the fascinating allurements of vice, the crooked ways of injustice and dishonesty, the sober habits of goodness and right dealing, show for what they are and what they tend to. The sages thus put themselves, too, in entire harmony with what is taught by priests and prophets; there is no room for the law oracles to supply the third strand in the threefold cord of instruction (of Jer 18 18). From this basal presupposition other principles, scarcely less axiomatic, come in view: that the four and spring of wise living is reverence, the fear of Jehovah; that the earnestness of mind is teachableness, the precluding attitude of perverseness; that it is the mark of wisdom, or righteousness, to be fearless and above board, of wickedness, which is fully, to be crooked and secretive. These principles recur constantly, not as a system, but in numerous aspects and applications in the practical business of life. For their sanctions they refer naively to the Heb idea of rewards on the one hand—wealth, honor, long life, family (cf Prov 1 13)—and of destruction on the other; but these are emphasized not as direct bestowments or infusions from a personal Deity, rather as in the law of human nature. The law that evil works its own destruction, good brings its own reward, is bearing itself in men's reason as one of the fundamental concepts of which grew the Wisdom philosophy.

From times long before Solomon sagacity in counsel, and skill to put such counsel into maxims or paradoxes, gain the possession, whether man or woman, of a natural leadership in the local communities (cf 2 8 14 2; 20 16); and Solomon's exceptional endowment showed itself not merely in his literary tastes, but in his ability, much esteemed among Orientals, to determine the merits of cases brought before him for judgment (1 K 3 16 28), and to answer puzzling questions (1 K 10 1 67). It was from the Conception such estimate of men's intellectual powers, from the recognition of mental magnificence and of this application to the practical issues of life (of Prov 1 5), that the conception of Wisdom in its larger sense arose. As, however, the cultivation of such sagacity of utterance passed beyond the stage of time and of court speech (cf 1 29 34) into the hands of city elders and sages, it attained to greatly enhanced value; note how the influence of such a sage is idealized (Job 29 7 25). The sages had a definite calling and mission of their own, more potent perhaps than belonged to priests and prophets; the frequent reference to the young and the simple or immature in the Book of Prov would indicate that they were virtually the schoolmasters and educators of the nation. As such, working as they did in a fellowship and collaboration with each other, the subject-matter with which they dealt would not remain as casual and miscellaneous maxims, but would toward a center and system of doctrine which could claim the distinction of an articulated philosophy of life and the sages themselves would be identified with the great Heb ideal of righteousness and truth. We have already noted how this sense of the dignity and value of their calling manifested itself in the body of precepts sent in response to solicitation (as above), with its appendix (4 is loved (Prov 22 17 24 34). It was not long after this stage of Wisdom-culture, I think, that a very significant new word came into their vocabulary, the word tsithyth (תִּשִּׁית), a puzzle to the translators, variously rendered "sound wisdom," "effectual wisdom," and, correctly, "the exegesis," the technical term of the Wisdom literature," BDB, s.v.). Its earliest appearance, and the only one except in the introductory section (Prov 18 1), is where the man who separates himself from others' opinions and seeks his own desire is said to quarrel with all tsithyth. The word seems to designate Wisdom in its subjective aspect, as an authentic insight or intuition of truth, the human power to rise into the region of true revelation from below, as distinguished from the prophet, or the spirit of prophecy, identified from above. Outside of Prov and Job the word occurs only twice: once in Mic 6 9, and once in Isa 28 29, in which latter case the prophet has deliberately composited a passage (vs 23 29) in the chapter, and called by the designation the strain of insight to Jehovah. Evidently there came a time in the culture of wisdom when its utterances attained in men's estimate to a parity with utterances direct from the unseen; perhaps this explains why Agur's and Lemuel's words could be so highly ranked as oracles (see above, 6 and 7). At any rate, such a high distinction, an authority derived from intimacy with the creative work of Jehovah (8 30 31), is ascribed to Wisdom (kohinin, תִּשָּׁת) in the introductory section; "counsel is mine," Wisdom is made to say, and tisvith (Prov 8). Thus the Book of Prov reveals to us a philosophy, as it were, in the making and from scattered counsels attaining gradually to the summit where the human intellect could place its findings by the side of Divine oracles, together.

IV. Considerations of Age and Literary Kinship.—To get at the history of the Book of Prov, several inquiries must be raised. Were the proverbial compositions? The book, like the Book of Ps., is confessedly a product of the exilic or later accumulations, and both by style and maturing thought bearing the marks of different ages. When were the successive compilations made? And,
finally, when did the strain of literature here represented reach that point of self-conscious unity and coordination which justified its being reckoned with as a strain by itself and choosing the comprehensive name Wisdom? What makes these inquiries hard to the fact that the proverbs are precepts for the common people, relating to ordinary affairs of the village, the market, and the field, and move in lines remote from politics and dynastic vicissitudes and wars. They are, to an extent far more penetrative and pervasive than law or prophecy, the educative literature on which, as on sturdy rank and file of the nation was nourished. Where there is no vision, the people let loose," says a Hezekian proverb (Prov 29:15); but they are also when there is no abiding tonic of social convention and principle. Precisely this latter it is which this Book of Prov in a large degree reveals; and in course of time its value was so felt that, as we have seen, it could rank itself as an asset of life by the side of vision. It represents, in a word, the human movement toward self-directiveness and self-reliance, without supine dependence on ruler or public sentiment (cf Prov 29:25,26). When and how was this same and wholesome communal fiber developed?

When Solomon and his court made the mashal an elegant fast, they builded better than they knew. There move on to the 1. Under the kings epigrammatic mold and polish, the éclat of a popular literature. This was done or at first (Solomon spoke his proverbs, 1 K 4.32-33); but the recording of such carefully expressed utterances could not be long delayed; perhaps this brief style coupé was the most natural early exercise in the new transition from the unyielding cuneiform to the use of papyrus and a more flexible alphabet, which probably the "men of Hezekiah" means just what is said; these men of letters were adding this supplementary collection (Prov 25-29) to a body of proverbs that already existed and were recognized as Solomon's. This would put the composition of the main body of the proverbs (chs 10-29) prior to the reign of Hezekiah. They represent therefore the chief literary instruction available to the people in the long period of the Kings from Solomon onward, a period which otherwise was very meagerly supplied. The Mos- saic Law as well as the Torah from the standpoint of the Law in the time of Josiah (2 K 22), was at best a sequestered thing in the keeping—or neglect—of priests and judges; the prophetic word was a specific message for great national emergencies; the accumu- lation that gives birth to the property of the temple and the cultus; what then was there for the education of the people? There were indeed the folk-tales and catechetical legends of their heroic history; but there were also, most influential of all, these wise sayings of the sages, groupe, bodies of persons resident in village centers, published in the open places by the gate (cf Job 29:7), embodying the elements of a common-sense

religion and citizenship, and representing views of life which were not only Hebrew, but to a great extent international among the neighbor kingdoms. Understood so, these Solomonic proverbs furnish incomparably the best reflection we have of the religious and social standards of the common people, during a period otherwise meagerly portrayed. And from it we can understand that the property of character existed after all, and how well worth preserving for a unique mission in the world, in spite of the idolatrous corruptions that invaded the sanctuaries, the self-pleasing unconcern of the rulers and the pessimistic demoralization of the times.

For the point in the Heb literary history when these scattered Solomonic proverbs were recognized as a homogeneous strain of thought and the compilations were made and recommended as Wisdom, we can do no better, I think, than to name the age of Israel's literary prime, the age of Hezekiah. The "men of Hezekiah" did more than append their supplementary section (chs 25-29); the words "these also" (22:23), "gammel" in their heading imply it (see HEEZKIH, THE MAN OF). I apprehend the order and nature of their work somehow thus: I. The core of the Proverbs (II K 10-29) which was connected together as the proverbs most closely associated with Solomon, without much attempt at systematizing, substantially as these had accumulated through the ages in the rough order of their developing form and thought; II. The record of the search for the God in the past, the body of educational literature which lay nearest at hand, a body adapted especially, though not exclusively, to the inculcation of instruction and formation. This done, there next came to their knowledge a remarkable body of "words of the wise" (22:17-24, 25), which had been lost or did not come to light, so that a modelem was found for some persons in responsible position, and which were procured by a recommendation of them as "words of truth" designed to promote "trust in Jehovah" (22:19-21) which latter, as we know from Isaiah, was the great civic issue of Hezekiah's time. With this section naturally goes the little appendix of "sayings of the wise" (24:23-34), added probably at about the same time. These two sections, which seem to open the collection to matter beyond the distinctive Solomonic mashal, are, beyond the rest of the book, in the tone of the introductory section (chs 1-9), which latter, along with the Hezekian appendix of proverbs, constitutes partly as a new composition, partly as incorporating some additional findings (cf for instance the completion of the poem in the sluggard, 6:6-11). Thus, by the addition of this introductory section, the Book of Prov was recognized as a unity, probably not, with the initial proposition (1:1-6),7, and launched with such hortatory material as had already, on a smaller scale, been introduced there. Thus the whole of the book contains the praise of Wisdom as a human endowment, sharing in the mind and purpose of the Divine (8:22-31); but it has become aware also of the revelatory value of thehishlah (2:7; 3:21; 8:14), or chastened intuition (see above, III. 3), and dares to aspire, in its righteous teachableness, to the intimacy or secret friendship of Jehovah (3:34; 10:1); all this indicates the holy self-consciousness to which Wisdom has attained. I see no cogent reason for postponing the sub- stantial completion of the Book of Prov beyond the time of Hezekiah and perhaps of the King of Lemuel, with the final acrostic poem, may be later additions; but their difference in tone and work- shipmanship is just as likely to be due to the fact that while they are admitted, in the liberal spirit of the compiles, from foreign stores of wisdom. For spiritual clarity and intensity they do not rise to the height of the native Hev consciousness; and they incline to an artificial structure which suggests that the writer's interest is divided between sincere tshishlah and literary skill. For all the case of like something may be forgiven.

It is too early in the history of Wisdom to regard this Book of Prov as an articulated and coordinated system. It is merely what it purports to be, a col-
lected body of literature having a common bearing and purpose; a literature of reverent and intelligent prophecy, involving the office of a Prophet.

3. Its Stage and Nature. Relations of life, and not assuming wisdom in Progressively to embody any mystic disclosures of truth beyond the reach of human reason. As such, it has a vocabulary and range of ideas of its own, which distinguishes it from another strain of literature. This is seen in those passages outside of the Book of Proverbs which deliberately assume, for some specific purpose, the Wisdom dialect. In Isa 28:23-29, the prophet, whom the perverse rulers have taunted with baby-talk (vs 9,10), appeals to them with the characteristic Wisdom call to attention (vers 23); and in illustrations drawn from husbandry proves to them that this also is from Jeh of hosts, 'who is transcendent in counsel, preeminent in tahshiyah,' (vers 29)—teaching them thus in their own vauanted idiom. In Mic 6:9-15, similarly, calling in tahshiyah to even the prophecy of prophecy ('in voice of Job), נְקֵי יְהוּדָה, מִשְׁרָראֶה, וּתָחֲשִׁיָּה (6:9), the prophet speaks of the natural disasters that men ought to derive from their abuse of trade relations, evidently appealing to them in their own favorite strain of thinking. Both these passages seem to reflect a time when the Wisdom dialect was prevalent and popular, although some are concerned to call in sound human intuition as an ally of prophecy. At the same time, as prophets have the right to do, they labor to give revelation the casting vote; the authentic disclosure of truth from Jeh is their objective, not the mere luxury of making clever observations on practical life. All this coincides in the Wisdom sphere, with what in Isaiah's and Micah's time was the supreme issue of state, namely trust in Jeh, rather than in crooked human devices (cf. Is 28:16; 29:15); and it is noteworthy that this is the venture of Wisdom urged by the editors of the Proverbs in their introductory exhortations (cf. 22:19; 3:5-8). In other words, these editors are concerned with inducing a spiritual attitude; and so in their literary strain they make their book an adjunct in the movement toward spirituality which Isaiah is laboring to promote. As yet, however, its findings are still in the periphrastic stage, stated as absolute and unqualified truths; it has not reached the sober testing of fact and interrogation of motive which it must encounter in order to become a seasoned philosophy of life. Its main pervading thesis—that righteousness in the fear of God is wisdom and bound for success, that wickedness is fatality and bound for destruction—is eternally sound; but it must make itself good in a world where so many of the enterprizes of life seem to come out the other way, and where there is so little appreciation of spiritual values. Nor is the time of preparation and rigid testing that is coming. Two psalms of this period (as I apprehend) (Pss 73 and 49) concern themselves with the anomaly of the successes of the wicked and the trials of the righteous; the latter pointedly adopting the Wisdom or mishabah style of utterance (Ps 49 3,4), both laboring to induce a more inward and spiritual attitude toward the problem. It remains, however, for the Book of Job to take the momentous forward step of setting wisdom on the unshakable foundation of spiritual integrity, which it does by subjecting its findings to the rigid test of fact and its motives to a drastic Sicanization. It is in the Book of Job thus in the Book of Job is followed by the Book of Ecc, that the Wisdom strain of literature, initiated by the Proverbs of Solomon, finds its OT culmination.

John Franklin Genung
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LITERATURE

1. Providence Defined.—The word "provides" (from Lut providere) means etymologically "to foresee." The corresponding word, προνοεῖν, means "forethought." Forethought and foreknowledge imply a future end, a goal, and a definite purpose and plan for attaining that end. The doctrine of final ends is a doctrine of final causes, and means that that which is last in realization and attainment is first in mind and thought. The most essential attribute of rational beings is that they act with reference to an end; that they act not only with thought but with forethought. As, therefore, it is characteristic of rational beings to make preparation for every event even as it is foreseen or anticipated, the word "providence" has come to be used less in its original etymological meaning of foresight than to signify that preparation, care and supervision which are necessary to secure a desired future result. While all rational beings exercise a providence proportioned to their powers, yet it is only when the word is used with reference to the Divine Being who is possessed of infinite knowledge and power that it takes on its real and true significance. The doctrine of Divine providence, therefore, has reference to that preservation, care and government which God exercises over all things that He has created, in order that they may accomplish the ends for which they were created.

"Providence is the most comprehensive term in the language of theology. It is the background of all the several departments of religious truth, a background
mysterious in its commanded brightness and darkness. It penetrates and fills the whole compass of the relations of man with his Maker. It is unseen, and yet with the visible creation, and the visible creation with the work of redemption, and redemption with personal salvation, and personal salvation with the redemption of all things. It carries our thoughts back to the supreme purpose which was in the beginning with God, and forward to the forseen end and consummation of all things, while it includes between these the whole infinite variety of the dealings of God in the ages. (W. B. Pope, Compendium of Christian Theology, I, 456).

II. Different Spheres of Providential Activity Distinguished.—The created universe may be conveniently divided, with reference to Divine providence, into three departments: first, the ministrant or physical universe, which is composed or governed by God according to certain uniform principles called the laws of Nature; secondly, animate existence, embracing the vegetable and animal world, over which God exercises that providential care which is necessary to sustain the life that He created; and, thirdly, the rational world, composed of beings who, in addition to animate life, are possessed of reason and moral free agency, and are governed by God, not necessarily, but through an appeal to reason, having the power to obey or disobey the laws of God according to the decision of their own free will. This wise and broad care and supervision which God exercises over His created universe is commonly designated as His general providence, which embraces alike the evil and the good, in addition to which there is a more special and particular providence which He exercises over and in behalf of the good, those whose wills are in harmony with the Divine will.

III. Biblical Presentation of the Doctrine of Providence.—The word "providence" is used only once in the Septuagint, and 15 times in the Bible, viz., of man, in which sense it is now seldom used. (See also Rom 13 14, where the same Gr word is tr "provision." ) While, however, the Bib. use of the word calls for little consideration, the doctrine indicated by the term "providence" is one of the most significant in the Christian system, and is either distinctly stated or plainly assumed by every Bib. writer. The OT Scriptures are best understood when interpreted as a progressive revelation of God’s purposes. The Messianic expectations pervade the entire life and lit. of the Heb people, and the entire OT dispensation may not improperly be regarded as the moral training and providential preparation of the world, and even of the chosen people, for the coming in of the Messiah. In the apocryphal "Book of Wisdom" the word "providence" is twice used (14 3; 17 2) in reference to God’s government of the world. Rabbinical Judaism, according to Jos, was much occupied with discussing the relation of Divine providence to human free will. The Sadducees, he tells us, held an extreme view of human freedom, while the Essenes were believers in absolute fate; the Pharisees, avoiding these extremes, believed in both the overruling providence of God and responsibility of man (Ant, XIII, v, 9; XVIII, i, 3; BJ, II, viii, 14). See PHARISEES. The NT begins with the announcement that the "kingdom of heaven is at hand," which declaration carries along with it the idea of a providential purpose with reference to the final consummation of the dispersion that prepared for the Messiah’s coming. But the work of Christ is set forth in the NT, not only as the culmination of a Divine providence that preceded it, but as the beginning of a new providential order, a dispensation marked by the forethought and plan so comprehensive that it gives to the very idea of Divine providence a new, larger and richer mean-

ing, both intensively and extensively, than it ever had before. The minutest want of the humblest individual and the largest interests of the world-wide kingdom of God are alike embraced within the scope of Divine providence as it is set forth by Christ and the apostles.

(1) Providence in the Pentateuch.—The opening sentence of the Scriptures, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," is a noble and majestic affirmation of God’s essential relationship to the origin of all things. It is followed by a God’s consequential utterance without the sacred volume that declare that He who created also preserves and governs all that He created. But the Israelitish nation was from the beginning of its history, in the Heb conception, the special object of God’s providence and care, though it was declared that Jeh’s lordship and government extended over all the earth (Ex 38 22). The Deuteronomist (10 14) uses language which implies that Divine possession of all things in heaven and earth carries along with it the idea of Divine prosperity and control; and he also regards Israel as Jeh’s peculiar possession and special care (32 8).

This special providence that was over the elect nation as a whole was also minute and particular, in that special individuals were chosen to serve in the affairs of the nation in the making of the nation, and were Divinely guided in the accomplishment of their providential mission. Thus Abraham’s providential place in history is set forth in Gen 7 8. Jacob acknowledges the same providential hand in his life (Gen 31 42; 45 15). The life of Joseph abounds in evidences of a Divine providence (Gen 39 5-7; 50 20). The whole life-history of Moses as it is found in the Pent is a study in the doctrine of Divine providence. Other lives as set forth in these early narratives may be less notable, but they are not less indebted to Divine providence for what they are and for what they accomplish for others. Indeed, as Professor Oehler emphatically states: "The whole system of revelation is nothing but the activity of that Divine providence which, in order to the realisation of the Divine aim, is at once directed to the whole, and at the same time proves itself efficacious in the direction of the life of separate men, and in the guiding of all circumstances" (OT Theology).

(2) The historical books of the OT.—In a sense all the books of the OT are historical in that they furnish material for writing a history of the people of Israel. See ISRAEL, HISTORY OF THE PEOPLE. The Pent, the Prophets, the Books of the Prophets, all furnish material for writing OT history; but there is still left a body of literature, including the books from Josh to Est, that may with peculiar fitness be designated as historical. These books furnish the interpretation and presentation of the facts of Heb history in their relation to Divine providence. The sacred historians undertake to give something of a Divine philosophy of history, in that they present the facts of history, to point out the evils of individual and national sin and the rewards and blessings of righteousness, and to show God’s ever-present and ever-governing hand in human history—that He is not a silent spectator of human affairs, but one in whom the whole history of the universe, to whom individuals and nations alike owe allegiance. To the Heb historian every event in the life of the nation has a moral significance, both because of its relation to God and because of its bearing on the providential mission and testing of Israel as the people of God through whom the Redeemer which covers the "dark ages" of Bible history, and is an enigma to many in the study of God’s hand in history, shows how far God must needs condescend at times in His use of imperfect and even sensual men to bring about even the most perfect and accomplish His work in the world. While therefore He condescends to use as instruments of His providence such men as Samson and Jephthah, it is never
through these that He does His greatest work, but through an Abraham, a Joseph, a Moses, an Isaiah, through men of lofty moral character. And this is one of the most notable lessons of OT history if it be studied as a revelation of God's providential methods and instrumentality. Among these histories of great men we find growing clearer and stronger expression to God's providential relation to the physical world as its preserver and to the moral world as its Divine Governor than the author of Nehemiah. "Thou, even thou, art Lord alone; thou hast made heaven and heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth, and all things that are therein, the seas, and all that is therein, and thou preservest them all. . . . Yet thou in thy manifold mercies forsookest them not in the wilderness; the pillar of the cloud departed not from them by day, to lead them in the way; neither of fire by night, to shew them light, and the way wherein they should go. Thou gavest also thy good spirit to instruct them" (9 6.19.20 AV). His words reflect the views that were entertained by all the OT historians of God in the government and guidance of the nation. Heb history, because of the Divine promises and Divine providence, is ever moving forward toward the Messianic goal.

(2) The Psalms.—The poets are among the world's greatest teachers, and the theology of the best poets generally represents the highest and purest faith that is found among a people. Applying this truth to the Heb race, we may say that in the Ps and the Book of Job we reach the highest points in the OT revelation as to the doctrine of Divine providence. The Psalmist's God is not only the Creator and Preserver of all things, but is a prayer-hearing and prayer-answering God, a Being so full of tender mercy and loving-kindness that he will not fail to intercede for Him with the God whom Christ taught us to call "Our Father." Nowhere else in the entire Scriptures, except in the Sermon on the Mount, can we find such a full and clear exhibition of the minute and special providence of God over His faithful and believing children as in the Ps—notably such as Ps 91, 103, 104, and 139. Ps 106 traces God's hand in providential and gracious guidance through every stage of Israel's wondrous history. Thanksgiving and praise for past blessings and assistance abound in Ps 44, 66, 78, 85, 135. While the relation of God's power and providence to the physical universe and to the material and temporal blessings of life is constantly asserted in the Ps, yet it is the connection of inspired draughts of ethical and spiritual nature, with righteousness and faith and love, that marks the highest characteristic of the Psalmist's revelation of the doctrine of providence. That righteousness and obedience are necessary conditions and accompaniments of Divine providence in its moral aspects and results is evidenced by numerous declarations of the psalmists (1 6; 31 19.20; 74 12; 84 11; 91 1; 125 2). This thought finds happiest expression in Ps 37 23 AV: "The steps of a good man are ordered of the Lord, and he delighteth in his way." The inspired poets make it plain that the purpose of Divine providence is not merely to meet temporal wants and bring earthly blessings, but to secure the moral good of individuals and nations.

(4) The Wisdom Literature.—The doctrine of providence finds ample and varied expression in the Wisdom Lit. of the OT, notably in the Book of Prov. The power that preserves and governs and guides is also recognized as inseparable from the great events of history and human providence (Prov 3 21; 16 4). Divine providence does not work independently of man's free will; providential blessings are conditioned on character and conduct (Prov 26 10 AV; 2 7.8; 12 2.21). There cannot be, in OT terms of faith, any stronger statement of the doctrine of Divine providence than that given by the Wise Men of Israel in the following utterances recorded in the Book of Prov: "In all thy ways acknowledge him, and he will direct thy paths" (3 6); "A man's heart directs his steps" (16 9); "His lot is cast into the lap; but the whole disposing thereof is of Jehovah" (16 33); "A man's goings are of Jehovah" (20 24); "The king's heart is in the hand of Jehovah as the watercourses; He turneth it whithersoever he will." (21 1); "The horse is prepared against the day of battle; but makes ready is of Jehovah." (3 21-26; 12 2.21). The conception of providence that is presented in the Book of Eccel seems to reflect the views of one who had had experience in sin and had come into close contact with many of life's ills. All things have their appointed time, but the realization of the providential purposes and ends of creaturely existence is, wherever human free agency is involved, always conditioned upon man's exercise of his free will. The God of providence rules and overrules, but He does not by His providence overcome and override man's true freedom. Things that are do not reflect God's perfect providence, but rather His providence as affected by human free agency and as marred by man's sin (Eccl 1 5-11). I know that there is nothing better for them, than to rejoice and to do good so long as they live. And also that every man should eat and drink, and enjoy good in all his labor, in the gift of God;" (vs 12.13; see also ver 14); "The righteous and the wise, and their works, are in the hand of Jehovah." (9 1); "The race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong." (9 11). The same conclusion that the author of Eccel reached as to how human life is affected by Divine providence and man's sin has found expression in the oft-quoted lines of the great poet:

"There's a Divinity that shapes our ends, Rough-hew how we will."

(5) The Book of Job.—The greatest of all the inspired contributions to the Wisdom Lit. of the OT, the Book of Job, demands special consideration. It is the one book in the Bible that is devoted wholly to the subject of Divine providence. The perplexities of a thoughtful mind on the subject of Divine providence and its relation to human suffering have nowhere in the literature of the world found stronger and clearer expression than in this inspired drama of ethical and spiritual development. Job, the mighty and marvelous hero, Job represents not only a great sufferer, but an honest doubter: he dared to doubt the theology of his day, a theology which he had himself doubtless believed until experience, the best of all teachers, taught him its utter inadequacy to explain the deepest problems of human life and of Divine providence. The purpose of this book in the inspired volume seems to be to correct the prevailing theology of the day with regard to the subject of sin and suffering in the Book of Job to Divine providence. There is no more deplorable and hurtful error that a false theology could teach than that all suffering in this world is a proof of sin and a measure of one's guilt (see Affliction). It is hard enough for the innocent to suffer. To add to their suffering by teaching them that it is all God's will, that they are not, is to lay upon the innocent a burden too grievous to be borne. The value in the inspired Canon of a book written to reveal the error of such a false theology is greatly and easily be overestimated. The invaluable contribution which this book makes to the Bib. doctrine of providence is to be found, not in individual and detached sayings,
striking and suggestive as some of these may be, but rather in the book as a whole. Statements concerning God's general providence abound in this inspired drama—such as these, for example: "...to all these, that the hand of Jeh hath wrought this, in whose hand is the soul of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind?" (Job 12:10); "Who hath given him a charge over the earth? or who hath disposed the whole world? He shall break in pieces mighty men without number, and set others in their stead" (Ps 13:24 AV).

But the special contribution of the Book of Job to the doctrine of Divine providence, as already indicated, is to set forth its connection with the fact of sin and suffering. Perplexed souls in all ages have been asking: Is God be all-powerful and all-good, why should there be any suffering in a world which He created and over which He rules? If He cannot prevent suffering, is He omnipotent? If He can, but will not prevent suffering, is He infinitely good? Does the book solve the mystery? We cannot claim that it does. But it does vindicate the character of God, the Creator, and of Job, the moral free agent under trial. It does show the power of a moral order, that is, of the free agents who are forming character; it does show that perfect moral character is made, not by Divine omnipotence, but by trial, and that physical suffering serves a moral end in God's providential government of men and nations. While the book does not clearly the problem of mystery, it does show how on the dark background of a suffering world the luminous holiness of Divine and human character may be revealed. The picture of this suffering man of Uz speaks with pathetic words of well-meaning friends, planting himself on the solid rock of his own conscious rectitude, and defying earth and hell to prove him guilty of wrong, and knowing that his Vindicator liveth and would come to his rescue—that is an inspiring picture that will make every innocent sufferer who reads it stronger until the end of time. See also Job, Book of.

(6) The prophetic writings.—Nowhere in all literature is the existence and supremacy of a moral and providential order in His universe clearly recognized than in the writings of the OT prophets. These writings are best understood when interpreted as the moral messages and passionate appeals of men who were not only prophets and preachers of righteousness, but who were the agents and teachers of the moral philosophy of history for the whole world. Each of the prophets is the voice of the King of the kingdom of God reveal a Divine providential plan for the world's redemption and education extending of necessity far into the future; and still beyond that, in His vision of Divine providence, evokes a day of final judgment, but students of Divine providence and reward, followed by a new and eternal order of things, in which the destiny of every man will be determined by his conduct and character in this present life. (See Our Lord's parable concerning the Kingdom: Mt 13:24–30; Mk 4:26ff; Lk 14:16ff; also Mt 24 and 25).

(2) The Johannine writings.—St. John's Gospel differs from the Synoptic Gospels in its mode of presenting the doctrine of providence chiefly in that it goes back to the mind and purpose of God in the very beginning (Jn 1:1–5), whereas the Synoptic Gospels simply go back to the Messianic prophecies of the OT. Both the Gospel and the Epp. of John in their presentation of Divine providence place the greater emphasis on Divine love and filial trust, the latter rising in many places to the point of positive assurance. The Book of Rev is a prophetic vision, in apocalyptic form, of God's providential purpose for the future, dealing not so much with individuals as with nations and with
the far-reaching movements of history extending through the centuries. God is revealed in St. John's writings, not as an omnipotent and arbitrary Sovereign, but as an all-loving Father, who not only cares for His children in this life but is building for them a home to come a house of many mansions (Jn 14:1-20).

(3) The Book of Acts and other NT history.—The historical portions of the NT, as contained in the Acts, and elsewhere, while not eliminating or depreciating the element of human freedom in individuals and nations, yet recognize in human life and history the ever-present and all-controlling mind of that God in whom, it is declared, "we live, and move, and have our being" (Acts 17:28). The career of the first distinctive NT character begins with these words: "There came a man, sent from God, whose name was John" (Jn 1:6). But not only John, the forerunner, but every other individual, according to the NT conceptions, is a man "sent from God." The apostles conceive themselves to be such; Stephen, the martyr, was such; Paul was such (Acts 22:21). NT biography is a study in providentially guided lives, not omitting references to those who refuse to be so guided—for such the NT holds the human from generation, men who "are seen from God" refuse to go upon their Divinely appointed mission. The Day of Pentecost is the revelation of a new power in history—a revelation of the place and power which the Divine-human Christ and the Holy Spirit are to have henceforth in making history—in making the character of the men and the nations whose deeds are to make history. The most potent moral force in history is to be, from the day of Pentecost on, the ascended incarnate Christ, and He is to be all the more influencing in the life of man, because the work shall be done through the Holy Spirit. This is the historical view of providence as connected with the person of Christ, which the NT historians present, and which we, after 19 centuries of Christian history, are warranted in holding more confidently and firmly even than the Christians of the 1st cent. could hold it; for the Christian centuries have proved it true. What God is in Nature Christ is in history. All history was becoming Christian history. The NT conception of Divine providence in and through Christ.

(4) The Pauline writings.—No character of whom we have any account in Christian literature was providentially prepared for his life-work and providentially employed in illustrating that life-work more truly than was the apostle Paul. We find, therefore, as we would antecedently expect, that Paul's speeches and writings abound in proofs of his absolute faith in the ever-rolling providence of an all-wise God. His doctrine of predestination and foreordination is best understood when interpreted, not as a Divine power predetermining human destiny and nullifying the human will, but as a conception of Divine providence as the eternal purpose of God to accomplish an end contemplated and foreseen from the beginning, viz. the redemption of the world and the creation in and through Christ of a new and holy humanity. Every one of the Pauline Epistles bears witness to the author's faith in a Divine providence that overrules and guides the life of every soul that works in harmony with the Divine will; but this providence is working to secure as its chief end, not material and temporal blessings, but the moral and spiritual goods of those concerned. Paul's teaching concerning Divine providence in all concerns individuals, and is explicit when mentioned on character may be found summed up in what is perhaps the most comprehensive single sentence concerning providence that was ever written: "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose" (Rom 8:28 AV). Any true exposition of the NT doctrine of Divine providence that may be given can only be an unfolding of the content of this brief but comprehensive sentence. Paul the great teacher, that to the Rom, is a study in the divine philosophy of history, a revelation of God's providential purpose and plan concerning the salvation, not merely of individuals, but of the nations. These purposes, as Paul views them, whether they concern individuals or the entire race, are always associated with the mediatorial ministry of Christ: "For of him, and through him, and unto him, are all things. To him be the glory for ever" (Rom 11:36).

(5) The Petrine Epistles and other NT writings.—The Epistles of Peter, James, and Jude, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, are all in entire accord with the teachings of the other NT writings already considered. St. Peter, who at first found it so hard to see how God's providential purpose in and for the Messianic kingdom could be realized if Christ should suffer and die, came later to see that the power and the glory of Christ and His all-conquering gospel are inseparably connected with the sufferings and death of the Messiah (1 Pet 3:18). Concerning God's providence over the righteous can be clearer or stronger than the following utterance of Peter: "The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous, and his ears unto their supplication. But the face of the Lord is against those that do evil. And who is he that will hurt you, if ye be zealous of that which is good?" (1 Pet 3:12-13). The purpose and end of Divine providence as viewed in the Epistle of James are always ethical: as conduct and character are the end and crown of Christian effort, so they are the end and conclusion, where Divine providence is concerned, of the character of God's servants in the world. And God's providence is a matter of the greatest interest to all the characters in it, whether they are God's people or God's enemies. In the case of the former, the mind of the character is greatly enriched by a more comprehensive study of the lessons of history that illustrate the workings and the retributions of the moral law under Divine providence than is found in the Epistle of Jude (see esp. vs. 5:7.11.14.15.24).

From this brief survey of the teachings of the OT and NT Scriptures concerning the doctrine of Divine providence, it will be seen that, while the NT reaffirms in most particulars the doctrine of Divine providence as set forth in the OT Scriptures, there are three particularly in which the points of emphasis are changed, and by which new and changed emphasis the doctrine is greatly enriched in the NT.

(1) The fatherhood and love of God in providence.—The God of providence in the OT is regarded as a Sovereign whose will is to be obeyed, and His leading attributes are omnipotence and holiness, whereas in the NT God is revealed not only as Father and His providence is set forth as the forethought and care of a father for His children. His leading attributes here are love and holiness—His very omnipotence is the omnipotence of love. To teach that God is not only revealed as Father and adored, but a tender and loving Father who is ever thinking of and caring for His children, is to make God lovable and turn His providence into an administration of Almighty love.
(2) The place of Christ and the Holy Spirit in providence. The doctrine of the Godhead in NT is connected with the person of Christ and the administration of the divine life in a manner that distinguishes it from the OT presentation of a personal God. One God who was there revealed in the simple unity of His three persons, to be prayed to as He be worshiped, as some theologians have taught, that "God the Father plans, God the Son executes, and God the Holy Ghost administers," is now evident if real work exclusively of Christ and the Holy Spirit: but this traditional division of work, however rational it be, cannot be accepted as an accurate statement of Bib. doctrine. The work of creation, of course, may be imagined as proceeding from a divine trinity, but the work both of creation and providence. Thus Paul: "For by him all things were created, that are in heaven and earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." (Col. 1:16, 17 AV). Although this and other passages refer to Christ's relation to general providence, including the government of the physical universe, yet it is only when the Divine providence is concerned with the redemption of a lost world and the establishment of the Kingdom of God in the hearts and lives of men, that the full extent of the NT's interest in the function of the Holy Spirit is evident. The saving and perfecting of men is the supreme purpose of providence, if it be viewed from the NT standpoint, which was that of Christ's mediating activity.

(3) The new emphasis upon moral and spiritual blessings.—The NT not only subordinates the material and temporal aspects of providence to the spiritual and eternal more than does the OT, but Christ and the apostles, to an extent that finds no parallel in the OT, place the emphasis of the teaching concerning providence upon man's moral needs and eternal interests, and upon the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, the establishment of which in the hearts and lives of men is the one great object for which the heavenly Father and His children are ceaselessly working. To be free from sin, to be holy in heart and useful in life, to love and obey God as a Father, to love and serve men as brothers—this is the ideal and the end for which, according to the NT, men should work and pray, and this is the end toward which God is working by His ceaseless cooperative providence.

IV. Discussion of the Contents of the Biblical Doctrine.—There are four distinct conceptions of providence as it concerns God's relation to the ongoing life of the world and the views of man, the rational and moral free Providence agent whom He has placed upon it, viz. the atheistic, the deistic, the pantheistic, and the theistic or Bib. view. See also Ch. 4, p. 244. This framed view must be understood only when stated in comparison and contrast with these opposing views.

(1) Atheism, or materialism, stands at one extreme, affirming that there is no God, that the material universe is eternal, and that from material atoms, eternally endowed with certain properties, there have come, by a process of evolution, all existing forms of vegetable, animal and rational life. As materialism denies the existence of a personal Creator, it of course denies any and every part of divine providence.

(2) Pantheism stands at the other extreme from atheism, teaching that God is everything and everything is God. The proof that the universe is "the living garment of God," the soul of the world, the universe His existence, is not to be found in a personal God who can express His existence in terms of self-consciousness—i. Th., Thu. Providence, according to pantheism, is spiritual, the creative act of a personal God, differing from materialism only in the name which it gives to the infinite substance from which all things flow. The point of departure is, that there is one God, and that He created the world, but created things do not need His presence and the maintenance of His power in order to run their course. The material universe is placed under immutable law; while man, the responsible agent, is left free to do as he will. God sustains, according to deism, very much the same relation to the universe that the clockmaker does to his clock, and wound it up, he does not interfere with it, and the longer it can run without the maker's intervention the greater the evidence of wisdom and skill on the part of the maker. God is meant to be God, not that there is a supernatural revelation to the man. The only religion that is possible to man is natural religion; he may reason from his knowledge of God in nature up to a knowledge of God as the creator of the world. His subjective influence is of great importance; it helps us to answer our own prayers, to be assured that it be heard. If the Deity is a praying-hearing God, He is at least not a prayer-anwering God. The laws of Nature constitute God's general providence; but there is no other personal and special providence than this, according to deism. God, the deists affirm, is too great, too distant, too transcendental a Being to concern Himself with the details of creaturely existence.

(4) The theistic or Biblical conception of providence teaches that not only the Creator but the Preserver of the universe, and the wise government of the universe, no less than its creation, implies and necessitates at every moment of time an omnipotent and omnipresent personal Being. This world is not "governed by the laws of Nature," as deism teaches, but it is "governed by God, according to the laws of Nature." "Law," in itself, is an impotent thing, except as it is the expression of a free will or person back of it; "the laws of Nature" are meaningless and impotent, except as they are the expression of the uniform mode, according to which God preserves and governs the world. It is customary to speak of the laws of Nature as if they were certain self-existent forces or powers governing the world. But shall we not rather say that there is no law except what is created by the Divine will or created wills? If this be true, then it is inconsistent to say that God has contracted the government of the physical universe to "secondary causes"—that is, to the laws of Nature—and that these causes are not in themselves dependent upon Him for their efficiency. The omnipotent and ever-active God is the only real force and power and cause in the universe, except as created wills may be true and real causes within their limited bounds. This view of God's relation to the created universe serves to distinguish the Bib. doctrine of Divine providence from the teachings of materialists and deists, who eliminate entirely the Divine hand from the ongoing of the universe, and in its stead make a god of the "laws of Nature," and hence have no need for a Divine preserver. Bib. theism makes ample room for the presence of the supernatural and miraculous, but we must not be blind to a danger here, in that it is possible to make too much of the presence of God in this way of expressing His (revelation, inspiration, and miracle) as to overlook entirely His equally important and necessary presence in the natural—which would be to encourage a deistical conception of God's relation to the world and to exaggerate the expense of His immanence. That is the true theistic doctrine of providence which, while not undervaluing the supernatural and miraculous, yet steadfastly maintains that God is none the less present in, and necessary to, what is termed the "natural."
the created universe is defined as an act of “continuous creation.” By the Divine Immanence is meant something more than omnipresence, which term, in itself alone, does not affirm any causal relation between God and the world. Not present, whereas the term “immanence” does affirm such causal relation. By asserting the Divine Immanence, therefore, as the mode of God’s providential efficiency, we affirm that all created things are dependent upon Him for continued existence, that the laws of Nature have no efficiency apart from their Creator and Preserver, that God is to be sought and seen in all forms and phases of creaturely existence, in the natural as well as the supernatural and miraculous, that He is not only omnipresent but always and everywhere active both in the natural and the spiritual world, and that without Him neither the material atom, nor the living organism, nor the rational soul could have any being. He not only created all things, but “by Him all things consist,” that is, by Him all things are preserved in being.

What, then, let us ask, do the Scriptures teach as to the purpose and end of God’s providential care? Without a doubt, the Bible is mainly concerned with the highest and purest use of the Divine Providence. How should we understand the “final cause” of the Creator? If we can think God’s thoughts after Him and discover this “final cause” of creation, with even approximate accuracy, then we shall find a principle that will illuminate at least, if it does not fully explain, the methods and mysteries of providence. We venture to affirm that the controlling thought in the mind of God in establishing this order of things, of which we are a conscious part, was to create a race of beings who should find their highest happiness by being in the highest degree holy, and who should, in proportion as they attain their highest holiness and happiness, thereby in the highest degree glorify their Creator. The Creator’s highest glory can be promoted only by such beings as are at once rational, moral, free, holy. There are unconscious, unthinking, unmoral forms of existence, but the motive and meaning of the universe is to be found, not in the lower, the physical and animal, but in the highest, in the rational and moral. They are the most holy, the most blessed, the most holy. But creatures are the animal for the spiritual and moral. A being whose character is formed under the conditions and laws of intellectual and moral freedom is higher than any being can be that is what it is necessarily, that is, by virtue of conditions over which it has no control. Character that is formed freely under God’s government and guidance will glorify the Creator more than anything can which is made to be what it is wholly by Divine omnipotence. These things being true, it follows that God’s providence in the world will be directed primarily and ceaselessly toward developing character in free moral agents, toward reducing sin to the minimum and developing the government of holiness, in every way and by every means compatible with perfect moral freedom in the creature.

The possibility of sin in a world of free agents and in a state of probation is unavoidable, but to say that sin is possible does not mean that it is necessary. See Choose: Will. The final cause and end, the purpose and motive, of Divine providence, then, are not the temporal, material and earthly happiness of men, but the highest ultimate moral good of free beings whose highest happiness is to be found in their obedience to the holy will of God, as their Father, and secondly, loving and self-sacrificing service to their fellow-men. This ever-present and all-dominating moral purpose of Divine providence determines its methods and explains, in part at least, what would otherwise be its mysteries.

With this view of Divine Providence and the general trend of Bib. thought is in entire accord. In the light of Christ’s revelation of God as a holy and loving Father who regards all men as His children and whose chief concern is to develop holiness and love in those whom He loves, we may define Divine Providence as the infinite power to accomplish the ends of infinite holiness and love. The originating and determining cause of Divine providence is, in the NT conception of it, always to be found in the love of God, while the final cause is the glory of the Father as realized in the holiness and happiness of His children.

By the doctrine of special providence, according to the best use of that term in theological literature, is meant as already indicated, that minute care and ever-watchful supervision which God exercises over His obedient and believing children in times both small and great, which are designed to secure their ever-increasing holiness and usefulness. God’s general providence is said to be “omnipresent,” “omnipotent,” and “omnipotent,” to the minute details of creaturely existence— and is always, everywhere, and for all time, the “work of providence.” But the Scriptures teach that there is a more special care over and ordering of the lives of the spiritually good than pertains to the wicked. They have not the same eyes. The following Scriptures set forth in unmistakable terms the doctrine of a special providence exercised by the heavenly Father over His people: “A man’s goings are established of Jehovah; and he delighteth in his way” (Ps 37:23). “There shall be no mishap happen to the righteous” (Prov 12:21). “But I will make him first to inherit and to be full of honor; and all the days of the righteous: ‘A man’s goings are established of Jehovah; and he delighteth in his way’” (Prov 12:21).

The following points seem to be plainly involved in any statement of the doctrine of special providence that we claim to be from the inspiration of the Scriptures:

1. Spiritual, not material, good to man the end sought in special providence.—A mistaken and hurtful notion has long been prevalent to the effect that special providence is designed to secure the secular and earthly good, the material and temporal prosperity, of God’s children. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Material blessings may indeed come as a special providence to the child of God (Mt 6:31), but that “good” which all things work together for their secure, spiritual good, and not financial, or social, or intellectual, or temporal, is the ultimate spiritual good. Indeed, God’s special providence may take away wealth and bring poverty in its stead in order to impress the creature with the higher importance of the spiritual good, and not merely in order to make the creature suffer, but rather than further one’s worldly hopes and ambitions; may occasion sickness rather than health, and death instead of life—sometimes for a Christian to be increased in his faith by sickness or death than by health or continued life—and when that is the case, he shall be interpreted as special as a special providence. “Every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit.” Many of the O.T. promises do, it is true, seem to have special reference to material and temporal blessings, but we should remember that the best interpretation of these is to be found in the NT, where they are (as, for example, when quoted by Christ in the Temptation) interpreted to promote spiritual good (and, hence, to bring forth more fruit). When Our Lord speaks of the very hairs of our heads being numbered, and declares that if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without the Father’s notice, surely we, of whom more value than many sparrows, cannot drift beyond His love and care. He is interpreted as teaching that God will save us from physical suffering and death; but such is not His meaning, for in the very same context He speaks of how they to whom He thus pledges His love and care shall be persecuted and depressed for His name’s sake, and hence, put to death; indeed, His promise is true. God was with them in their physical suffering and death; but such is not their physical death, nor is God with them in their great blessing wherewith He blessed them was not physical but moral and spiritual.

2. Special Providence and “accidents.”—Another still more mistaken and hurtful notion concerning special providence is the association of it with, and the limitation of it largely to, those accidents, or what are called “accidents,” that are extraordinary and occasional occurrences which involve more than ordinary danger and annoyance. That special providence associates it with a happy escape from visible dangers and serious injury, when the house catches on fire, or the horses run away, or the train is
wrecked, or the ship encounters an awful storm, or one comes in contact with contagious disease, or the terror of pestilence that walketh in darkness. A happy escape from injury thus occasioned is popularly designated as a "special providence," and this regardless of whether the individual thus escaping is a saint or a sinner, is strongly emphasized by the fact that God's special providence is not a capricious, occasional, and irregular intervention of His love and power in behalf of His peculiar children. It involves ceaseless, yet infinitely tender thought and care for those that love Him, everywhere and in every experience of life.

(3) Special providence as related to piously and prayer.—God's special providence is conditioned upon pious and prayerful habits. When we may properly pray for things pertaining to our temporal and physical life, there is no assurance that God will answer such prayers in so far as He deems best, yet the Scriptures encourage us to pray both for "all things," and for the special concerns of our prayers. "Seek ye first His kingdom, and His righteousness; this is the essence of the NT teaching on the subject, but we should overlook the fact that this Divine interposition is both preceded and followed by the strongest assurances of the most important and all-embracing provision for all our temporal and physical wants by the loving heavenly Father. Therefore take no thought saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? Wherewith shall we be clothed?.... For your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you. For where your mind is, there shall be your treasure also." (Matt. 6:25-33). The poet has written:

"Make you His service your delight; Your wants shall be His care." But while it is true that God has promised to make our wants and needs, and has reminded us that He has promised this only to that devout and godly number of pious, praying souls who "seek first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness," general providence is all-embracing, by which "he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." (Matt. 5:45). But, "As the Father hath power over all things, so doth the Son; therefore doth the Father love the Son, because he hath given him all power in heaven and on earth." (Matt. 28:18). And this is promised that "all things work together for good"—and the proof of love is not in one's profession, but in his obedience and service.

(4) Special providence as related to human cooperation.—To "works of love" and "concerning the heavenly Father's will" watchful and loving providence do not mean that the children become the agents in any sense, but only as thought of and charged with food and raiment, and labor daily to obtain the necessities of life. Labor, both mental and physical, is as much a duty as prayer. The prayer, "O give us this day our daily bread." does not render it unnecessary that they who offer it should work for their own daily bread. Nothing could be more hurtful to healthful Christian activity than to interpret Our Lord's instruction, in the Sermon on the Mount, as a command to live by the sweat of our brow. Nevertheless, the heavenly Father's watchful providence as a justification of our own cooperation is as "for our benefit" that it is simple to warn us against that needless and hurtful anxiety about the future which is not only unprofitable in God's sight, but which is utterly destructive of man's best efforts in his own behalf.

(5) General and special providence both equally Divine.—While the Scriptures appear to us to make a real and true distinction between God's natural and His supernatural order, and between His general and His special providence, yet to truly pious and wisely discerning souls all is alike Divine, the natural as well as the supernatural, general as well as special providence. So far as God's faithful and loving children are concerned, general and special providence are but one. The only real and important distinction between the two is that made by the free wills of men, by virtue of which some are in loving accord with the Divine plans concerning them, and others are at enmity with God and oppose the purposes of His love concerning them. If this love of the heavenly Father had and had always been, alike trustful and loving children of the heavenly Father, there would perhaps never have been any occasion for making a distinction between the general and the special providence of God. The only reason why it was expedient to refer to in that case would have been as to the varieties of Divine providence, in view of the fact that the all-loving Father would cause widely different events to happen to His different children. If anyone, therefore, is inclined to deny the distinction between the two, there have been made between general and special providence, and prefers to affirm that there is but one general providential order over mankind in the world, that the only thing that really "special" and out of the general order is the limit which sin imposes upon the workings of Divine providence in so far as the self-will and opposition of men prevent the realization of the providential purposes of God concerning them. But, unfortunately, sin is now, and has long been, so prevalent and dominant in the world that we have come to regard God's providence as affected and limited by it, as that which is regular and general, and His more perfect and complete providence in behalf of and over the good as the exceptional and special. But whether we call Divine providence, as related to believers, "general" or "special," is of little consequence, provided we believe that "the steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord." (Psa. 37:23 AV), that "all things work together for [spiritual] good to them that love God," and that to those who, duly subordinating the temporal to the spiritual, seek "first the kingdom of God and his righteousness," all things needful "shall be added unto [them]." (Matt. 6:33).

The problem of Divine providence has its utmost significance, not in its bearing on the laws of physical nature, but in that phase of it which concerns God's dealings with moral agents, where discretion, reason, and free will are factors of paramount importance.

Free Will—Will. God governs men as a father governs his children, as a king governs his free subjects; not as a machinist works his machine, or as a hypnotist controls his mesmerized victims. A father in his family and a sovereign in his realm may each do as he pleases within certain limits, and God infinitely more: "He doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay his hand or say unto him, What dost thou?" (Dan. 4:35). He setteth up one and putteth down another. Nevertheless, even God acts within limits; He limited Himself when He created free agents. As a mere matter of power God could determine men's volitions and necessitate his acts, but He can do so only by making of him a kind of rational machine, and destroying his true freedom. But Scripture, reason and consciousness all unite in teaching man that he is morally free, that he is an agent, and not something merely acted on. God's providential government of men, therefore, is based on their freedom as rational and moral beings, and consists in such an administration and guidance by the Holy Spirit of the affairs of men as shall encourage free moral agents to virtue, and discourage them from sin. God's providence must needs work upon and with two kinds of wills—willing wills and opposing wills.

(1) Divine providence as related to willing wills.—The apostle declares that God works in believers "both to will and to do of his good pleasure." If God's special providence over and in behalf of His children may involve an intervention of His Divine power with regard to physical law, much more, it would seem, will it involve a similar intervention when the same power acts on free moral agents. The wise and holy use made of the human will. Spiritual guidance is one of the most precious privileges of believers, but it is difficult to conceive how the Holy Spirit can guide a believer without finding some way of controlling his will and determining his voluntary acts. While men of man's thoughts, emotions and volitions are self-determined in their origin, being due to their nature as self-determined, men of heart and will, yet there are also thoughts,
emotions and volitions that are Divinely produced. Even a great deal of sin has its roots in the rights and emotions that are produced by the Holy Ghost. Much more harm has been done by Divinely produced thoughts and feelings than by the agency of moral free agency? We think not; it is no more subordinate to God that there should be evil than that there is a free moral agent.

But, one thing is evident, God is responsible for the exercise of a man’s volitions and secure a certain course of action than it is for one man effectively to influence another. No volition is effective, unless it be the conscience of a free moral agent; for moral volitions are such as are formed in the pursuit of most natural and common ends. The element of necessity and compulsion would destroy all true freedom, and moral accountability, for any prouctions of mind, if it were not for the voluntary nature of free beings as attributes of free beings would be thereby rendered impossible in men; for only such beings can put forth free holy volitions as can put forth free sinful volitions. If man had never sinned, there would probably have never been such a large providential use of natural or physical evil as at present prevails; and this because of the fact that an unfallen and holy race of beings would not have needed the presence of natural evil to secure their highest moral development. But, fast, though, the future does not seem to bring it back to God and to develop holy character and the highest moral service. It is not true that sin is now always or even generally the immediate cause of an individual’s sinning, but it is rather the result of that natural propensity, which is a proof of extraordinary sin.

"Master, who did sin, " asked the disciples, "this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?' Jesus answered, "Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents: but that the works of God might be made manifest in him" (Jn 9:2-3 AV). Human suffering is for man’s spiritual good and for the Divine glory, as shown in working good out of evil—this is the explanation which the Master gives as to why natural evil is permitted or sent by God. It is not only a powerful, but in a world like ours, a necessary agency for the correction and cure of moral evil and for the spiritual development of fallen man. Before I was afflicted I went astray; but now I observe thy word... It is good for me that I have been afflicted; that I may learn thy statutes" (Ps 119:67-71); "Every branch that beareth fruit, he cleanseth it, that it may bear more fruit" (Jn 15:2). The saintly and eminently useful men and women of history have, as a rule, had to undergo a severe discipline in order to keep them pure and were made perfect only by their sufferings. Divine providence thus turns much of the world’s natural and physical evil into moral good.

Many of the things that befall the children of God are directly due to the sins of other men. That good men, even the very best of men, suffer many things at the hands of wicked men admits of no questions; and not these are among the “all things” which are declared by the apostle to work together for good to them that love God. The good that may ensue to good men from the evil conduct of the wicked is certainly not due to the intrinsic power in sin to work good to those against whom it is maliciously directed; it can only be due to God directing and working good of the innocent. “As for you,” said Joseph, “ye meant evil against me; but God meant it for good” (Gen 50:20). 5. Divine Providence as Related to Natural and Moral Evil. For the existence of the world in moral evil (sin), man, the moral free agent, is wholly responsible. God could prevent moral evil from sinning only by not permitting them to work under their wills under irresistible Divine restraint and compulsion. But the latter method of controlling them would virtually destroy their real and true freedom; and if this were done, then man would be no longer a voluntary or vicarious agent.

5. Divine Providence as Related to Natural and Moral Evil.
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here again to remark that it is not material and temporal, but spiritual good, that God has guaranteed to His holy, loving and faithful children. If sin had这话的'intoxicated power to work good, they would be right who maintain that the Church is their salvation, and one may do evil when good will come of it' (cf. Rom 3:8); and the right who maintain that God, as the author of evil, seeing that evil is, on that supposition, only disguised good—prophecies which are thoroughly vicious and ungodly, and which cannot be right in God. The Scriptures, rightly interpreted, nowhere lend themselves to establish the ungodly doctrine of Isa 45:19.

To what extent may we, having studied God's providential methods as revealed in the Scriptures, in Nature, History, and the life and personal experience, venture to interpret providence as it relates to the current events in our own lives and in the lives of others? Experience and observation will warn us both against haste and against too great confidence in our interpretations of providence. Hasty misinterpretations of providence in it we are on present passing events frequently become fruitful sources of sin to the future. Some people are much given to interpreting providence. Certain ills or misfortunes come to a bad man; they are quick to assert that it is a Divine judgment sent upon him in view of his sin. Certain blessings come to a good man; they are sure the blessings of heaven—sent in view of his extraordinary pieté. A whiskey merchant's store burns down: it is, say they, a Divine judgment, in view of his ill-gotten gains. But presently the property of an unquestionably pious and conscientious man is 攫取 away by a false claimant. When now is the providence? The 'oracles' fail to explain; and the set of the problem remains as hard to interpret as, for example, when two men, a saint and a sinner, are prostrated on beds of sickness. The former, in spite of prayer and penitence, grows worse, and finally dies; while the other, without prayer or penitence, is restored to health. God has not revealed his providence. And the providence for ourselves and our God, seeing that God has not furnished us with any means of absolving proving that what has happened to us might not have happened, under similar circumstances, even to sinful men. Many a Christian man to see that the goodness which has happened to him—the loss of property, the terrible ill of sickness, and the like—grows as time, he would not interpret as providential—are among the best things that were ever sent upon him, in that they made him holier and more useful (cf. Jts 13:7).

"Blind unbelief is sure to err, And scan His work in vain; And He will make it plain."

There are, however, many evident truths that it is large on the pages of history, to see the divine and human in the development of kingdoms and nations, who he who reads may read. And to him who truly believes in the God and Father of all men, Jesus Christ, and who will duly consider all the facts and lessons of life, in himself and others, in individuals and in collective life, he will patiently as the years come and go, it will be made plain that 'God's in His heaven—All's right with the world, and all that the providence together for the spiritual good of those who love God and who prove their love for Him by serving their fellow-men.

We conclude then, that there is, according the Scriptures, an ever-watchful providence exercised by the heavenly Father over His faithful and loving children, which is ceaselessly working to secure their ever-increasing holiness and usefulness here, and their perfect happiness in a future state of existence. To prepare rational and immortal free agents through holiness and usefulness here for happiness hereafter is the aim and end of this all-embracing providence of God, which includes within its loving care every human being, except such as get out of the way of God's holy, loving, and perfecting. There is no providential highway to a state here that is free from life's ills, and that abounds in temporal and earthly blessings to the good. But there is a royal and holy highway, along which moves a providential pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night, leading the children of the covenant, through lives of loving service and sacrifice, to a holy land of promise, the goal of a gracious providence; and who they journey along this highway for this end: 'The Lord knoweth those that are his: And, Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity' (2 Tim 2 19 AV). They who bear this seal are the Divinely chosen instruments and agents of that larger and wider providence that is ever working to effect the perfect kingdom of righteousness in the whole earth, that kingdom of God, to inaugurate which, in its Messianic form, Our Lord became incarnate, and to consummate which, in its final and perfect form, He reigns from heaven and will continue to reign until, having 'brought as under his feet,' He shall "deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father" when the poet's vision shall be realized of "That God who ever lives and loves: One God, one law, one element: And one far-off Divine event, To which the whole creation moves."


WILBUR F. TILLET

PROVINCIA, provins (7777), mhdlnâh, "jurisdiction"; επαρχία, eparchia [EV province] [Acts 23:34; 25:6];

1. Meaning of the Term
2. Roman Provincial Administration
3. Division of Provinces
4. Province of Judaea
5. Revenue
6. Literature

Province (provincia) did not originally denote a territorial insurrection; indeed, the name "province" of the provinces of the world was much more

Meaning more ancient than any of the other parts of the Roman Empire outside of Italy.

In the most comprehensive official sense it signified a magistrature's sphere of administrative action, which in one instance might be the direction of jurisdiction at Rome, in another the management of military operations against a particular hostile community. When the imperium was conferred upon two consuls at the beginning of the Republic, and upon a praetor in 367 BC, and finally upon a second praetor in 241 BC, it became necessary in practice to define their individual competence which was unlimited in theory. When the Romans extended their control over lands situated outside of Italy, it became expedient to fix territorial limits to the exercise of authority by the magistrates who were regularly sent abroad, so that provincia signified hencethrough in an abstract sense the rule of the governor, and in a concrete sense the specified region entrusted to his care; and with the development and consolidation of the Roman system of administration, the geographical meaning of the word became more and more significant.

The history of Roman provincial administration in the more definite sense commences in 227 BC, when four praetors were elected for the first time, of whom two were assigned to the government of
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Province
Psalms, Book of

THE PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATION was for the government of the provinces by means of special procurators, or, in exceptional circumstances, by consuls, during their term of office. Accordingly, the number of procurators was increased from four in 227 BC to eight at the time of Sulla. A second point is that in accordance with the reforms of Sulla all the consuls and procurators remained at Rome during their year of office, and were entrusted with the administration of provinces a subsequent year with the title proconsul (pro consule) or procurator (pro procuratore). The procurators were sent to the more important provinces. The Senate determined the distinction between consular and praetorian provinces and generally controlled the assignment of the provinces to the ex-magistrates. Julius Caesar removed the praetors to sixteen, but Augustus reduced them to twelve.

3. Third period.—In 27 BC, Augustus as commander-in-chief of the Roman army definitely assumed the administration of all provinces which required the presence of the imperial forces and left the other provinces to the control of the Senate. There were then twelve imperial and ten senatorial provinces, but all provinces added after 27 BC came under imperial administration. The emperor administered through the agency of personal delegates, legati Augusti of senatorial, and praetors or procuratores of equestrian, rank. The term of their service was not uniform, but continued usually for more than a single year. The senatorial administration was essentially a continuation of the post-Sullan, republican régime. The senatorial governors were called proconsuls generally, whether they were of consular or praetorian rank; but Africa and Asia alone were reserved for consuls, the eight remaining senatorial provinces being attributed to ex-procurators. The financial administration of each imperial province was entrusted to a procurator, that of each senatorial province to a quaestor.

The provinces were divided into smaller circumscriptions (civitates) for the purposes of local government. In the older provinces these districts corresponded generally with Provinces the urban communities which had been established by the sovereigns before the advent of the Romans. Under Rom rule they were divided into different classes on the basis of their dignity and prerogatives, as follows:

1. Colonial: Procurators (see Procuratores) who resided at Caesarea (Jos, B.9, II, xv, 6; Acts 23 23.33; 25 1) in the palace of Herod the Great (Acts 23-35). The procurators of Judaea were subject to the authority of the imperial governors of Syria, as was also the province of Judaea. The Roman procurator at Jerusalem was Thaddeus, an intimate friend of Pontius Pilate by Vitellius (Jos, Ant, X VIII, iv, 2; Tac. Ann. vi.32). The procurator was competent to exercise criminal jurisdiction over the provincials in cases involving a capital sentence (Jos, B. 9, II, xii, 1). He was bound to present every non-Roman citizen for trial at Rome (Acts 25 11). A death sentence by the Sanhedrin required the sanction of the procurator, as appears in the process against the Saviour. Under Rom rule cities like Caesarea, Sebaste, and Aelia Corinth, became organs for local government, like the urban communities in other parts of the Empire.

The revenue of Pal under Claudius is said to have been 12,000,000 denarii (about $3,400,000, or £500,000; cf Jos, Ant, X IX, vii, 2). The revenue in addition to the amount of which is not known, a variety of indirect contributions were collected on auctions, salt, highways, bridges, etc, which constituted, no doubt, the field of activity in which the procurators gained their incomes.

LITERATURE.—The reader may be directed to Marquardt, Römische Staatsverwaltung, I, 497-502, 517-57, for a general discussion of the Roman system of provincial administration, and to the same volume, pp. 455-63, for the provincial government of Pal.

George H. Allen

PROVOCATION, prov-o-kä’shun, PROVOKE, prö-vök; "Provoke," lit. "to call forth," hence to excite or stir up, whether in a good or bad sense, appears frequently in the OT as the tr of Piel, or Hiph. of לֶאַב, kâ’as (noun, לֶאַב, kâ’as), in the sense of "to make angry" (Dt 4 23, 16 20; Isa 1 4); "provoked" (Dt 8 1); "provoketh" (Eph 4 3); cf (Prov. 8 16); with לֶאַב kâ’as, "to embitter" (He 3 16; cf in I Esd 6 15), and other Gr words. "Provocation" in He 3 15 (quoting Ps 95 8) is paropikrasmos, LXX for ἀτιασίαν. An example of the good sense of the word is in He 10 22, "Consider one another to provoke[lit. "to the provoking," here paroikramos] unto love and good works."

For "provoke" RV has "despise" (Nu 14 11; Dt 31 20), "rebel against" (Ps 78 40); for "provoked," "despised" (Nu 14 23; 16 20; Isa 1 4); "provoked" (Dt 32 16; I Ch 21, 1); "rebuked against" (Ps 78 56), were rebellious (106 33-35); for "provoking" (Ps 78 17), "to rebel against;" for "provoked" (2 Cor 9 2), "stirred up;" "provoked within" for "stirred in" (Acts 17 16); "provoked" for "limited" (Ps 78 41, "limited"); "provoked" for "embarrass;" (Job 16 3); instead of "Provoke not your children to anger" (Col 3 21). "Provoke not your children." W. L. Walker

PRUNDE, pröd’en, PRUDENT, pröd’ent: In the OT "prudence" is the tr of וּכַּלְכֶל, "orādāh (Prov 8 12); also in AV of וּכַּל, sekhel (2 Ch 2 12, RV "discretion"); and "prudent" is the tr of נַפְף" (Grum. "sensible" (Prov 12 16,23, 13 16, etc; cf Gen 3 1; Jer 5 12), and "wise" (Prov 8 12, RVm "skilful"); Prov 16 18, 15; Isa 55 21; 10 13, ARV "understanding," etc), with other words. In the NT "prudence" occurs once as the tr of προνοια, prōnōsia (Eph 1 8); "prudent" is in AV the tr of προνοια in 10 years later, changed in RV to "understanding" (Mt 11 23; Acts 13 14). But in 1 Cor 1 19, ARV has "the discerning," ERV retains "prudent." In its etymological sense of being foreknowledge (contraction of "providence"), "prudence"
does not occur in the NT. As forethought, foresight, prudence was reckoned one of the cardinal virtues by the ancient ethical writers. See the remarks of Coleridge on its lower and higher character in his *Aids to Reflection*, Aphor. 29.


(3) *Vine.*

**PSALMS, sâmâ, BOOK OF (פֶּסַלְמָי, pslâmîm), "praises," פֶּסַלְמָי כָּל, pslâmîm 'alîm, "book of praises"; פֶּסַלְמִי, pslâmîy, פֶּסַלְמִיתָן, pslâmîyôn, Psaltéron):**

I. **Introductory Topics.**—The Heb title for the Psalter is sâpher pslâmîm, "book of praises." When we consider the fact that more than 20 of these poems have praise for their keynote, and that there are outbursts of thanksgiving in many others, the fitness of the Heb title dawns upon us. As Ker well says, "The book begins with benediction, and ends with praise—first, blessing on man, and then glory to God." Hymns of praise, though found in all parts of the Psalter, become far more numerous in Books IV and V, as if the volume of praise would gather itself up into a Hallelujah Chorus at the end.

In the Gr version the book is entitled in some MSS *Psalmoi*, in others *Psaltéron*, whence come our Eng. titles "Psalms," and "Psalter." The Gr word *psalmoi*, as well as the Heb *mizmôr*, both of which are used in the superscriptions prefixed to many of the separate pses, indicates a poem sung to a stringed instrument. The title *mizmôr* is found before 57 pses. The Psalter was the hymnal of the Jewish nation. To individual pses other titles are sometimes prefixed, such as *shir*, "song"; *thullîm*, "praise"; *thullâh*, "prayer," etc. The Psalter was both prayerbook and nuptial to the Jewish people. It was also a manual for the nurture of the spiritual life in private as well as public worship.

The Pses were placed in the *ketübbîm* or "Writings," the third group of the Heb Scriptures. As the chief book of the *ketübbîm*, the Psalter appears first in the great majority of German MSS through the Spanish MSS place Ps after Ch, and the Talmuts Ruth before Ps. There has never been any serious question as to the right of the Psalter to a place in the Canon of Scripture. The book is possibly more highly esteemed by Christians than by the Jews. If Christians were permitted to retain only one book in the OT, they would almost certainly choose Ps. By 100 B.C. a much earlier date than at a much earlier date, the Book of Ps was completed and recognized as part of the *Hagiographa*, the 3d division of the Heb Bible.

According to the Heb text, followed by modern VSS, there are 150 separate poems in the Psalms. The Gr version has an additional ps, in which David describes his victory over Goliath; but this is expressly said to be "aside", i.e., a ps added. As to the number, the LXX, followed by many VSS, Vulg, combined Ps 9 and 10, and also 114 and 115, into a single ps. On the other hand, they divide Ps 116 and 117 each into two poems.

Thus for the greater part of the Psalter the Heb enumeration is one number in advance of that in the Gr and Lat Bibles.

The existing division in the Heb text has been called in question at various points. *Ps* 42 and 43 are almost certainly one ps (see refrain), and it is probable that Ps 9 and 10 were originally one, as in LXX. On the other hand, it is thought by some that certain pses originally comprised of two different poems. We may cite as examples Ps 19.1–6; 7–14; 25.1–6; 82.1–6; 85.7–10; 119.97–106. It is evident that such combinations of two different poems into one may have taken place, for we have an example in Ps 68, which is composed of portions of two other pses (57.7–11; 60.5–12).

(1) **Value of the superscriptions.**—It is the fashion among advanced critics to waive the titles of the pses out of court as wholly worthless, and misleading. This method is as thoroughly unscientific as the older Text procedure of defending the superscriptions as part of an inspired text.

These titles are clearly very old, for the LXX, in the 2d cent. BC, did not understand many of them. The worst that can be said of the superscriptions is that they are guesses of Heb editors and scribes of a period long prior to the Gr version. As to the musical and liturgical titles, the best learning of Jews and Christian editors is unable to recover the original meaning. The scribes who prefixed the titles had no conceivable reason for writing nonsense into their prayerbook and hymnal. These superscriptions and subscriptions all had a worthy meaning, when they were first placed beside individual pses. This indisputable fact of the great antiquity of these titles ought forever to make it impossible for scientific research to ignore them. Grant, for the sake of argument, that not one of these either came from the pen of the writers of the Pses, but only from editors and compilers of eulogic or post-eulogic days, it would still be reasonable to give attention to the views of ancient Heb scholars, before considering the conjectures of modern critics on questions of authorship and date. Sources of information, both oral and written, to which they had access, have long since perished. In estimating the value of their work, we have a right to use the best critical processes known to us, but it is unscientific to overlook the fact that the attempt by the time of the composition of the Pses gave them an advantage over the modern scholar. If it be said by objectors that ancient scribes formed their conclusions by the study of the life of David as portrayed in the Psalter, the historian is ready to say that the reply is ready that several historical notices in the titles cannot be thus explained. Who was Cush? Who was Abimelech? (Ps 7 and 34). A careful weighing of the facts concerning the superscriptions will make it seem highly improbable that the earliest of these titles does not reach back into preëxilic times. We almost certainly have in them the results of the labors of Heb scribes and compilers stretching over several centuries. Some of the titles may have been appended by the psalmists themselves.

We are far from claiming that the titles are always intelligible to us, or that, when understood, they are always correct. The process of constructing titles indicative of authorship had not ceased in the 2d cent. BC. In the LXX, the editors added many to pses that were anonymous in the Heb. The view expressed nearly 50 years ago by Ferowne is eminently sane: "The inscriptions cannot always be relied on. They are sometimes genuine, and really represent the most ancient tradition. At other times, they are due to the caprice of later editors and collectors, the fruits of conjecture, or of dimer and more uncertain traditions. In short, the inscriptions of the Pses are like the subscriptions to the Epp. of the NT. They are not of any necessary authority, and their
value must be weighed and tested by the usual critical processes.

(2) Thrill's theory.—J. W. Thrill (The Titles of the Psalms (1907) points to the hypothesis that the both superscriptions and subscriptions were incorporated in the Psalter, and that in the process of copying and transmission it was customary to fill up the subscription of a given ps and the subscription of the one immediately preceding it. When the first of these adjacent ps's were separated from one another, as in printed ed., the subscriptions and superscriptions of the intervening ps's were all set aside. Thus it came about that the musical subscription of a given ps was prefixed to the title of the immediately following ps, and vice versa. If the ps and the prayer, "The dithyrambic "For Two Sh'minith" The generally goodly always title, positively."

We know from 1 Ch 16:41: "37 that Jecoreus (q.v.) was a choir leader in the days of King David. Perhaps the authorship of the psalm has often been called attention to the fact that as a subscript to Ps 55 "the dove of the distant terebinth," or "the silent dove with its wings closely folded," and in comparison with Ps 55:6–8.

(2) Meholth (Ps 53). Meholth Ferzadah (Ps 88): Perhaps Thrill’s vocalization of the Hebrew consonants as meholath, "dancings," is correct. As a subscript to Ps 57, meholah may mean David’s joy at the bringing of the ark to Zion in 2 Sam 6:15.

(3) Meholath (Ps 52, 42:45, 52:55, 74, 75, 58, 89, 137): The exact meaning of this common term is not clear. Briggs suggests "a meditation." Thrill and others "a psalm instruction," or "an ancient Vedic reciter’s ps.

Some of the 13 ps's bearing this title are, plainly didactic, while others are scarcely to beclassed as "psalm instructions." Such ps's include Ps 65, 106, and 110.

(a) Mithkalm (Ps 81, 59–60): Following the rabbinical guess, some translate "a golden poem. The exact meaning is uncertain.

(b) Muth labbon: The title is generally supposed to refer to a companion ps, to "a companion ps," which is recognized by when the melody to which this composition was set was the tune of Ps 9, or is to be sung. Thrill translates "Thirtle's title" and regards it as a superscription to Ps 8, in celebration of the victory over the enemy. Perhaps the "title" was originally a superscription to Ps 3, 5, 54, 55, 60, 66, 75.

(2) Nhuloth (Ps 5): possibly a subscript to Ps 4, is supposed by some to refer to "wind instruments," probably literally.

(c) Selah, though not strictly a title, may well be discussed in connection with the superscriptions. It occurs 17 times in the Psalms, but is most common in Ps 44, 50, 64, 65, 96, and 97. In this sense it is a term of address, the same word as Selah in Ps 84:20. The LXX always renders the Hebrew by "theresonance of the harp," "the excellent harp," or other technical term of musical effect. The word was thus called "the title" of a psalm, or of the first couplet of a prosaic composition. Selah was probably the ancient Arab custom of inserting a word or phrase to mark the end of a psalm, or to indicate a pause in speaking, in place of the "Amen" of modern psalms.

(2) Shikhaloth (Ps 57): possibly a subscript to Ps 4, is supposed by some to refer to "wind instruments," probably literally.

(d) Shikhaloth (Ps 5): possibly a subscript to Ps 4, is supposed by some to refer to "wind instruments," probably literally.

(e) Shikhaloth (Ps 5): possibly a subscript to Ps 4, is supposed by some to refer to "wind instruments," probably literally.

(f) Shikhaloth (Ps 5): possibly a subscript to Ps 4, is supposed by some to refer to "wind instruments," probably literally.

(g) Shikhaloth (Ps 5): possibly a subscript to Ps 4, is supposed by some to refer to "wind instruments," probably literally.

(h) Shikhaloth (Ps 5): possibly a subscript to Ps 4, is supposed by some to refer to "wind instruments," probably literally.

(i) Shikhaloth (Ps 5): possibly a subscript to Ps 4, is supposed by some to refer to "wind instruments," probably literally.
1. The age of David offered fruitful soil for the growth of religious poetry.—(a) The political and religious reforms of Samuel created a new sense of national unity, and kindled the fires of religious patriotism. (b) Music had a large place in the life of the prophetic guilds or schools of the prophets, and was used in public religious exercises (1 S 10 5 f). (c) The victories of David and the internal expansion of the life of Israel would inevitably superimpose the instinct of worship and majesty of the Elizabethan age and the Victorian era in Eng. literature. (d) The removal of the ark to the new capital and the organization of the Levitical choirs would stimulate poets to compose hymns of praise to Jeh (2 S 6; 1 Ch 15, 16, 25).

It is the fashion in certain critical circles to blot out the Mosaic era as unhistoric, all accounts of it being considered legendary or mythical. It is easy then to isolate in the mind all the religious teaching attributed to Samuel. This leaves David "a rude knave, a semi-barbaric, a rustic" as the revered, versatile contritum, chattiet, and king. It would seem more reasonable to accept as trustworthy the undiluted tradition of Israel as it is given by the great writers, Moses, Samuel, and David, than to rewrite Israel's history out of the tiny fragments of historical material that are accepted by skeptical critics as credible. It is often said that late writers read into their accounts of early heroes their own ideas of what would be fitting. James Robertson's remark in reply has great weight: "This habit of explaining the early as the backward projection of the late is always liable to the objection that it leaves the late itself without explanation" (Poetry and Religion of the Ps., 352).

(2) David's qualifications for composing ps.—(a) He was a skilful musician, with a sense of rhythm and an ear for pleasing sounds (1 S 16 15–23). He seems to have invented new instruments of music (Am 6 5). (b) He is recognized by critics of all schools as a poet of no mean ability. The greatest and the most usual claim is to his authorship and his editorship (2 S 1 19–27) is commonly accepted; also his lament over Abner (3 33 f). In the elegy over Saul and Jonathan, David displays a magnanimity and tenderness that accord with the representations of S as to his treatment of Saul and of Jonathan. No mere rough border chieftain could have composed a poem full of the tenderest sentiment and the most exemplary attitude toward a persecutor. The moral elevation of the elegy has to be accounted for. If the author was a man enjoying the friendship of God, it is easy to account for the moral dignity of the poem. Surely it is only a step from the patriotism and magnanimity and devoted friendship of the elegy to the religious fervor of the Ps. Moreover, the poetic skill displayed cannot escape the reasonable objection that literary art in the days of David had not attained a development equal to the composition of poems such as the Ps. There is nothing more beautiful and artistic in the entire Psalter.

Radical critics saw the David of the Bible as a usurper. They have no right to object with the psalmist. Though willing to believe every statement that reflects upon the moral character of David, they consider the references to David as a writer of hymns and the organization of choirs as the pious imaginaries of late chronicles. Robertson well observes: "This habit of refusing to admit complexity in the capacities of Biblical characters is characteristic of primitive uneducated thought. We may believe that David could not have written even one string, but we have religious leaders who have united the most fervent spirituality with the most polished, or with the most worldly, forms of speech or with the most improved, or with the most diluted, forms of speech or with the most approved, or with the most despised, forms of speech. There are no exceptions to this universal law. The moral elements in the moral characters of all these gifted men. Of Constantine it has been said that his soul was: the doleful believer and the cruel despot, devotees and martyr, patron saint and avenging demon." David was a many-sided man, with a character often at war with himself, a man with conflicting impulses, the flesh lustful against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh. Men of flesh and blood in the midst of life's temptations have no difficulty in understanding the David of the Bible.

(c) David was a man of deep feeling and of imperial imagination. Think of his love for Jonathan, his grateful appreciation of every exploit done in his behalf, his mighty pride in the majesty of Saul, his manly courage, his thankfulness to God for victory over Absalom. His successful generalship would argue for imagination, as well as the vivid imagery of the elegy. (d) David was an enthusiastic worshipper of Jeh. All the records of his life agree in representing him as devoted to Israel's God and to Israel's life. His dangerous, his fears, his sorrows, his firm and noble spirit, his sense of life's dangers and disappointments, "David strengthened himself in Jeh his God!" (1 S 30 6). We should have been surprised had no trace of religious poetry come from his pen. It would be difficult to imagine Milton or Cowper or Tennyson as confining himself to secular poetry. "Comus," "John Gilmor," and the "Charge of the Light Brigade" did not exhaust their genius; nor did the elegy over Saul and Jonathan and the lament over Abner relieve David's soul of the poetry that clamped him for expression. The known facts of his life and times prepare us for an outburst of psalmody under his leadership. (e) The varied experiences through which David passed were of a character to quicken any latent gifts for poetic expression.

James Robertson states this argument clearly, and yet with becoming caution: "The vicissitudes and situations in David's life presented in these narratives are of such a nature that, though we can discern precisely that such and such a psalm was composed at such a time and such a time and place, yet we cannot say with certainty that it was written by David, or even that such a man has passed through certain experiences and borne himself in such wise that we are not surprised to receive a poem that is characteristic of him and the other ps. It is very doubtful whether we should tie down any psalm to the situation of Jonathan and David, or to the poet being like a painter, who, having found a landscape, sits down to transfer it to canvas. I do not think it likely that David, finding himself in some great perplexity or sorrow, called for writing materials in order to describe the situation or record his feelings. But I do think it probable that the vicissitudes through which he passed made such an impression on his sensitive heart, and became material, as it were, to the poetic and religious nature, that when he soothed himself in his retirement with his lyre, they came forth spontaneously in the form of a psalm or song or prayer, according as the recollection was sad or joyful, and as his singing mood moved him." (Poetry and Religion of the Ps., 353).

The Bib. writers, both early and late, agree in affirming that the Spirit of Jeh rested upon David, empowering him for service of the highest order (1 S 16 13; 2 S 23 1–3; Mt 22 43; Acts 2 29–31). The gift of prophetic inspiration was bestowed upon Israel's chief musician and poet.

(3) External evidence for the ps.—(a) In the NT David is named as the author of certain ps. Thus Ps 110 is ascribed to David by Jesus in his debate with the Pharisees in the Temple (Mt 27 41–45; Mk 12 35–37; Lk 20 41–44). Peter teaches that David prophesied concerning Jesus (Acts 1 16), and he also refers Ps 18 and 110 to...
David (Acts 2:25-34). The whole company of the disciples in prayer attribute Ps 2 to David (Acts 4:25 f ). Paul quotes Ps 32 and 69 as Davidic (Rom 4:6-8; 11:91). The author of He even refers Ps 95 to David, following the LXX (1 Sam 17). These chapters are unusual in that the scholars infer that any quotation from the Psyps might be referred to David as the chief author of the Psyps. Possibly this free and easy method of citation, without any attempt at rigorous critical accuracy, was in vogue in the 1st cent. AD. At the same time, it is evident that the view that David was the chief author of the Psyps was accepted by the NT writers.

In 2 Mace 2:13 (RV), in a letter purporting to have been written by the Jews of Palestine to their brethren in Egypt, about 144 BC, occurs the following: "And the same things were related both in the public archives and in the records that concern Nehemiah; and how he, founding a library, gathered together the books about the kings and prophets, and the books of David, and letters of kings about sacred gifts." We do not know the exact date of 2 Mace, but it was almost certainly in the 1st cent. BC. The author regards David as the author of books in the sacred library gathered together by Nehemiah. (c) The author of 2 Sam refers not later than 180 BC, and possibly a good deal earlier, thus describes David's contribution to public worship: "In every work of his he gave thanks to the Holy One Most High with words of glory; with his whole heart he sang praise, and loved him that made him" (Eccles 47:5f RV). David's fame as a psalmist and the organizer of choirs for the sanctuary was well known to Ben Sira at the beginning of the 2d cent. BC. (d) The author of Ch, writing not later than 300 BC, and probably much earlier, represents Ps 34 as a provision for a service of songs before the ark of God and in connection with its removal to the city of David (1 Ch 15:16). It seems to be imagined by some scholars that the Chronicler, whose historical accuracy is severely attacked by certain critics, is responsible for the idea that David was a great writer of hymns. On the contrary, he has less to say about David as a poet and psalmist than the author of S. Only in 2 Sam 2. 1-10 meet most of the standards of David the author of praises to Jehovah. The Chronicler speaks repeatedly of the instruments of David and of his organization of the choirs. And so in the kindred books of Ezr and Neh there is mention of the style of music employed by Jeh. (Am 6:5; 12:24,36). The author of the Book of K refers repeatedly to David as a model king (1 K 11:4; 2 K 14:3; 20:51f, etc.). He becomes a witness for the high reputation of David for uprightness and religious zeal. (e) Amos refers incidentally to David's great skill as an inventor of musical instruments (Am 6:5). The same prophet is a witness to the fact that songs were sung in worship at Bethel to the accompaniment of harps or viols (Am 5:23). (f) The earliest witnesses, or witnesses, if the narrative be composite, we find in 1 and 2 S. David is described as a wonderful musician, and as one on whom the Spirit of Jehovah rested mightily (1 S 16:13-23). He is credited with the beautiful cloy over Saul and Jonathan (2 S 1:17-27) and the brief lament over Absner (2 S 3:33). He is said to have danced with joy before the ark, and to have brought it up to Jerusalem with shouting and with sound of trumpet (2 S 6:12ff). He is credited with the pious wish that he might build a temple for Jehovah and the ark, and is spoken of forthwith as the man who was to build a temple to Jehovah for the perpetuation of a perpetual throne (2 S 7). David dedicated to Jehovah much wealth taken from his enemies (2 S 8:11). Both the good and the bad in David's life and character are faithfully set forth in the vivid narrative.

We come next to two statements that would settle the question of David's psalmist, if critics would only accept them as the views of an author living within a generation or so of the time of David. Unfortunately 2 S 21-24 is regarded by most critical scholars as an appendix to the early narrative of David, which would make the agreement as to the exact date of the composition of these chapters all but negligible. The scholar who criticizes the critic who tries to disintegrate a document, and suspicion of bias is inevitable. If by the disintegration he is able to escape the force of the conclusion, the effect is that, happily, we live in a free country, every man having a right to hold and to press his own opinion, for whatever it may be worth. It seems to the present writer that 2 S 21-24 may well have come from the pen of the early narrator who told the story of David in such a masterly fashion. Even if these chapters were added by a later editor as an appendix, the sufficient reason for putting this writer so late at the exile. His statements cannot be set aside as unreliable, simply because they run counter to the current theory as to the date of the Psyps. 2 S 22 purports to give the words of a song which David spoke to Jehovah, when he had been delivered from Saul and from all his enemies. Ps 18 is evidently a different reception of the same poem. The differences in the various edd of 'Rock of Ages.' Only the most critical is called conjectural. In fact, this glorious song, 2 S 23:1-7 must not be omitted, for here David claimed prophetic inspiration as the sweet psalmist of Israel. This original psalm is worthy of the brilliant royal bard. (6) The titles of the Psyps are external evidence of their value; and so are the date and authorship of the Psyps, and these ascribe 73 to David. A sweeping denial of all the forms of external evidence for Davidic authorship of the Psyps, by convincing arguments from internal evidence. Unverified conjectures will not answer.

(4) Internal evidence for Davidic psalm.—The fact that many of the Psyps ascribed to David correspond in tone and manner and in language and allusions to the incidents in his life, while not in itself convincing proof that David wrote them, certainly reinforces the external evidence in favor of Davidic psalm. We must refer the reader to the commentaries of Delitzsch, Kirkpatrick, Perowne and others for the evidence discovered in individual Psyps. In many of the Psyps the evidence is strongly in favor of the superscriptions, in which David is named as the writer. See esp. Ps 18, 22, 32, 3.

(5) Number of Davidic psalm.—Opinion varies among conservative scholars all the way from 3 or 4 to 44 or 45. It has come to pass that a critic who acknowledges even *Ps* 18 to be by David's hand is considered a conservative. In fact, the more radical critics regard a scholar as conservative if he assigns even a small group of psalm to the period before the exile. We must not allow any break in the succession of names from ascribing *Ps* 46 to David or *Ps* 90 to Asaph. He is a different mind and accepts the results of same criticism. W.T. Davidson (HBB) speaks out plainly and strongly for Davidic authorship of *Ps* 7, 11, 17, 18, 19, 119, 124 and a few other so or parts of so, though he makes large concessions to the present tendency to bring down the dates of the Psyps to a later date. He stands firmly for a large body of psalm as David assigned to David. *Ps* 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 19, 24, 29, 32, 101 also 60 8-11 and 68 and 129. Hitzig ascribed to David *Ps* 3, 119, with the exception of 5, 126, and 14. It follows the critics in the Hebr text, except where internal evidence clearly contradicts the superscriptions, it would be rash to follow Delitzsch in attributing 44 or 45 psalm to David.

(1) Ps of Asaph (73-83, also 50).—The prophetic spirit thrives in most of the Psalms ascribed to Asaph (q.v.). God is pictured as a righteous Judge. He is also pictured as the Shepherd of Israel. Ps 73 holds forth God's righteousness in spite of the prosperity of the wicked. Ps 50, which is assigned by many to the time of Hosea and Isaiah, because of its powerful prophetic message, may well have come from Asaph, the contemporary of David's reign. The Psalms of the Asaph group, notably 74 and 79, belong to the period of the exile or later. The family of Asaph continued for centuries to lead in the service of God (2 Ch 35:15; Neh 7:44). Inspired poets were raised up from age to age in the Asaph guild.
(2) Psalms of the sons of Korah (42-49, 54, 85, 87).—This family of singers was prominent in the temple-worship in the days of David and afterward. Several of their poems in the Psalter are ascribed to members of this group (see Ps 42, 43, 45, 46, 49, 84). We are not to think of these poems as having been composed by a committee of the sons of Korah; no doubt each poem had an individual author, who was willing to sink his personality in the line he was composing. The privileges and blessings of social worship in the sanctuary are greatly magnified in this group of psalms.

(3) Psalms of Solomon (72, 127).—Even conservative critics are in doubt as to the Solomonic authorship of the two psalms ascribed to him by the titles. Perhaps assurance is not attainable in the present state of inquiry. Delitzsch well says: "Under Solomon psalmody already began to decline; all the productions of that period bear the stamp of thoughtless contemplation rather than of direct feeling, for restless yearning for higher things had given place to sensuous enjoyment, national concentration to cosmopolitan expansion."

(4) The era of Jehoshaphat.—Delitzsch and others regard the period of Jehoshaphat as one of literary decay. In Ps 76, 77 five psalms celebrate the deliverance from the great eastern invasion toward the close of Jehoshaphat's reign.

(5) The era of Hezekiah.—The latter half of the 8th century B.C. was one of literary vigor and expansion, esp. in Judah. Perhaps the great deliverance from Sennacherib's invasion is celebrated in Ps 46 and 48.

(6) The period of Jeremiah.—Ehret and some other scholars are inclined to attribute to Jeremiah a considerable number of psalms. Among those which have been assigned to this prophet may be named Ps 31, 35, 38, 40, 55, 69, 71. Those who deny the Davidic authorship of Ps 22 also assign this great poem to Jeremiah. Whether we are able to name definitely any ps of Jeremiah, it seems thoroughly reasonable that he should have been the author of certain of the plaintive poems in the Psalter.

(7) During the exile.—Ps 102 seems to have been composed during the exile. The poet pours out his complaint over the present distress, and reminds Jeh that he had previously suffered, and that his will be pity upon him. Ps 137 pictures the distress of the captives by the rivers of Babylon. The fire and fervor of the poem bespeak an author personally involved in the distress. No doubt other psalms in our collection were composed during the exile in Babylon.

(8) Post-exilic psalms.—As specimens of the joyous hymns composed after the return from exile, we may name Ps 85 and 126. Many of the liturgical hymns in the Psalter were no doubt prepared for use in the worship of the second temple. Certain recent critics have extended this class of hymns so as to include the greater part of the Psalter, but that is surely an extreme view. No doubt, the stirring times of Ezra and Nehemiah stimulated poets in Jerusalem forth thanksgiving and praise to Jehovah's God. Ewald taught that the latest psalms in our collection were composed at this time.

(9) Are there Maccabean psalms?—Calvin assigned Ps 44, 47 and 79 to the Maccabean period. If there are Maccabean psalms, Calvin has perhaps hit upon three of them. Hitzig assigns to the Maccabean period all the psalms from 73 to 150, together with a few in the earlier half of the Psalter. Among moderns, Delitzsch puts practically the whole Psalter in the period from 170 to 130 B.C. Ewald, Heinrich, and Dillmann, four of the greatest names in OT criticism, oppose the view that the Psalter contains Maccabean psalms. Most recent scholarship is opposed to each of these views of the Maccabean Psalms. The question may well be left open for further investigation.

III. The Growth of the Psalter.—In the Heb text as well as in RV, the Ps are grouped into five books, as follows: Book I, Ps 1-41; Book II, Ps 42-72; Book III, Ps 73-89; Book IV, Ps 90-106; Book V, Ps 107-150.

1. Division into Five Books

It is possible that this division into five books has been made on grounds similar to those which the Chronicler composed his history of Judah (cf 1 Ch 16:36 with Ps 106:48). At the end of Ps 72 it appears that the Psalms which were significant in the history of the Psalter. It is said in Ps 72:20: "The prayers of the righteous are Ps 51-70, however, to Ps 71:20; these psalms are ended." It would seem from this note that the editor who appended it meant to say that in his collection he had included all the psalms of David known to him. Similarly, enough, the subscript is attached to a psalm ascribed to Solomon. This is a further indication that the Second Book of Ps opens with nine poems ascribed to the sons of Korah and to Asaph. It is a very natural conjecture that these nine psalms were at one time united with Ps 73-83. With these removed, it would be possible to unite Ps 51-70 with Book I. Then the subscript to Ps 72 would be a fitting close to a roll made up of psalms ascribed to David. It is impossible at this late date to trace fully and accurately the history of the formation of the Psalter.

Within the Psalter there lie certain groups of psalms which have in a measure retained the form in which they were probably originally composed separately. Among these groups may be named the Psalms of Ascents (Pss 120-134), the Asaph group (Pss 73-83), the sons of Korah group (Pss 42-49, 84-85), a group of poems (Pss 56-60), a group praising Jehovah for His character and deeds (Pss 93-100), to which Ps 90-92 form a fitting introduction. Psalms 3-107 constitute another group of praise psalms, and Psalms 146-150 make a closing Hallel to the group.

The Psalter has had a long and varied history. No doubt the precentor of the temple choir had his own collection of hymns for public worship. Small groups of psalms may have been issued also for private use in the home. As time went on, collections were made on different organizing principles. Sometimes hymns attributed to a given author were perhaps brought into a single group. Possibly psalms of a certain type, such as Maskil and Miktam, were gathered together in small collections. How these small groups were partly preserved and partly broken up, in the history of the formation of our present Psalter, will, perhaps, never be known.

IV. The Poetry of the Psalter.—For general discussion of the form of Heb poetry, see Poetry. In the Psalms all this known and parsed in Hebrew. Reliably are exemplified. Among moderns, C. A. Briggs has made extensive research into the poetical structure of the Psalms. In summing up the result of his study of the various measures employed in the Psalms, he classifies 80 psalms or parts of psalms as trimeters, that is, the lines have three main accents; 22 psalms or parts he regards as tetrameters, each of the lines having four accentuated syllables; 25 psalms or portions are classed as pentameters, and an equal number as hexameters. He recognizes some variety of measure in certain psalms. There is coming to be agreement among Heb scholars that the rhythm of Heb poetry is largely determined by the number of accentuated syllables to the line. Some critics insist rigorously on perfect regularity, and therefore are compelled to resort to conjectural emendation. See Poetry, Hebrew.

Nine psalms are known as alphabetical poems, viz. Ps 9, 10, 11, 34, 37, 111, 112, 138, 139. The most elaborate of these is Ps 115, which is divided into 150 sections of two verses each. The letter of the Heb alphabet occurs 8 t in succession as the initial letter of the verses in its section. This so to strophical structure or stanza formation, there is evidence in certain psalms of such organization of the poems. The refrain with which strophes end
often close form an easy guide to the strophical divisions in certain ps., such as Ps 42, 43, 46, 107. Among Eng. commentators, Briggs pays most attention to these. Many moderns hold that evidence of antiphonal singing in connection with the Psalter. It is thought by some that Ps 20 and 21 were sung by responsive choirs. Ps 24 and 118 may each be antiphonal.

V. THE SPEAKER IN THE PSS.—Smend, in ZATW, 1889, establishes and personifies the idea that the speaker in the Pss is not an individual, but a personification of the Jewish nation or church. At first he inclined to recognize an individual speaker in Ps 3, 4, 62 and 73, but one year later he interpreted these also as collective. Thus a one stroke individual religious experience is wiped out of the Psalter. A few scholars have accepted Smend's thesis; but the great majority of critics of every school have withheld their assent, and some of the leading harmonists have shown that the theory is wholly untenable.

Perhaps the best monograph on the subject, for the Ger. student, is one by Emil Bala, Das Ich der Psalmen. Bala's thesis is that the "I" pss., both in the Psalter, and in the other books of the OT, are always to be understood as individual, with the exception of those in which the idea of an individual in the position of the "I" is necessary. Of 100 pss. in which "I" occurs, Bala interprets; the remaining 29 there might be reasonable room for difference of opinion whether the ps was individual or collective.

Personification is largely used in all parts of the OT. There is no room for doubt that Ps 129, though using "I," "me," and "my," is the language of Israel as a people. The same is true of Ps 124. The author of Ps 126 likewise associates himself with his brethren. The author of Ps 122, however, is evidently speaking for himself individually, when he says in ver 8, "For my brethren and companions' sakes I will say peace; Peace be within thee."

A really intelligent reader usually has no difficulty in deciding, after a careful reading of a ps, whether the "I" refers to an individual Israelite or to the congregation of Israel. Some views on this subject are important and much as Smend's theory does violence to the strength and power of the individual religious experience of OT believers. In many portions of the OT, national duties are urged, and Israel is addressed as a whole. At the same time, it would be easy to demonstrate the relatively small place the individual religion occupies in the prophetic writings and in the Law. The Psalter absolutely refuses to be shut up in the molds of a rigid nationalism.

VI. THE GOSPEL IN THE PSS.—Christians love the Psalms, as the ancient Jews could possibly have done. On every page they discover elements of religious life and experience that are thoroughly Christian. In this respect the earlier dispensation came nearer to the perfection of Christian standards than in political and social organization. Along with the NT, the aged Christian saint desires a copy of the Ps. He passes easily from the Gospels to the Psalter and back again without the sense of shifting from one spiritual level to another. Religious experience was enjoyed and was portrayed by the ancient psalmists so well that no Christian book in the apostolic period was composed to displace the Psalter.

1. THE PSALMS ARE ALWAYS REVERENT IN THEIR APPROACH TO DEITY.—Jeh is infinitely holy (Ps 99:3). Ps 96-100 are models of adoration and worship.

2. SOUL'S THERThirsting FOR GOD.—Ps 42 and 43, which were originally one ps, voice with God the longing of the individual soul. Ps 42, and no other human composition has been able to express it.

3. PRaising GOD.—More than 20 pss. have for their keynote praise to God. See esp. Ps 8 1:9; 67:7-11; 74:24; 95:1-7. The first three vs. of Ps 33, 44, 46 and 105 reveal a rich vocabulary of praise for stammering human lips.

4. Joy in God's house.—Ps 84 and 122 are classic hymns expressive of joy in public worship in the sanctuary. Religious patriotism has never recovered a more striking expression than is found in Ps 137 5 ff.

5. PrACTISING THE PRESENCE OF GOD.—In Ps 91 and 23 the worshipping saint delights his soul with the sense of God's protecting presence. The Shepherd, tender and true, is ever present to shield and to comfort. The shadow of the Almighty is over the saint who dwells in the secret place of the Most High.

6. GOD IN NATURE.—The Psalmist did not go "through Nature up to Nature's God"; for he found God immanent in all things. He heard God's voice in the thunder; felt His breath in the twilight breeze; saw the gleam of His sword in the lightning's flash, and recognized His hand in every provision for the wants of man and the lower animals. See Ps 91:4, "Hymn of Creation", Ps 29, 115, 117, 139, 23, 105:2, 11:5. God is the God of the Psalms, and the first half of Ps 19, "the heavens are telling.

7. LOVE FOR GOD'S WORD.—Ps 119 is the classic description of the beauty and power and helpfulness of the Word of God. The second half of Ps 19 is also a gem. Ps 119 was happily named by one of the older commentators "a holy alphabet for Zion's scholars." The Psalmist sings the glories of God's Word as a lamp to guide, as a spring of comfort, and as a fountain of hope.

8. God's Care of all Things.—Faith in Divine Providence—both general and special—was a cardinal doctrine with the psalmists; yea, more, the very heart of their religion. Ps 66 sings of God's goodness in sunshine and shower, which clothes the meadows with waving grain. The river of God is always full of water. Ps 121, "Jeh thy Keeper," was read by David Livingstone at family worship on the morning when he left home to go out to Africa as a missionary.

9. GOD AND HUMAN VALUES.—The psalmists were fond of the figure of "taking refuge in God." Jeh was to them a rock of refuge, a stronghold, a high tower, an impregnable fortress. Ps 46, 61 and 62 exalt God as the refuge of His saints. His help is always easy to find. They might and do not, but we do not overthrow the inspired singers, but become a theme of devout and joyous contemplation.

Our Lord Jesus found in the Ps ps prophesies concerning Himself (Lk 24:44-47). (1) The suffering Saviour.—While 2. THE hanging on the cross, the mind of Our Messiah Lord turned to the Psalter. He voiced the terrible anguish of His soul in the opening words of Ps 22, and breathed out His spirit at the end with the truthful words of Ps 31 5. He also invited the fulfillment of a Messianic prediction in Ps 69 21 by saying, "I thirst." Isa and the Ps did not fail Him in the hour of His shame, when reproach broke His heart, and there was none to comfort Him. Only Isa 52 13—63 12 surpasses Ps 22 as a picture of Calvary and an interpretation of the significance of the cross. Whether Ps 22 is a direct prophecy of Christ, or only a typically Messianic ps., is in dispute. Every sentence can be applied to Jesus without straining its meaning.

If David or some other sufferer took up his horn to sing of his own sorrows, the Spirit of God guided him to describe those of a greater.

Rationalistic critics insist that to apply part of a ps to David and part to Christ introduces confusion. They ridicule the theory of a "double sense," and continue...
that the language refers to the Psalmist and to him alone, and that the application of certain vs to Our Lord Jesus is only by way of accommodation. This theory ignores the presence of sin and the Holies as a place of exclusion and when men talk of "psychological impossibilities," this may be to them a mystery, for who of us can understand fully the psychological experiences of men while receiving revelations from God? The real author of the psalms was the Holy Spirit. This means that which the reverent interpreter most delights to find; and we have evidence that the OT writers did not fully comprehend their own psalms concerning Christ (1 Pet 1:10-12). We ought not to be surprised that the prophet was not able to explain the methods of the Holy Spirit's activity in guiding the thought of prophets and psalmists in their predictions of the sufferings of Jesus. Idolatry and persecution are the true fruits of the psalmist's sufferings.

(2) The conquering King.—Ps 2 and 110 (with which Ps 73 may be compared) describe the Messiah as Jeh's Son, a mighty Conqueror, who shall overwhelm all foes and reign supported by Jeh. Some will oppose the Messiah, and so perish; others will enter His army as volunteers, and in the end will enjoy the fruits of victory. "It is better to sit on His throne than to be His footstool."

(3) The growing kingdom.—There is room in the earth for no god other than Jeh, the Creator and Redeemer of mankind. Ps 47, 67, 99-100 and 132 are glorious assertions of the earthly and heavenly blessings of the Psalter. All nations are exhorted to forsake idols and worship Jeh. Ps 47 closes with a picture of the whole world united in the worship of the God of Israel. Ps 67 is a bugle call to all nations to unite in the worship of the true God. Ps 96-100 paint the character of Jeh as a basis of appeal to all nations to turn from idols and worship the God of Abraham. Ps 96 and 98 exalt His righteousness; Ps 97 His power and dominion; Ps 99 His holiness and His fidelity to Israel, while Ps 100 tells of His government for a thousand years before a God worthy of men's reverence and love.

The Psalter deals with man as a sinner. Seven of the best known poems in the collection are so charged with a sense of sin and of its deadly fruits that they have been well known for centuries as the Penitential Poems of Sin Ps (6, 32, 38, 51, 102, 130, 143). Besides these poems of penitence and confession, there are many passages elsewhere in the Psalter which depict the sinfulness of men, and yet there are assertions of personal innocence and righteousness in the Psalter that sound like the claims of self-righteous persons (7 3-9; 47 1-5; 18 20-24; 35 11-17; 44 17-22). The psalmists do not mean them to say that they are sinless before God. Rather they are righteous in comparison with their foes who are seeking to destroy them. Sometimes they plead for mercy in the same context. The honest exegete does not find the Pharisaic temper in these noble hymns, though he is quite willing to admit that the Christian cannot well employ some of the expressions concerning his own experiences. Jesus requires a humility deeper than that which was attained in OT times.

(1) Confessing sin.—(a) Individual confession. Ps 32 and 51, am notable example of individual confession. The cries of the penitent in Ps 51 have been repeated by thousands on bended knee as the best expression of their own sense of sin and yearning for forgiveness. (b) National confession (see esp. 78, 86 and 106). Ps 106 celebrates the praises of Jeh for His unfailing kindness to Israel; 106 tells the tale of Israel's repeated rebellion.

(2) Seeking forgiveness.—Ps 51 is the penitent's cry for mercy. Never did the soul of man plead more powerfully for forgiveness. God cannot despise a heart broken and crushed with the sense of sin and pleading like a lost child for home and mother.

(3) Conquering sin.—Ps 130 begins with a cry out of the depths and ends with a note of joy over redemption from sin. The penitent's redemption of which the Psalter so largely includes man's sin over sin in one's heart and life. The cries of the OT saints for victory over sin were not unheeded (139 23f; 19 13, 119 133). The author of Ps 84 truthfully depicts the life of Jeh's worshippers, "They go from strength to strength."

The ancient Hebrew seems to have had no temptation to atheism or pantheism. The author of the Ecles felt the pull ofagnosticism and atheism (Ecc 10-11) but in the end he rejected both (12 7-13 f). The ancient Hebrew found in the world about him one difficulty which seemed almost insuperable. He believed in the wisdom and power and justice of God. How then could it be possible, in a world over which a wise and just God presides, that the wicked should prosper and the righteous suffer? This is the question which is hotly debated by job and his three friends. A partial solution of the difficulty may be seen in Ps 37, the theme of which is the brevity of godless prosperity, and the certainty that well-doing will lead to well-being. A better solution is attained in Ps 73, which depicts God's attitude toward the wicked and toward the righteous. The wicked will be suddenly overthrown while the righteous will live forever in the enjoyment of communion with God. Not even death can sever him from God. The fleeting pleasures of proud scoffer pale into insignificance before the glories of everlasting fellowship with God.

(1) Out of the depths of persecution and slander the author of Ps 31 climbed into his refuge, as he exclaimed, "In the covert of thy presence with thy side from the plottings of men; Thou wilt keep them secretly in a pavilion from the strife of tongues." (2) Ps 77 is a stairway out of the depths of suspense and anxiety. The experience of the author well illustrates Macalur's epigram, "If out of the depths we cry, we shall cry ourselves out of the depths." (3) The author of Ps 116 looked into the jaws of death. Perhaps no other ps has so much to say of physical death. The singer is filled with gratitude as he reviews the day He, frail and sick, has saved him (4) Ps 18 is unique, because it is sad and plaintive from beginning to end. The singer has long cried for deliverance from bodily weakness and from loneliness. (5) Out of the depths of disaster and defeat the authors of Ps 60, 74, 79 and 89 cried to God. The Book of Psalms was a sore trial to patriotic Jews. They mourned over the destruction of their beautiful temple and the holy city in which their fathers had worshipped. The author of Ps 60 closes with hope and confidence (60 12).

"Unquestionably in the Ps we reach the high-water mark of OT practical piety, the best that the OT can exhibit of heart-religion." 5. Ethical Ideals (1) What sort of man, then, would the Ps accredit as good?—Ps 1 opens with a vivid contrast between the righteous and the wicked. Ps 15 is the most complete description of a good man to be found in the Psalter. The picture is drawn in answer to the question. What sort of man will Jeh receive as an acceptable worshipper? The morality of the Bible is rooted in religion, and the religion of the Bible blossoms and bears fruit in the highest ethical known to man. Ps 131 makes humility a prime quality of a real good man (Ps 133) and the best fruit of brotherly love. The social virtues had a large place in the psalmists' ideals of goodness. Humility and brotherly love are a guaranty of peace in the
home, the church and the nation. Ps 24 4 is a compend of ethics in a single sentence.

(2) The ethics of speech.—Even a casual reading of the Ps must impress one with the fact that the psalms reflect a keen sense of the shunck God in the world to come. Life everlasting in the presence of Jesh is the prospect with which the author of Ps 16 refreshes himself (16 8–11). The vision of God's face after the sleep of death is better than worldly prosperity (17 13–15). The author of Ps 73 wins rest for his distressed soul in the assurance of fellowship with God that cannot be broken (73 23–26). God will finally take the singer to Himself. It has been well said that Ps 49 registers the high-water mark of OT faith in a future life. Death becomes the shepherd of the wicked who trusted in riches, while God redeems the righteous from the power of Sheol and takes the believing soul to Himself.

LITERATURE.—One of the most elaborate and informing articles on the history of the exposition of the Ps is found in the Intro to Delitzsch's Comm. (pp. 64–87, ET). Among the Fathers, Jerome, Chrysostom and Augustine are most helpful. Among the Reformers, Calvin, the prince of expositors, is most valuable. Among modern commentators, Ewald and Delitzsch are scholarly and sane. Their comments, accessible in Eng. trs, of Hupfeld is strong in grammatical exegesis. Among modern Hebrew scholars, B. Bloch and J. P. Dayan are helpful. Among recent Eng. and American commentators, the most helpful are D. A. North (1957) and J. C. H. Spalding (1966). M. I. G. Kay (1989–92), and Kirkpatrick in Cambridge Bible (1893–95). Briggs in ICC (1960) is learned; Davison, New Century Bible, is bright and attractive. Spurgeon, Treasury of David, is a valuable compilation, chiefly from the Puritan and Puritanic Commentaries. The Book of Ps (1882) and The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter (1891), is quite radical in his critical views. Binnie, The Psalms Their Origin, Teachings and Use (1880), is a fine introduction to the Psalter. Robertson, The Poetry and Religion of the Psalms, is an attractive and knowledgeable discussion of the Psalter. This last book constructs an able argument against recent radical views.
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PSALMS, IMPREGNATORY, im'prē-kā'tā-rē, im-prē-kā'ter-i. See Psalms, VI, 7.

PSALTER, sōl'tēr (PSALMS), OF SOLOMON. See Apocalyptic Literature, III, 1; Between the Testaments, IV, 1, (1), (b).

PSALTERY, sōl'tēr-i. See Music.

PSALTIEL, sōl-tī-el. Syr and RVm—"Phaltiel" of 2 Esd 5 16.

PSEUDO-MATTHEW, sū'dō-math'ō, GOSPEL OF. See Apocryphal Gospels, III, 1, (b).

PSYCHOLOGY, sē-kol'ō-ji:

1. Introduction: Scope of Biblical Psychology
2. Nature and Origin of the Soul
3. False Theories
4. Creativinism and Traducianism
5. Trichotomy
6. Scriptural Terms
7. Pauline Expressions
8. Monism and Other Theories
9. The Fall of Man
10. Effects of the Fall
11. Death as a Problem
12. Immortality of the Soul

LITERATURE

The extravagant claims made by some writers for a fully developed system of Bib. psychology has brought the whole subject into disfavour. So much, indeed, has Schriftheorie (Schriftheorie) boldly asserted that Scope of "a system of Biblical psychology has been got together without any justifi- Psychology fiction for it in Scripture." At the Psychology outset, therefore, it must be borne in mind that the Bible does not present us with a systematized philosophy of man, but gives in popular form an account of human nature in all its various relationships. A reverent study of Scripture will undoubtedly lead to the recognition of a
well-defined system of psychology, on which the whole scheme of redemption is based. Great truths regarding human nature are presupposed in and about the OT and the NT; hence there is some loose talk on other aspects of truth, unknown to writers outside of revelation, and presented to us, not in the language of the schools, but in that of practical life. Man is there described as fallen and degraded, but intended by God to be raised, redeemed, renewed. From this point of view Bib. psychology must be studied, and our aim should be "to bring out the views of Scripture regarding the nature, the life and life-destinies of the soul, as they are determined by the history of salvation" (Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psych.*, 15).

As to the *origin* of the soul, Scripture is silent. It states very clearly that life was "inbreathed into man by God* (Pn. 3), "wawpyp'nu;* 2. Nature LXX *eudvndaoj, eudvndaisen;* Vulg. *Vulg and Origin* *inspiravit.* The human being thus inspired by God was thereby constituted a *nephesh hayyâk* ("living soul"), because the *nishmath hayyim* ("breath of lives") had been imparted to him (Gen 2 7). Beyond this the first book of the Bible does not go. In later books the life of the person is taught under one equal expression. Thus in the Book of Job: "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty giveth me life" (Job 33 4). The difference in expression should be carefully noted. The "living soul* (LXX *psuch Âi zoos*) is made to depend upon, as it has its origin in, the "breath of life*" (LXX *pnuk zoÂs).* The *nishmath* ("breath") is characteristic of man—though it is very rarely, if ever, attributed to animals; man is described as a being "in whose nostrils is but a breath* (nishmath) ( Isa 2 22). That "breath" is "God's breath," as Job states it, is represented in Prov 20 27, "The spirit of man [nishmath] is the lamp of Jeh." In the NT Paul evidently refers to this view of man's origin in the statement that "the first man Adam became a living soul. The last Adam . . . a life-giving [quickening] spirit* (I Cor 15 45). This too agrees with what Christ has said: "It is the spirit that giveth life [quickeneth]" (Jn 6 63), and with what Paul, himself, has stated elsewhere in the Epistle to the Romans (8 2): "The Spirit of life who giveth life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and of death."

Scripture therefore repudiates all doctrines of emanation, by which is meant a natural, forth-flowing life from God. From this Jewish sphere, however, it teaches a doctrine of creation, wherever by *Theories* it declares that the Almighty acts with deliberation and design, in free choice, and not of necessity. "Let us make man* is the sublime utterance of Divine wisdom and power. Nor does Scripture teach the *preexistence* of the soul—a doctrine found in the extra-canonical, platonically inspired Book of Wisd (8 19 20), "For I was a child of parts, and a good soul fell to my lot; my father, being good, I came into a body undeftiled." This doctrine was well known to Jewish writers, and was taught in Talm and *Kabbalâh.*

"All souls were, according to the Talm, created and kept in secret from the first moment of creation. As creatures of the highest sphere they are omniscient; but at the moment of birth in a human body an angel touches the lips of the child, so that he forgets whatever has been (before the birth). At the Talm, however, must be a later importation into Jewish theology through the Fates and *Elysium.* It remains very vague (Bihl. *et al.*, 15), who makes the souls—destined by the Fates to inhabit new bodies on earth—drink of the waters of Life and thus give us all remembrance of the joys of Elysium.

"The soul that dries up the flood."

According to the *Kabbalâh*, souls are supposed to have an ideal as a real preexistence: 'ideal as emanations from the infinite real, which are then called the infinite real, as having been 'created' at a definite time" (cf Eric Bischoff, *De Kabbalah*).

The doctrine with some modifications passed into the Christian church, was accepted by Justin Martyr, Theodoretus, Origen and others of the church Fathers, but became obsolete by the latter part of the 4th cent. (cf Shedd, *Hist of Christian Doctrine*, II, 9). It was formally condemned by a synod held at Constantinople in the 6th cent. In later times it was accepted in modified form by Kant, Schelling, and others. Defended by Julius Müller, who held that the soul had a timeless preexistence and underwent a fall before the final act, whereby it was united in time to the body as its temporary home (Ein ausser-ordentl. Rom. Cath. div. I). Reform orthodox is sometimes made to Jer 1 5, where Jeh addresses His servant: "Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee; I have appointed thee a prophet unto the nations." There is no warrant to the doctrine as taught by the writers mentioned. All that may be conceded is, what Delitzsch has termed "an ideal preexistence," i.e. a preexistence, not only of man as such, but also of the individual soul, and of all created things, as a Divine knowledge, which precedes the existence in the individual consciousness* (Bibl. Psych.*, 46).

A new question arises at this point, viz. Is the soul a special creation? Is it derived from the parents? The Jews and Christians are agreed on this point. Many have supported the theory of Creationism, but it seems that in every instance where a new individual comes into being a soul is specially created by God, *de nihilo* out of the new-formed body. This view of the Jews is found generally in the church. It was dominant in the East and was advanced in the West. Jerome asserts that God *quotidie fabricatur animas* and cites Scripture in proof (Shedd, op. cit., II, 11). Scholastic theologians in the Middle Ages, Roman-Catholic divinity, and the Reform orthodox upheld the theory. Though finding little support in Scripture, they appealed to such texts as the following: "He fashioneth their hearts alike" (Ps 33 15 AV); Jeh: "formeth the spirit of man within him" (Zec 12 1); "The spirit of God moveth upon the face of the deep" (Gen 1 2); "God, the God of the spirits of all flesh" (Nu 27 16)—of which Delitzsch declared: "This is to nearly hardly be translated into the context for creationism" (Bibl. Psych., 157).

Trachemius Lapia has found real support in the Christian church. It declared that the parents were responsible, not merely for the bodies, but also for the souls of their children. (i.e. by direct derivation, in the ordinary way of propagation). Tradition was a strong witness for this: "The soul of man, like the shoot of a tree, is drawn out (deducta) into a physical progeny from Adam, the parent stock" (Shedd, *Hist of Doctrine*, II, 14). Jerome remarked that in his day it was adopted by *maxima pars occidentalis* ("the large majority of western theologians"). Leo the Great (d. 461) asserted that "the Catholic faith teaches that every man with reference to the substance of his soul as well as his body is born in the womb" (Shedd). Augustine, however, though doctrinally inclined to support the claims of the traditionists, kept an open mind on the subject: "You may blame, if you will, my hesitation," he wrote, "because I do not venture to affirm or deny that of which I am ignorant." And, perhaps, this is the safest attitude to assume; for there is little scriptural warrant for either theory. Birth is a mystery which does investigations, and Scripture throws no light upon that mystery. Yet some who have discussed this subject have tried actually to calculate the very day on which the soul is created or infused into the body, as it is being formed in the womb. This has led to the invention of the most feigned and unnecessary, and in girls on the 80th. This indeed is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the theory (Vercil, *et al.*, 173).

Whichever theory we accept, the difficulties are great either way. For if God creates a soul that soul must be pure and single and stainless. But if it be said that man is "conceived" as well as "born in sin"? If then, sin-stained, sin-remaining soul, the pure, stainless soul by contact, why cannot the stainless soul disfigure the contaminated body? And again, if every individual soul is a special creation by direct
interposition of the Almighty, what becomes of the union and solidarity of the soul? Is its connection with Adam then purely one of physical? Is it not a moral generation? Creationism cannot account for the birth of the soul. It is clear that both account equally for the origin, nor for the hereditary taint of the soul. It cannot be a hopeless dilemma. In the one case we fail to grasp the distinction of its individuality; in the other, we plunge into a materialism which is equally false. Becquerel, Laplace, Fries, and others, have been for the latter, viz., for the origin of the soul; and in infusing He creates). The problem is and remains insoluble.

Passing allusion may be made to another very curious theory, which reference is made by Martensen (Psychology, 4, I. 107). It bears upon human individuality, as impressed not only upon the soul, but upon the body. The soul and the body are represented as arising at the same moment, but the latter (not in regard to its physico-chemical composition, but in other respects) is the resultant of soul-influences, whatever these may be. The soul therefore exercises a formative influence upon the body, with which it is united. This theory had been accepted by E. Stahl, when he died in Berlin in 1734, as physician to the royal family. We are here in a region where the way is barred—a possible closure without the light of the Holy Spirit.

The next important question which has occupied many minds is equally difficult of solution—the theory of Tripartition. Is man composed of "body" and "soul" (dichotomy) only, or is there a third to be added to these two, so that both are constitutive elements in the constitution of the human nature (trichotomy)? Either theory is supposed to be supported by Scripture, and both have had their defenders in all ages of the church. Where the tripartite division has found favor, soul and spirit have been distinguished from each other, as man's lower is distinguished from his higher nature; where dichotomy prevailed, soul and spirit were represented as manifestations of the same spiritual essence. Under the influence of Platonist philosophy, trichotomy found favor in the early church, but was discredited on account of the Apollinarian heresy. The threefold division of human nature into ἄσωμα ("body"), ψυχή ("soul"), and ψυχήν ("soul") has always been understood. St. Ambrose, bishop of Laodicea (d. 382), attempted to explain the mystery of Christ's person by teaching that the Logos (or second person of the Trinity) had taken the place of the rational soul in Christ, so that the person of Christ on earth consisted of the Divine Logos, a human body, and a soul (psuchē) as the link between the two.

For the tripartite division of human nature two texts are specially brought into the discussion: 1 Thess 5 23, "May your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire, without blame."—a text which is popularly interpreted as conveying that "soul" stands for "our powers natural—those we have by nature," and that by "spirit" is meant "that life in man which in his natural state can scarcely be said to exist at all, but which is to be called out into power and vitality by regeneration" (F. W. Robertson, Sermons). There is very little warrant in Scripture for such interpretation. "The language does not require a distinction of organs or substances, but may be accounted for by a vivid conception of one substance in different relations and under different aspects. The two terms are used to give exhaustive expression to the whole being and nature of man" (Daivision, OT, Vol. I, p. 135). It has been evident that a distinction of organs here—viz. of a soul distinct from the body, and a body distinct from either. In his "fervid desire for the complete and perfect sanctification of his disciples, the apostle accumulates these terms in order to emphasize the doctrine of an entire renewal of the whole man by the working of the Holy Spirit. It has been pointed out (A. Knuyper, Het werk v. d. Heiligen Geest, III, 110) and this must be carefully borne in mind—that the "apostle does not use them as if all your parts and then summarize these parts in body, soul and spirit, but holoteles, a word that has no reference to the parts, but to the θέλων, the end or aim. Calvin interprets 'soul' and 'spirit' here as referring to our rational and moral existence, as thinking, willing beings, both modes of operation of the one, undivided soul.

The next text to which an appeal is made is Heb 4 12: "The word of God is living, and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and piercing even to the division of soul and spirit, of both joints and marrow, and quick to discern the thoughts and intents of the heart." Here spirit, soul and heart are brought into close correspondence, with heart evidently as the center of personality, manifesting itself in soul and spirit. The only question is, whether the dividing which takes place by the piercing word of God is one within the soul and spirit, causing a complete exposure of the inner man, a cutting asunder of all that composes his nature, or one between the soul and spirit, a division of one word of the spirit cuts through all obstacles, pierces the very heart, lays bare what hitherto was hidden to all observers, even to the man himself, and "discerns" the "thoughts and intents," which in the unity of soul and spirit have been kept in the background. "The meaning is rather, that the word of God pierces and dissects both the soul and spirit, separates each into its parts, subtle though they may be, and analyzes their thoughts and intents" (Davidson, op. cit. 187). At any rate, to found a doctrine of Trichotomy on an isolated, variously interpreted text is dangerous in the extreme. The language of metaphor is not the language of literal speech; and here evidently we are in the region of metaphor.

The ground is now cleared for a fuller investigation of the meaning of these terms:

6. Scrip- changeably, though they are not natural Terms synonymous. Lēḇāḇāḇ ("heart"), nēḇēḇ ("soul"), nēḇēḇ ("soul") are very closely connected in the OT. The heart is there represented as "the organ, the spirit as the principle, the soul as the subject of life" (Cremer, Lexicon). Hence we read that "out of it [the heart] are the issues of life" (Prov 4 23). Dying is represented as the surrender of soul (Gen 35 18; Job 11 20), but also of spirit (Ps 31 5; 146 4). The dead are called souls (Rev 6 9; 20 4), and also spirits (He 12 23; 1 Pet 3 19). In the last mentioned text the "spirits in prison" are also called "souls." The living are described as "disturbed" or "grieved" in soul (Jgs 10 16), "vexed" (Jgs 16 16), "discouraged" (Nu 21 4), "weary" (Zec 11 8); but also as in "an anguish of spirit" (Ex 6 9), "impatient in spirit" (Job 21 4, in the Heb), "straitened in spirit" (Mic 2 7). At part death the "spirit" departs (Ps 146 4, in the Heb), but also the "soul" (Gen 35 18). As in the OT so in the NT, Our Lord "sighed," or "was troubled in the spirit" (Jn 13 21); but we also read that His soul was "very sad" (Lk 22 44), and His body was "distressed" (Lk 26 38; Jn 12 27). See Spirit; Soul; Heart.

(2) And yet there is a distinction, whatever the real nature of it may be. In Mary's Magnificat, e.g., we find the two combined in an interesting manner: 'My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my
spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour” (Lk 1:46-47), the one clause "referring to the personal emotions of Mary, to her feeling as a woman and a mother, all of which find an outlet in adoration," the second clause “appearing to indicate the moment when, in the profoundest depths of her being, by the touch of the Divine spirit, the promise of the angel was accomplished in her” (Godet, in loc.). A like contrast meets us in the story of Gethsemane. The Master was “exceeding sorrowful in soul” (i.e. the emotional, sensitive center of His being was in deep sorrow), the disciples were ‘willing in spirit,’ but weak” (Mt 26:38-42). In the OT we find that when a man dies his "soul" departs, and when he is restored to life his "soul" returns (1 K 17:22); but when consciousness or life-power returns to one not dead, “soul” is used (Gen 45:27; Jps 15:19; 1 S 30:12; 1 K 10:5). Even in popular language the distinction is recognized: we speak of so many “souls,” not “spirits,” as having perished.

(2) From all this it would appear that philosophical distinction and scientific accuracy of expression is not met with in Scripture. Man is there represented as a unity, and the various terms employed to indicate that unity in its diversity of activities or passivities do not necessarily imply the existence of different essences, or of separate organs, through which these are realized. Psychical action is sometimes ascribed to the body, as well as to the soul; for soul and body are inextricably united to each other. It is the possession of a soul which makes the body what it is; and on the other hand, a soul without a body is unthinkable. The resurrection of the body therefore is no mere figment of the creed. The body is God’s work (Job 10:8), inseparable from the life of the soul. In the NT it is spoken of as “the house on earth” (epegeios oikias), that prepares a tent preparer for the occupant (skhuno) (1 Cor 12:18; 2 Cor 4:7; 5:1). In the OT "we have such metaphorical expressions as 'housea of clay'; or, as in post-Bib. writings, 'earthly tabernacle.' In the latest, we have words which suggest a hollow, a framework, or a sheath, favoring the Gr idea of the body as the husk or clothing of the soul” (LaIidlaw). Hence in Scripture, soul and spirit are interchangeably used by man for human nature in general, not as though indicating separate entities, but as denoting a parallelism which brings out the full personality of man. Soul and body are threatened with destruction (Mt 10:28); body without spirit is a corpse (Jas 2:26); soul and spirit are interchangeably united: "Stand fast in one spirit, with one soul striving, etc (Phil 1:27).

(4) Gathering all together, the Scriptural position seems to be as follows: The Divine Spirit is the source of all life, and its power is communicated in the physical, intellectual and moral sphere. That Spirit, as the spiritus Abissus, the inspirer of the spirit, by its very breath makes man a living soul: “The spirit [or breath] of God is in my nostrils” (Job 27:3); “Thou takest away their breath [rph, 'spirit'], they die, and return to their dust” (Ps 104:29). In the Psalms the term “God and the spirits of all flesh” (Nu 16:22; 27:16). Soul, though identical with spirit, has shades of meaning which spirit has not; it stands for the individual. "Man is spirit, because he is dependent upon God. Man has a soul, because unlike the angels, he has a body, which links him to earth. He is animal as possessing anima, but he is a reasoning animal, which distinguishes him from the brute” (Bavinck, Ger. Dogm., II, 628).

(5) In this connection stress may be laid upon some of the Greek terms. Paul exhorts the Philippians to “stand fast in one spirit [pneuma], with one soul [psuche] striving for the faith” (Phil 1:27). He exhorts them to be “of the same mind” (aimpsuchos, Phil 2:2); he hopes to have "good comfort" (eulogeth, Phil 2:20); expressions; he knows of "no man likened, [isapauchos], who would care truly for [their] state” (Phil 2:20). Everywhere therefore we have "soul" in various combinations to indicate the mental attitude, which in the "fellowship of the Spirit” he would assume toward his readers, and his readers would adopt toward himself. There cannot be therefore that subtle distinction which men have found in the terms "spirit" and "soul,” as though two separate essences were housed in one body. The body is not a refuge, the Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty giveth me life,” is the key to the whole problem. The spiritus spirans becomes the spiritus spirantis—the inspiring spirit becomes in man the life which is expired, outbreathed by man, in both soul and spirit. "Soul,” therefore, may well stand for the personal, living, animated being—the suffering, acting, thinking, reasoning, dying creature, "whose breath is in his nostrils.” Christ gave His "soul” (psuchas) for His sheen of the cross He Himself exclaimed: “Into thy hands I commend my spirit” (pneumatos) (Lk 23:46). Spirit may therefore indicate the all-embracing power, guiding the inward and the outward life—principium illud in animam ex quoe insinuatur (Boehmer) on Eph 2:2 (of Lk 9:55 AV: 4:30). Hence by an easy gradation it may stand for the abysmal depths of personality; while "soul” would express man’s individuality in general. See SOUL; SPIRIT.

Pauline phraseology has somewhat confused the issue; at any rate, new meanings, not obvious to the reader, have been assigned to various terms. Paul contrasts the psychical and the pneumatic, the man under the influence of the Divine pneuma, and the man as influenced by his own psyché. The psychical man is man in his natural, unregenerate state, psychical in this connection being almost equivalent to carnal; while the pneumatic man would be the man guided and directed by the Spirit from on high. Nature and grace are contrasted in the two terms as the first and second Adam are contrasted in 1 Cor 15:45—the first Adam being described as a living psyché ("soul”); the second as a life-giving pneuma ("spirits”). The psychical man intended, fitted to hear the pneuma, while the pneumatic body is evidently the body capable of hearing the pneuma. Hence the one is corruptible and weak, the other incorruptible and full of power. The soul confined to the carnal body uses it as an organ, till it falls into decay and no longer lends itself to such use. The spirit, in constant fellowship with the Divine Spirit, communicates its energy to a body fitted to be the bearer of this renewed life. When that organ, made of that body its docile instrument, enables the body to fulfill its wishes and thoughts, with inexhaustible power of action, “as we even now see the artist using his voice or his hand with marvelous freedom and thus foreshadowing the perfect spiritualizing of the body.”

Other questions call for discussion here: they may be briefly touched upon. Scripture acknowledges a dualism, which recognizes the separate existence of soul and body. It recognizes a "doublefaced unity” (Bain); or considers mind and body as equally unreal, and as "aspects,” "appearances," "sides” of one and the same reality (scientific monism). It knows nothing of monism (idealism, which makes mind the only reality, of which in text is a modification).
nor of materialism, which considers matter as that which alone is substantial, while mind is a mere product of the brain (Haeckel). It does not support the evil of human frailties—practabillia—pre-established harmony, whereby:

“Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting,”

because soul and body were united in harmonious action before the individual was called into active being, body and soul acting in harmony after creation like two clocks accurately regulated, pointing to the same hour on the dial plate, though driven by different springs (Leibnitz). Science has no theory of fact to answer any of these questions, as they bear upon the history of man’s sin and man’s redemption. It throws no light on many problems raised by science or philosophy. It does not discuss origins—the origin of evil, of matter, of mind. “All is of God” (Jn 11 12), in order to answer many questions. Thus the relation of mind to body is and remains a mystery—as great as the relation between the forces in Nature, to which the names of light and electricity have been given. Science has not explained that mystery and failed. The words of Shenstone (Cornhill Magazine, 1907) may be applied to all psychological problems, outside of Holy Writ, which by him were applied to those scientific questions which remain unanswered by all of our efforts at solution: "We are still very far from knowing definitely that atoms are composed entirely of electrons or that electrons are nothing else than electric charges; and though electrons have been shown to exhibit electric inertia, it has not been proved that the inertia of atoms also is electrical." The mystery of matter is great; that of soul is greater still.

The next question which falls to be discussed is the influence of the fall of man upon his soul. Scripture is clear upon the point. Man’s fall from a primeval state of innocence is there told in unambiguous terms, though the word itself is not found in the narrative, except perhaps in Rom 11 12, where allusion is made to the fall of man (aparaphrasetically). With the origin of evil Scripture apparently does not concern itself, though it clearly states that man’s sinful condition stands in direct connection with the transgression of Adam, as in Rom 5 12, where the introduction of sin (and death into the world) is made of the act of one man (e.c. Adam), hæmosta being evidently taken as the boundary of all human life. The Fall allusion in Rom 6 7 can hardly be referred to Adam’s transgression; at any rate the reference is debatable, and the passage itself scarcely gives the term "covetous covenant," though the revisers have deemed that "the covenant of Adam has transgressed the covenant." The German and Dutch VSS give the same interpretation to the verse: "like Adam. The LXX takes the term to be equivalent (συνταγμα), but the Vulg refers the transgression to Adam (sine Adam transgressus est). The other allusions in the OT to this event are slight, as in Job 31:33; Ezek 28 13 15. In the NT, however, the references are much more frequent, esp. in the writings of John and of St. Paul. Paul of St. Paul of St. John 3 8: 1 (Jn 3 8); 2 Cor 11 3; 1 Tim 2 14. The striking parallelism between Adam and Christ in Rom 5 12-21, the obedience of the one bringing freedom, while that of the other brought woe, and the contrast in 1 Cor 15 22 between Adam and Christ throw sufficient light on the question at issue.

Modern science, under the influence of the evolutionary hypothesis, has eliminated or at least attempted to eliminate the factor of the Fall. That "fall" has been interpreted as a "rise," the "descent" is supposed to have been a real "ascent." Far down the ages, man has become more miserable, more degraded, naked and wretched, just emerged from the brutal condition, torn with fierce passions, and fighting his way among his companions with low-browed cunning (Orr, Christian View of God, 150) must have emerged somehow out of darkness, and yet we prefer the words of Professor J. A. Thomson, "as those who look back to a paradise in which man fell: we are as those who, rowing hard against the current of opposite states. I am not saying the word, do not dream it is a dream." (Bible of Nature, 226). If science definitely teaches that man has arisen by slow, irregular, subminute grades, and not from the word may be said on the subject, then indeed the problem is utterly inexplicable. There can then be no agreement between the Bible, conception of

the evolutionary theory as so presented. For primitive man’s transmigration would only be the result of the natural expression of brute passion, to which the name of sin in the Christian sense can hardly be applied. But the "minute" or "lift" occurred in the process of development under the guiding and directing influence of the Divine power. Almost every naturalist of the problem sees a different shape. A sinless creature, transcending the moral law, is then not an unscientific assumption; conscience tells us the voice Divine within the human soul is then not only possible, but actual and real, in the history of man’s earliest progenitors. It will after all remain as the most reasonable explanation of man’s original condition and his terribil fall. In that narrative will be found enshrined the "shadowing tradition" of a real, historic event, which has influenced the human race through all the ages. Asessor Driver, writing under the strong influence of the evolutionary theory, and accepting as "the law stamped upon the entire range of organic nature, gradual advance from lower to higher, from the less perfect to the more perfect," has wisely remarked that "man failed in the trial to which he was exposed, that sin has entered into the world, and that through the whole course of the race it has been attended by an element of moral disorder, and thus it has been marred, perverted, impeded or drawn back. Adams Driver, Genesis 2 17.

An equally serious question arises as to the effects of the fall of man. Shame, corruption, death is the answer given by the OT and NT. 10. Effects "In the day that thou eatest thereof of the fruit of the tree (Gen 2 17) was the judgment pronounced upon man. By this was evidently meant "death" as a physical and as a spiritual fact. Man was doomed. The posse non mort, which according to older theologians was man’s privilege, was lost and was succeeded by a punishment of which the non posse mort, i.e. the inability of immortal life was followed by the impossibility of not suffering death. Not as though immortality was absolutely lost; for with sin came death, degeneration, death, not of the inbreathed spirit, but of the body into which the soul was breathed by God. But even the body is imperishable. It undergoes change, but not extinction. The resurrection-body has become a possibility through the atonement and resurrection of Christ. The tabernacle is removed, but renewed. The body is not a Carson house, but an adjunct but an integral part of the human being. The Bible teaches not only a resurrection-body, but a transformed body (Rom 12 1). It speaks not only of a soul to be saved, but of a body to be renewed. Scripture alone accounts for death and explains it.

With modern evolutionists death is an unsolved problem. Weissmann (Essays on Heredity) maintains on the one hand that "death is not an essential attribute of matter" (p. 159), and on the other, "it is only a Problem from the point of view of utility that we can understand the necessity of death" (p. 23), and again "death is to be looked upon as an occurrence which is disadvantageous to the species as a whole, and in the case of life, and not as an absolute necessity, essentially inherent in life." He even speaks of "the immorality of the protozoa," because "an immense number of the lower organisms" are not subject to death (ib. 241). Death the most evil that has been "acquired secondarily as an adaptation," and must in a certain sense be unnatural. It is indeed "one of the most difficult problems in the whole range of physiology." If this be so, we may safely from a scientific point of view regard the problem, which has a value peculiarly its own. "By man came death" is the authoritative declara-
tion, because by man came sin. "In Adam all die," because through Adam came sin. Here we may say leave the problem, because, "by man" will come "resurrection from the dead."—Souter.

But if the body is mortal, is the soul immortal? On this point the NT gives no uncertain sound, and though the doctrine be not as clearly expressed in the OT, yet even there the thought of an immortal soul is entertained.

12. Immortality of the Soul—In Christian teaching the soul is held to be immortal; it is given to Adam as a gift from God, and it lives on after the body is destroyed. This belief is based on the following scriptural passages:

"I know that my redeemer liveth, and after my skin shall I see thee face to face." (Job 19:25).

"You shall desire your life, your body shall rise again, and ye shall not be ashamed." (Ps 37:29).

"I will ransom them from the power of Sheol; I will redeem them from death, where are thy plagues? O Sheol, where is thy destruction?" (Isa 26:19). The words of Isaiah (26:19): "Thy dead shall live; thy bodies shall rise again, awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust." Still clearer is the note sounded by Daniel (12:2,3): "Many of them that sleep in the dust shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that are wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever." In another word, the OT saint based all his hope and fellowship on God. That hope strengthened his soul when he shuddered at the sight of Sheol. "It overleaps Sheol in the vigor of his faith." In the Psalms we find the same hope expressed on almost every page: "As for me, I shall behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with beholding thy form." (AV, "with thy likeness," Ps 17:15) and again: "Thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol; neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption. Thou hast made known to me the path of life; in thy presence is fulness of joy; in the right hand there are pleasures for evermore." (16:10,11). Whatever the ultimate verdict of science may be regarding the "utility" of death in regard to the human race, Scripture considers it abnormal, unnatural, an intervention, an interlude of man's wrongdoing and his transgression of the law of God. But death in Holy Writ is not a hopeless separation of body and soul. The NT sounds a note even clearer than the OT; for Christ has brought "life and immortality to light." "We know," says Paul, "that we have a building from God." (Acts 21:8) after the dissolution of our tabernacle (2 Cor 5:1); and that is but the necessary corollary to Christ's great utterance: "I AM THE RESURRECTION, AND THE LIFE." (Jn 11:25).


J. I. MARAIS

PTOLEMAIS, tol'-e-maís (Πτολεμαίος, Ptolemaios), but usually called Ptolemy—"the Warlike").

The name Ptolemy is rather common from the days of Alexander the Great. Ptolemy is best known as the dynastic name of the 13 (14) Macedonian kings of Egypt (323–43 BC) (as Pharaoh in the OT). Those of interest to the Bib. student are:

1. Ptolemy I, surnamed Soter (Savēr, Sōter, "Savior"). Ptolemy Lagi, was born c. 366 BC, the son of Lagus and Arsinoë, a concubine of Philip of Macedon. He was prominent among the officers of Alexander the Great, whom he accompanied in his eastern campaigns. On the death of Alexander, Ptolemy seized Egypt as his share (1 Mace 16 ff.). Now commenced the long hostilities between Egypt and Syria, Ptolemy on more than one occasion invading Syria. In 316 he joined in a war against Antigonus during which Coele-Syria and Phoenicia were lost, but in 312 regained from Demetrius the son of Antigonus. It was most probably in this year (312) that Ptolemy captured Jerus on a Sabbath day (Jos, Antl. II, 1, 1), and by force or persuasion induced many Jews to accompany him to Egypt as colonists or mercenaries. His kind treatment of them induced others to leave Syria for Egypt. In 306 Ptolemy was defeated in the great naval fight off Salamis in Cyprus by which Cyprus was lost to Egypt.

2. Ptolemy II, surnamed Philadelphus (Φιλαδέλφος, Philadelphos, "Brother[sister-jl-loving]"). whose youngest son of Ptolemy was disposed of by his youngest son Phila
dophilus—the son of his favorite wife Berenice—and died in 283 BC. According to the usual interpretation this Philae is "the king of the south" in Dn 11 5. This Ptolemy shares with his son and successor the honor of founding the famous Alexandrian Museum and Library.

3. Ptolemy III, surnamed Euergetes (Εὐεργήτης, "Benefactor"). son of Philadelphus, whom he succeeded in 247 BC. In 246 he was provoked to war by the murder of his sister Berenice at Antioch; in the course of this campaign he met with remarkable success,
overran Syria, plundered Susa and Babylonia, penetrated to the shores of India and captured the important stronghold of Seleucia (1 Macc 11:8). Euergetes was, however, prevented from reaping the fruits of his victories by being recalled by internal rebellion in Egypt. He then proceeded to the East where he fought the Egyptians. While he was fighting against the Egyptians, he died a natural death (222 BC), or, according to another (Justin, xxxi.1), he was murdered by his son. Some regard this king as the Euergetes mentioned in the Prologue to Sir, but the reference must rather be to Euergetes II (Ptolemy VII). The "shoot" who "shall enter into the fortress of the king of the north" and prevail is Euergetes I (Dnl 11:7-9), ver 8 referring to the act by which he won his title.

(4) **Ptolemy IV**, surnamed Philopator (φιλοπατηρ, Philopatér, "Lover of his father"), or Tryphon (Τριφων, Tríphón), the eldest son of Euergetes whom he succeeded in 222 BC. Antiochus the Great of Syria declared war against Egypt about 230 BC, in order to settle the Coeles-Syria and Phoenicia, he was defeated by Philopator at the battle of Raphia near Gaza (217 BC). On his victorious return to Alexandria, Philopator assumed a very anti-Jewish attitude, and indeed caused discontent generally among his subjects. In spite of the victory of Raphia, Egypt began to decline under his weakness. He was as dissolute as Nero, while his domestic tragedies are as dark as those of Herod the Great. He died in 205 BC. Dnl 11:10-12 refers to the death of Philopator. He was most probably the oppressor of 3 Macc.

(5) **Ptolemy V**, surnamed Epiphanes (Εἰπιφανῆς, Epiphanês, "Illustrious"). He was only 5 years old when his father Philopator died. Taking advantage of the king's minority, Antiochus the Great, leagued with Philip of Macedon against Egypt. Philip took the Cyclades and some cities in Thrace, while Antiochus defeated the Egyptian general Scopas at Panas on the Jordan in 198 BC, and thus Pal palaces and the Macedonid dynasty. Some Romans now interfered to make Antiochus surrender his conquests. Not daring to disobey Rome, Antiochus compromised by making peace with Ptolemy and betrothing to him his daughter Cleopatra, who was to overlook the recovered provinces Coeles-Syria, Pal and Phoenicia (Jos, Ant, XII, iv, 1; Polyb. xviii.17), but the control of these provinces seems to have been retained by Antiochus. The marriage took place in 193 BC. After the dismissal of his faithful minister, Aristomenes, Epiphanes' character and reign deteriorated. At last he bestirred himself to recover the lost provinces from Seleucia, the successor of Antiochus, but was poisoned before his plans materialized, in 182 (181) BC (Jos, Ant, XII, iv, 11). Dnl 11:14-17 is to be interpreted as referring to the relations between Ptolemy V and Antiochus III, "the Great."

(6) **Ptolemy VI**, surnamed Philometor (Φιλομητώρ, Philometor, "Fond of his mother"), elder son of Ptolemy V whom he succeeded in 182 (181) BC. For the first 7 years of his reign his mother Cleopatra acted as queen-regent, and peace was maintained with Syria till 173 BC. Antiochus IV Epiphanes then invaded Egypt, defeated the Egyptians at Panas on the Jordan, and proceeded to the person of Ptolemy, whom he spared, hoping to employ him as a tool to gain the ascendency over Egypt. Philometor's brother was now proclaimed king by the Alexandrians, with the title of Euergetes (II). When Antiochus retired, Philometor made peace with his brother, conceding him a share in the government (170 BC). This displeased Antiochus, who marched against Alexandria, but was stopped beneath the walls by a Roman embassy (168 BC), in obedience to which he withdrew. The brothers quarreled again, and Antiochus was expelled by the Alexandrians. The young king, Polybius, took refuge in Rome to seek assistance (164 BC). The Romans seated him again on his throne, assigning Cyrenaica to Euergetes. The next quarrel was about Cyprus. Philometor this time secured his brother as a prisoner, but sent him back to his province. Philometor was later drawn into Syrian politics in the conflict between Alexander Balas and Demetrius. The Egypt king espoused the cause of the former, to whom he also betrothed his daughter Cleopatra. But on discovering Balas' treachery, he took away his daughter from him and gave her to his opponent, Demetrius Nikator, whom he now supported against Balas. Balas was defeated in a decisive battle on the Oenoparas and killed, but Ptolemy himself died in 146 BC from the effects of a fall from his horse in the battle (1 Macc 1:18; 10:51 ff.; 2 Macc 1:10; 4:21). Dnl 11:25-30 refers to the events of this reign. Philometor seems to have taken a friendly attitude toward the Jews. In his reign the large Jewish community at Alexandria in Phoenicia was founded in 154 BC (Dn 11:1, 5), and two Jewish generals, Onias and Dositheus, were at the head of his armies and had a large share in the government (Jos, Cap, II, 5). The Jewish-Alexandrine philosopher Aristotle probably lived in this reign.

(7) On the death of Philometor his young son was proclaimed king as Ptolemy Eupator (["of a noble father"], but after reigning but a few months was put to death by his uncle Euergetes II (Just. xxxviii.8). His reign being so brief, he need hardly be numbered among the Ptolemies.

(8) **Ptolemy VII** (VIII), surnamed Euergetes (II) and called also Physcon (Φυσκός, *Big-pauneh*), became sole ruler in succession to his brother Philometor (or to his murdered nephew) in 146 BC, and reigned till 117 BC. His reign was characterized by cruelty, tyranny and vice, so that he was hated by his subjects, esp. by the people of Alexandria, who on one occasion expelled him during an insurrection. It is uncertain whether Physcon was an enemy or an persecutor of the Jews or their patron. Some authorities refer the persecutions mentioned in 3 Macc to this reign, but most modern authorities are disposed to date them in the reign of the anti-Jewish Ptolemy IV Philopator. The statement, "in the 38th year of King Ptolemy VII..." in the Prologue to Sir refers to Physcon Euergetes II and=132 BC, since he dated his reign from the year of joint kingship with his brother (170 BC).

The other Ptolemies of Egypt require no mention here.

The following are the apocryphal Ptolemites:

1. **Ptolemy Macron.** See Macron.


4. **Ptolemy**, son of Dosithes; he and his father were bearers of the "epistle of Pharruia" (Ad Est 11:1).

**Literature.**—J. P. Mahaffy, *Empire of the Ptolemies*, is the best account for English readers, but the first translation of the Ptolemaic records. A long list of Ptolemies will be found, e.g., in Smith's *Classical Dict.* The ancient authorities are Josephus, Polybius, Justin, Pausanias, Plutarch (*Chrm.*), Livy, Diodorus, Jerome (*Comm. to Dnl 11*).

S. Angus
PUAH, pū'ah, PUAH, pū'ah: (1) תַּעַה, pā'ah: One of the Heb midwives whom the king of Egypt commanded to kill all male children of Israel, the Heb. midwives, fearing God, refused to obey, pretending that the children of the Heb women were usually born before they arrived. Their act is spoken of as being meritorious in the eyes of the Lord, who is said to have rewarded them by making "houses" for their sons (Ex 1 15–20). In the Midrash, Ex Rabba', Puaḥ is identified with Miriam, and Shiprah, the other midwife, with her mother Jochebed. According to another tradition Puaḥ was a prostrate.

(2) תַּעַה, pā'ah, in 1 Ch 7 1; תַּעַה, pūmah, in Gen 46 13; Nu 26 23; written also "Pua" AV, and "Puvah" RV: Second son of Issachar, ancestor of the Punites, enumerated in the desert census taken by Moses and Eleazar.

(3) תַּעַה, pā'ah: Member of the tribe of Issachar, mentioned (Jgs 10 1) as the son of Dodo and the father of Tola, the judge. ELLA DAVIS ISACCS

PUBLICAN, pub'i-kan. See TAX, TAXING.

PUBLIUS, pub'li-us (Πούλιος, Pólios, from the Lat. praenomen Publius, derived from populus, "popular"); according to Ramsay it is the Gr form of the Lat. nomen Poplius; the Gr title meaning "first," applied to Publius in Acts 28 7, was an official one, and has been found on an inscription from the island of Culena near Malta (cf Böckh, CIG, no. 5, 754): Publius held office under the governor of Sicily. As the leading official in Malta, he was responsible for any Rom soldiers and their prisoners who might land there, but the account in Acts 28 7 implies that he displayed more than ordinary solicitude for Paul and his shipwrecked company, for, according to the writer, he "received us, and lodged us three days courteously" (AV). The Apocalypse "Acts of St. Paul" (see APOCALYPHAL ACRES, B, 1) states also that "he did for them many acts of great kindness and charity" (cf Budge, Contendings of the Apostles, II, 605). On this occasion Paul miraculously healed the father of Publius, who "lay sick of fever and dysentery" (Acts 28 8). The exactitude of the medical terms here employed foremoins that the writer of Acts was a physician. Tradition relates that Publius was the first bishop of Malta and that he afterward became bishop of Athens. C. M. KERR

PUDENS, pu'denz, pu'dens (Ποῦδες, Pōdēs, lit. "bashful") [2 Tim 4 21]: One of the Christians in Rome who remained loyal to Paul during his second and last imprisonment there, when most of the members of the church "forsook him." The pressure under which they acted must have been very great, as the apostle's final trial before the supreme court of the empire followed quickly after the Neroic persecution. Their defection from their loyalty to Paul must not be taken as implying that they had also professed the faith of Christ. At this time, however, there were some of the Christians who risked their earthly all, and their lives too, in order to prove their adherence to Paul, and Pudens was one of these.

Writing the last of all his letters, the Second Ep. to Tim, Paul sends greetings from "all the brethren" who were then with him. Among these he names Pudens. There were three other names associated with the apostle with that of Pudens: Eubulus, Linus and Claudia. The most interesting conjecture regarding Pudens and Claudia, that they were husband and wife, and that Claudia was of British birth, a daughter of a British chief of the tribe of the King Cogdunus was an ally of the Romans, and assumed the name of the emperor Tiberius Claudius, who was his patron. In this way his daughter would be named Claudia. But this identification of the British princess with the Claudia who sends salutation to Timothy is only a supposition; it lacks both evidence and proof. See CLAUDIA and CH (CH, B, 6).

In modern Rome, however, the tourist is still shown a building which is called the home of Pudens, in the same way as "Paul's hired house" is also shown. The authenticity in both cases is lacking.

Pudens is not mentioned elsewhere in the NT.

JOHN Rutherford

PULITES, pu'lit-es. See PUL-THITES.

PUL, pul: (1) An Assyrian king (2 K 15 19). See TIOLATH-PLACE.

(2) An African country and people (Isa 66 19). See PFT.

PULPIT, pul'p-it: Neh 8 4, " Ezra the scribe stood upon a mishdol of wood." Mishdol is one of the commonest words in the OT and means simply a high object—here a scaffolding or platform (בַּעַ, בֶּמֶה, 1 Esd 9 42). "Tower" (so RVm) gives an entirely wrong picture.

PULSE, pul' (םו'לס, zērōthim [Dnl 1 12 m., "herbs",] בַּע'ק, zērōthim [Dnl 1 16]; cf פַּלִּס, "sowing seed" [Lev 11 37], and בְּמו', "things sown" [Isa 61 11]): (1) In Dnl 1 12, 16, it must mean herbs or vegetables grown from seeds; a vegetable diet is what is implied. (2) In 2 S 17 28, "pulse" after "parchei" is not in the original, but is probably more correct than the tr in (1), as "pulse" usually implies leguminous plants, peas, beans, etc.

PUNISHMENT, pun'sh-ment, EVERLASTING:

I. PRELIMINARY ASSUMPTIONS

1. Survival after Death
2. Retribution for Sin
3. Conscious Suffering in Future

II. SCRIPTURAL SUPPORT

1. OT and Jewish Conceptions
2. NT Teaching
   (1) Eternal
   (2) Equivalent Expressions
   (3) Last Judgment
3. Teaching of Analogy

III. DIFFICULTIES AND RIVAL HYPOTHESES

1. Universal Salvation
2. Annihilation
3. Second Probation

IV. NATURE, CONDITIONS AND ISSUES

1. Mystery of the Future
2. Nature of Punishment
3. Range of Divine Mercy
4. Gradation of Punishment
5. God "All in All"

LITERATURE

I. Preliminary Assumptions.—(For "everlasting," where used in AV as the rendering of αἰώνιος, αἰώνιος, RV substitutes "eternal.") It is assumed in this art. that Scripture teaches the survival of the soul after death, the reality of retribution and of judgment to come, and a shorter or longer period of suffering for sin in the case of the unredeemed in the world beyond. Only such words need be said, therefore, in preliminary remark on these assumptions.

Whatever view may be taken of the development of the doctrine of immortality in the OT (see ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OT), it will 1. Survival after Death out assumed in the NT that the souls of men, good and bad, survive death (see IMMORTALITY). Two passages only need be referred to in proof: one, Christ's saying in Mt 10 28: "Be not afraid of them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell"
Punishment
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(Geenna); the other, the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus in Lk 16 19-31: Lazarus is carried by the angels to Abraham’s bosom; the rich man lifts up his eyes in Hades, but is tormented. The whole doctrine of the future judgment in the NT presupposes survival after death.

Retribution for sin is a cardinal point in the teaching of both the OT and NT. The doctrine of judgment, again, in the NT, with Christ as judge, turns on this point. The following passages are decisive: Isa 3 10.11; Mt 11 22.24; 12 41.42; Rom 2 5.12; 2 Cor 5 10; Gal 6 7.8, etc (see Retribution).

The conscious endurance of punishment for sin in the future state is already implied in the preceding. The parable of the Rich Man speaks of it as following immediately on death in Hades; all the descriptions of the judgment imply pain and anguish as the result of condemnation (cf Rom 5 12). This does not settle the nature or duration of the punishment; but it excludes the idea that physical death is the extinction of being, or that annihilation follows immediately on punishment. It is maintained here that the punishment of sin, in the case of the finally impenitent, is everlasting.

II. Scriptural Support.—The doctrine that the punishment of sin is everlasting is sustained by many plain statements of the OT and NT.

The doctrine of future punishment is not prominent in the OT, where rewards and punishments are chiefly connected with the present life. In a few passages (Is 49 14.15; 73 18.19; of Isa 24 21.22; 66 24), Conceptions of Dr. Charles thinks that “Sheol appears as the place of punishment of the wicked” (Eschatology, 73-76, 156). If so, there is no suggestion of escape from it. In Dnl 12 2, some that sleep in the dust are represented as awaking to “shame and everlasting contempt” (the word for “everlasting” is the usual one, ご覒). In the Jewish literature of the century before Christ, “Sheol is regarded,” says Dr. Charles, “as the place of punishment, and punishment, death—hell” (op. cit., 236; see ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OT).

In the NT, the strongest language is used by Jesus and the apostolic writers on the certainty and severity of the punishment of sin in the future state, and always in a manner "eternal" (according to Cox it does not mean this at all), but is strictly “age-long,” is therefore compatible with, if it does not directly suggest, a termination of punishments in the NT, but they are described as being passed through and through with the element of time” (p. 100), but he denies its equivalence with "everlasting." The sense, no doubt, is to be determined by the context, but it can hardly be questioned that “the chains of the aeons” and similar phrases are the practical NT equivalents for eternity, and that αἰῶνιος in its application to God and to life (“eternal life”) includes the idea of an unending duration (cf Jn 18 33-39 for express assertion of this). When, therefore, the term is applied in the same context to punishment in the NT (Mt 25 46), and no hint is given anywhere of limitation, the only reasonable exegesis is to take the word in its full sense of "eternal.

(3) Equivalent expressions.—The meaning "eternal is confirmed by the use of equivalent expressions and of forms of speech which convey in the strongest manner the idea of finality. Such are the expressions, "the unquenchable fire," the "worm" that "doth not" (Mt 3 12; Mk 9 43-45; cf Mt 10 28), "the second death," "the second death," "second death," on which the advocates of conditional immortality build their arguments for final extinction. Such is the dictum of Jesus: "He that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him" (Jn 3 36; the opposite of "life" is "perishing," ver 16); or that in Rev 22 11, "He that is unrighteous, let him do unrighteousness still; and he that is filthy, let him be made filthy still." Finally, this is the word in the NT (see Retribution) — "the outer darkness" (Mt 8 12; 22 13); "The door was shut . . . I know you not" (Mt 25 10.12; cf 7 24), as in those of the Epp. (e.g. He 2 3; 6 6-8; 10 27.31; 12 25.29). Jesus speaks of the blasphemy against the Spirit as a sin which shall not be forgiven, “neither in this world, nor in that which is to come” (Mt 12 32; not as implying that other sins, unforgiven in this life, may be forgiven in the next), a passage which Mk 3 29 does not give in the remarkable form, “hath not forgiven, but is guilty of an eternal sin” (Mk 3 29). The Rich Man in Hades found an impassable gulf fixed between himself and Lazarus (Lk 16 26). See GULP. It adds to the terribleness of these sayings things that, as punishment, it has been common in the past to put against them; no hint or indication of a termination of the doom. Why did Jesus not safeguard His words from misapprehension, if behind them there lay an assurance of restoration and mercy? One may ask with Oxenham, in a reply to Jukes, “whether if Christ had intended to teach the doctrine of eternal punishment, He could possibly have taught it in plainer terms.

(5) The last judgment.—The NT doctrine of the last judgment is different in form and content. Two things seem plainly taught about this judgment: the first, that it proceeds on the matter of the present life—"the things done in the body" (Mt 25 31-46; 2 Cor 5 10; Rev 20 12); and the second, that it is decisive in its issues. Not a single suggestion is given of a reversal of its decisions in any future age. Such silence is inexplicable if the Scriptures meant to teach what the opponents of this doctrine so confidently maintain.

In corroboration of this Scripture view analogy might be pointed. How constantly referred to in this life is the law illustrated of the tend.

3. Teaching eny of character to fixity! The of Analogy present is the season of grace (2 Cor 6 2), yet what powers of resistance to God and good are so to lie in human nature, and how effectually, often, does it harden itself?
under the influences that seem most fitted to break down its rebellion! What likelihood is there that eternity will alter this tendency, or make conversion more easy? Eternity can hardly be thought of as more really a gift of grace than advocated by Origen to whom the gospel has already come. Its characteristic mark is said to be "judgment" (He 9 27). Like the photographer's bath, may it do effect to develop and fix existing character, rather than to change it. Yet it is true that judgment finds the soul may be presumed to be one that will remain.

III. Difficulties and Objections—Rival Hypotheses.—What, it will now be asked, of the tremendous difficulties which inher in this doctrine, with their undeniable effect in alienating many generous minds from it and from Christianity? The lurid rhetorical picturings of the sufferings of the lost, too frequent in the teaching of the past, may be discounted; it is not necessary to go beyond the inexpressibly solemn words of Christ Himself and His apostles. But even with this limitation, does it not seem as if, by this doctrine, a reflection was cast on the righteousness and mercy of God in creating such multitudes of the human race, as, on any showing, are outside the pale of Christ's salvation? The generation of the masses with the masses even in Christian lands who have not received or do not obey the light—only to doom them to endless misery? Before attempting a positive answer, it is proper that a glance be taken at the rival theories put forth in alleviation of the difficulty.

The most comprehensive solution propounded is that of universal salvation—of a final restitution of all souls to God's favor and to blessing.

1. Universal Salvation. This tempting speculation—Salvation for it is no more advocated by those who, in the early church, by Schleiermacher in the last century, has been urged by many writers in modern times. One of its best known advocates was Samuel Cox, in his book Salvator Mundi. It is noticeable that not a few who favor this theory (e.g. Maurice, Farrar) decline to commit themselves to it as more than a "hope," and admit the possibility of human souls continuing to resit God endlessly (Maurice, Theological Essays, 470; Farrar, Belief of Those Who, xx in The Christian Faith, 485, "In this sense there may be for some souls an endless hell"). It must, however, be evident that, be the number greater or smaller—and who shall give assurance of its smallness?—if there are any such souls, the difficulty in principle remains. And if the passion is alleged as teaching universal restoration is equally contradicted. The deeper objection to this theory is that, springing, not from real knowledge, but from men's hopes and wishes, it has, as already shown, the tremendous stress of Scripture testimony against it; nor do the passages commonly adduced as favoring it really bear the weight put upon them. We read, e.g., of a "restoration of all things"—the same that Christ calls the palingenesia—but, in the same breath, we are told that those who love not the light will not be spared; and will be destroyed (Mt 19 28; Acts 3 21.23). We read of Christ drawing all men unto Him (Jn 12 32); but we are not less clearly told that at His coming Christ will pronounce on some a tremendous condemnation (Mt 7 22-23; 25 41); we read of all things being governed, or esteemed, up, in Christ, of Christ subduing all things to Himself, etc; but representative exegesis like Meyer and Weiss show that it is far from Paul's view to teach an ultimate conversion or amelioration of the kingdom of evil (cf Meyer on 1 Cor 15 21.28, and Eph 1 10; Weiss, Bib. Theol., II, 723, 107, 109, ET). We confess, however, that the strain of these last passages does seem to point in the direction of some ultimate unity, be it through subjugation, or in some other way, in which active opposition to God's kingdom is no longer to be reckoned with.

The view favored by another class is that of the annihilation of the finally impenitent. The type of doctrine called "extinctionism," and "mortality" includes other elements (see IMMORTALITY). The annihilation theory takes different forms. So far as the annihilation is supposed to take place at death, it is contradicted by the Scriptures which support the soul's survival after death; so far as it is believed to take place after a longer or shorter period of conscious suffering (which is White's theory), it involves its advocates in difficulties with their own interpretations of "death," "destruction," "perishing," seeing that in Scripture this doom is uniformly represented as over-taking the ungodly at the day of judgment, and not at some indefinite period thereafter. The theory conflicts also with the idea of the gradation of punishment, for which room has to be sought in the period of conscious suffering, and rests really on an unduly narrowed conception of the meaning of the Scriptural terms "life" and "death." Life is not bare existence, nor is "death" necessarily extinction of being. And the language of most of the passages of Scripture implies the continued existence of the subjects of the Divine wrath.

It is significant that on the side alike of the advocates of restoration and of that of annihilation there seems to be refuge from the difficulties frequently sought in the Probation hypothesis of an extended probation and work of evangelization beyond death. This theory laboring under the drawback that—in marked contrast with Scripture, it throws immensity the larger part of the work of salvation into the future state of being. It is, besides, apart from the dubious and limited support given to it by the passage on Christ's preaching to "the spirits in prison" (1 Pet 3 19.20), destitute of Scriptural support. It has already been pointed out that the final judgment is uniformly represented as proceeding on the matter of this life. The theory is considered elsewhere (see punishment).}

IV. Nature, Conditions and Issues.—While dogmas like the above, which seem opposed to Scripture, are to be avoided, it is equally necessary to guard against dogmas of all possible forms, as if an extremity must not, in the nature of the case, have its undiscovered mysteries of which we here in time can frame no conception. The difficulties connected with the ultimate destinies of mankind are truly enormous, and no serious thinker will minimize them. Scripture does not warrant it in negative, any more than in positive, dogmas; with its uniformly practical aim, it does not seek to satisfy an idle curiosity (cf Lk 13 23.24). Its language is bold, popular, figurative, intense; the essential idea is to be held fast, but what is said cannot be taken as a directory to all that is to transpire in the ages upon ages of an unending duration. God's methods of dealing with sin in the eternities may prove to be as much above our present thoughts as His dealings now are with men in grace. In His hands we must be content to leave it, only using such light as His immediate revelation yields.

As respects the nature of the punishment of sin, it cannot be doubted that in its essence it is spiritual. Everything can be adopted here which is said by Maurice and others of the punishment of being without the knowledge of God, who is love, and of Jesus Christ who has manifested it; even as
eternal life is declared to be the having the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ" (Theological Essays, 450). The supreme penalty of sin is unquestionably the loss of God's life and love—the being sinful. Environment, indeed, may be expanded or contracted with will, but the heart is one the sinner essentially makes for himself, and, like the kingdom of God, is within. The fire, the worm, the stripes, that figure its severity, are not physical. Even should the poena sensus (were that conceivable) be utterly removed, the poena damnii would eternally remain.

It is a sound principle that, in His dealing with a sinner in the world to come, God's mercy will reach as far as it can reach. This follows 3. Range of from the whole Scriptural revelation Divine of the character of God. What may mercy be included in it, it is impossible for anyone to say. It should be noticed that those of whom it is said that they shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on them, are the ones who deny not the truth (Da 3 30)—who actively and consciously disregard and oppose it. But all do not belong to this class. It may be assumed that none will be lost who can in consistency with holiness and love be saved. The most germinal ground of the belief is the interposition of His own Spirit, God will acknowledge and develop. The problem of undeveloped character may receive a solution we do not wot of with the entrance into the eternal light—not in change of character, but rather, as said before, in the reduction of character's inmost bent. In this sense, the entrance into eternity may be to many the revelation of a love and grace which had not been understood or appreciated as it should have been on earth, but with which it was essential. There are at least many shades and degrees of character, and God may be intrusted to take the most just, yet most merciful, account of all.

The fullest weight must further be given to what the Scripture so expressly says of gradation of punishment, even of the unsaved. It is not the case that the lot of all who fail of the eternal life in Christ is all Punishment of one grade. There are the "few stripes" and the "most stripes" (Lk 12 47 48); those for whom it will be "more tolerable" than for others in the day of judgment (Mt 11 20 24). Even "Sodom and her daughters" will be mercilessly dealt with in comparison with others (Ezk 16 49). There are here for everyone the most exact weighing of privilege, knowledge and opportunity. There is a vast area here for the Divine administration on which no light at all is afforded us. There remain those passages already alluded to which do seem to speak, not, indeed, of conversion or admission into the light and fellowship of all.

5. God "All ship of Christ's kingdom, but still of a final subjugation of the powers of evil, to the extent, at least, of a cessation of active opposition to God's will, of some form of ultimate unification and acknowledgment of Christ as Lord. Such passages are Eph 1 10; Phil 2 9 11; above all, 1 Cor 18 24 28. God, in this final vision, has become "all in all."

Here, again, dogmatism is entirely out of place, but it is permissible to believe that these texts foreshadow such a final persuasion of God's righteousness in His judgment and of the futurity of further rebellion as shall bring about an outward pacification and restoration of order in the universe disturbed, so that it can never repair that eternal loss accruing from exclusion from Christ's kingdom and glory.

LITERATURE.—Against Maurice. Theological Essays. "Eternal Life and Eternal Death"; S. Cox, Sal-
fact that the nation consisted of newly emancipated slaves, and therefore required harsh measures to keep them in check.

Under the Mosaic Law, the offences that made one liable to the punishment of death were: (1) acts of sacrilege (Ex 21:15; 177); (2) blasphemy (Lev 24:14-16:23; 1 K 21:10; Mt. 26:55.66); (3) Sabbath-breaking (Ex 31:14; 35:2; Nu 15:28-32); (4) witchcraft and false pretense to prophecy (Ex 22:18; Lev 20:27; Dt 18:2; 20:9); (5) adultery (Lev 20:10; Dt 22:22); (6) sodomy (Lev 20:13; 15:20); (7) in case of a woman with someone other than her betrothed (Dt 25:23), (b) in a priest's daughter (Lev 21:9); (7) rape (Dt 22:25); (8) incestuous and unnatural connections (Ex 22:19; Lev 20:11.14.16); (9) man-stealing (Ex 21:16); (10) idolatry, actual or virtual, in any form (Lev 20:2; Dt 13:6; 17:2-7); (11) false witness in capital cases (Dt 19:16.18).

A large number of offences come under the law of punishment by cutting off from the people, the meaning of which expression has led to some controversy. It may signify excommunication or death, and occurs in connection with the following offences: cutting off of the head, such before marriage, but detected afterward (Dt 22:21), (b) in case of a woman with someone other than her betrothed (Dt 22:23), (c) in a priest's daughter (Lev 21:9); (7) rape (Dt 22:25); (8) incestuous and unnatural connections (Ex 22:19; Lev 20:11.14.16); (9) man-stealing (Ex 21:16); (10) idolatry, actual or virtual, in any form (Lev 20:2; Dt 13:6; 17:2-7); (11) false witness in capital cases (Dt 19:16.18).

Of capital punishments that are properly regarded as of Hebrew origin, we note:

(1) Stoning, which was the ordinary mode of execution (Ex 19:13; Lev 20:27; Josh 7:25; 1 K 20:6; Acts 7:58; 14:6). The number of witnesses, of whom there were at least two, were required to cast the first stone (Dt 17:9); (Jn 8:7). If these failed to cause death, the bystanders proceeded to complete the sentence, whereupon the body was to be suspended until sunset (Dt 21:25).

(2) Hanging is mentioned (Nu 25:4; Dt 21:22), probably not as a mode of execution, but rather of exposure after death. It may have been a Canaanitish punishment, since it was practised by the Gibonites on the sons of Saul (2 S 21:6-9).

(3) Burning, before the age of Moses, was the punishment of unchastity (Gen 38:24). The Law prescribes it as a punishment in the case of a priest's daughter (Lev 21:9), and in case of incest (Lev 20:14), but it is also mentioned as following death by other means (Lev 27:25), and some believe it was never used excepting after death. That it was sometimes used as a punishment on living persons among the heathen is shown by Dnl 3.

(4) The sword or spear as an instrument of punishment appears in the law (Ex 19:13; 32:27; Nu 25:7ff). It occurs frequently in monarchic and post-Bab times (Jgs 9:5; 1 S 15:33; 2 S 20:22; 1 K 19:1; Jer 26:23; Mt 14:8,10), but among these cases, there are some of assassination rather than of punishment.

(5) Strangling as a form of punishment has no Scripture authority, but according to tradition was frequently employed, and is said to have been performed by immersing the convict in clay or mud, and then strangling him by a cloth tied around the neck.

Besides these, which are to be regarded as the ordinary capital punishments, we read of some that were either of foreign introduction or of an irregular kind, such as: (1) crucifixion or crucification (Acts 16:2; 20:12); (2) drowning (Mt 18:11) and exposure (Isa 59:15); (3) sawing asunder or crushing (Isa 10:31; Mt 14:2); (4) torturing (1 Ch 20:3; He 11:35); (5) precipitation (Ps 22:22; Lk 4:29); (6) suffocation (2 Mac 13:3-8). The Persians are said to have filled a high tower a great way up with ashes, and then to have thrown the criminal into it, and continually stirred up the ashes by means of a wheel till he was suffocated (Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchy, III, 246). See also Hexen, I, 110.

Secondary forms of punishment not heretofore mentioned are to be noted as follows:

(1) Blinding or putting out of eyes in the case of captives (Jgs 16:21; 1 S 11:2; 2 K 25:7).

(2) Chastening as willful and habitual, copper or iron, similar to our handcuffs fastened on the wrists and ankles and attached to each other by a chain (Jgs 16:21; 2 S 33:4; 2 K 25:7); also alluded to in the life of Paul (Acts 28:20; Eph 6:20; 2 Tm 1:16); and in the case of Peter (Acts 12:6).

(3) Confiscation of property that had fallen under the ban, i.e. had been singled out for destruction by the special decree of Jeh, as in Nu 21:2; Josh 7:17; or had been reserved for the army (Dt 2:35; 20:14; Josh 22:8); or given over to the priesthood (Josh 19:10). The term may be extended to include all things vowed or sanctified and those irrevocably devoted or consecrated to God (Lev 27:21-28). The idea is applied with special emphasis to those things which, because of their uncleanness, must not be used by the Israelites, though, through their warfare with the heathen, they might have come into possession of them (Dt 7:26; 1 S 15:16-23).

(4) Dashing in pieces (Ps 2:9; Isa 13:18).

(5) Divine visitation.

See VISITATION.

(6) Exposure to wild beasts (Lev 26:22; 1 S 17:46; Dnl 6).

(7) Flaying (Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchy, I, 478; Ninmah and Babylon; mentioned figuratively in Misc. 3).

(8) Forfeiture (Ex 10:8).

(9) Gallows in the modern sense were probably unknown to the ancients. Where the word occurs in Est (8:14; 6:4; 7:9,10; 9:13,25), it probably refers to a beam or pole on which the body was impaled and then elevated to a height of 50 cubits as an object of warning to the people (see "Hanging").

(10) Imprisonment is frequently referred to in both the OT and the NT, indicating that this was a common mode of punishment among both the Israelites and other nations (Gen 40:3; 42:17;
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Lev 24 12; Nu 15 34; 1 K 22 27; Jer 37 15-21; Lk 3 20; Acts 3 10; 23 10; and the Epp. of Paul). See Prison.

(11) Indigities.—In this term may be included all those outbursts of vengeance or other evil dispositions that were practised in times or under circumstances when liberties with the prisoner were permitted on the part of bystanders or those who had charge beyond the execution of the judicial decree. Instances are found in the life of Christ (Mt 26 67-68; Lk 22 63 ff; Jn 18 22); also in the life of Paul (Acts 23 2).

(12) Mutilation (Jgs 1 6-7; Ezek 23 26; 2 Macc 7).—The law was opposed to thus treating any Israelite, and Samuel, when referring to the arbitrary power of the future king (1 S 8 10 ff), does not say that he would thus treat "their sons." It was a barbarous custom of the East (see Eunuchs; Polygamy), evidently regarded, among the Hebrews, as a heinous practice (Dt 23 1). The only act authorizing mutilation (except in retaliation) is mentioned in Dt 25 11.

(13) Plucking off the hair is alluded to as a mode of punishment in Neh 13 25; Isa 60 6.

(14) Prison sentences were in vogue to mark the convicts (Jer 62 33).

(15) Restitution has been alluded to in the general introduction to this topic.

(16) Retaliation was recognized by Moses as a principle, but the application of it was left to the judge (Lev 24 18-22). A fine example of it is found in the law of Dt 19 10.

(17) Scorpions, chasing with.—Probably the use of thongs armed with pointed pieces of lead or other metal (1 K 12 11; 2 Ch 10 14). See Scorpions.

(18) Scurrying. See separate article.

(19) Slavery. See separate article.

(20) Stocks. See Prison.

FRANK E. HIRSCH

PUNITIES, pūnīts (יִעְסָא, pūnāh, probably "dark"): Descendants of Pahah, of the tribe of Issachar (Nu 26 23; cf Gen 46 13; Jgs 10 1; 1 Ch 7 1).

PUNON, pūnōn (יִעְסָא, pūnān): A desert camp of the Israelites, the second after leaving Mt. Hor (Nu 33 42-43). Eusebius (Onom 299 85; 135 9) mentions a village 

Purges, pūr (Prison, Prison, Prison, 39): Gideon’s "serving," lit. "young man," i.e. armor-bearer (Jgs 7 10 f, AV "Phurah").

PURCHASE, pūrchās: In modern Eng., "to acquire by payment," in Elizabethan Eng., "to acquire" by any means. In the OT, AV has used "purchase" to represent יָכָּה, ḫāḥā, and its derivatives (vb. and noun), except in Lev 26 33, where the word is יָכָּה, ḫāḥā (RV "redeem"). In the NT the noun does not occur and the vb. is used for ḫākāyā, ḫākānāi, in Acts 1 18; 8 20, and ḫākānā, ḫākūnāi, in Acts 20 28; 1 Tim 3 13. But none of these words connects the payment of a price, so that RV has kept the word only in Acts 20 28 (in "acquired"), changing it into "obtain" in Acts 1 18; 8 20, and "gain" in 1 Tim 3 13. In the OT, RVm has "gotten" in Ex 15 16 and ARV has (very properly) introduced the same word into the text of Ps 74 2; 78 54.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

PURE, pūr, PURITAN, pūr-li, Purity, pūr-rī-ti: This group of words has in the OT and the NT an almost exclusively ethical significance, though the word "pure" is of course used also in its literal sense of freedom from alloy or other alien matter (Ex 25 11, etc.). "Pure" in the OT represents many Heb words, most frequently יָכָּה, ḥārōh; "purely," occurs once only in AV, as the tr of וַיְכָּה, bôr, properly that which cleanses" (cf Job 9 30, RVm "Heb "cleanse my hands with lye," i.e. wash them clean in Isa 1 25, RV "thoroughly [in "as with lye," AV "purely"] purge away thy dross"); "purity" is the AV tr of the same word in Job 22 20, RV "cleanliness." In the NT "pure" is the tr chiefly of καθαρός, katharōs (Mt 5 8, "Blessed are the pure in heart," etc), but also of ἄξυρος, ἀγνός (Phil 4 8; 1 Tim 5 22; Jas 3 17; 1 Jn 3 3)—always in an ethical sense. A different word (εὐλικρίνεια) is used in 2 Pet 3 1, RV "sincere.

PURGE, pūrje: A number of words in both the OT and the NT are so rendered in AV and RV. Although frequently in RV the older Eng word "purge" is displaced by the more applicable modern terms "cleanse" and "purify," since the emphatic and medical senses of the word, as we now use it, are not justified by some of the Heb or Gr originals. In older Eng. the word was broader in meaning, today it is specific. Occurrences in AV, with the changes made in RV, are as follows:

1. (Num 19:11; translated "to be clean." used of the putting-away of idolatry from Judah by Josiah (2 Ch 34 3, 8), AV is "purge" in all cases, but, in Ezek 24 13, ARV changes to "cleanse.

2. (Acts 22:13; translated "to make a sin offering" (Ps 51 7), is changed without improvement to "purify," "in RV, while "purge" is retained in ERV.

3. (Acts 22:13, translated "to cover" or to "make atonement," occurs in Ps 65 5; 79 9; Ezek 43 20-26; in the two passages in Ps, RV has "forgive" (the "expiate" of is still better), and in Ezek the even more accurate "make atonement." In both (4) ἀφανέσθη, "to refine" (Isa 1 25), and (5) ἀπορρίπτων, ἀπορρίπτων, lit. "to rinse" (Isa 4 4), "purge" is well retained in RV.

(6) (Acts 22:13, translated "to be shining." RV retains in Ezek 20 38, but in Dn 11 33 changes to "purify." (7) purge, zeac, "to make clean" in Mt, molten metal (Mal 3 3), also becomes "purify" in RV.

These occurrences are all in the figurative sense, and apply to sin, uncleanness, idolatry, etc. Most noteworthy is the ARV change of the familiar Ps 51 7.

The Gr words rendered "purge" in AV of the Apoc and NT are καθαρίζειν, katharizein, and καθαρίζον, katharizōn, and their compounds and derivatives.

2. In the AV, in all passages except four, RV more NT properly translates "cleanse" (Mt 3 12; Mk 1 7; Lk 3 17; Jn 18 2; He 9 22, 10 2). In He 1 13 "when he had by himself purged our sins" is changed to "had made purification." But in the case of the vb, compounded with the prep. ἀπό, ἀπὸ, and εἰς, i.e. ἀποκαθαρίζον and ἐκκαθαρίζον (Job 12 9; 1 Cor 7 5; 2 Tim 2 21), with strong signification to "cleanse out." RV more properly renders "purify" in the range of meaning. The change is the familiar verse in Jn, "Every branch, that beareth fruit, he purgeth" to "Every branch . . . he cleanseth" (15 2).

Edward Mack

PURIFICATION, pūr-i-ka-shān. See Purge; Purity; Uncleanness.

PURIM, pūrim (παραμνήσεως, purim, "lots"); LXX Phasmeu, Pherourai), RV, pūr: The name of a
Jewish festival celebrated on the 14th and 15th days of the month Adar, the final month of the Bib. year, corresponding to February-March. The

1. Scripture

Origin of the festival is narrated in the

References

Scripture

In there are therefore the Theories of the book, as the time, reason and manner of its celebration are given in detail (Est 3:7; 9:24 ff.). Reference also is made to it in apocryphal literature (I Macc 10:10-13; 2 Macc 15:10-18; in Jos (Ant, XI, vi, 13). No reference is made to this feast in the NT, as it was celebrated locally, and is therefore not to be connected with any of the festal pilgrimages to Jerusalem. For this reason the supposition of some that the feast of Nisan 1 (cf. 15) was Purim to be rejected, mention of it being immediately followed by the words, "And Jesus went up to Jerusalem."

For the complete account of the institution of Purim reference must be made to the Book of Est.

Only a brief statement is possible here.

2. History

Haman, son of Hammedatha the of Institution Aggaiteth (q.v.; cf I Sus 15.8.32), who had been prime minister by King Ahasuerus (Xerxes), bitterly hated the Jews, some of whom, as Mordecai, were rising to prominence in the empire. After Queen Vashiti had been put away from her royal position for cause 1 (9:12), a Jewess named Esther, kinswoman and adopted daughter of Mordecai, was chosen to become the royal consort. This only increased the hatred of Haman, who in his jealous fury soon began to seek an opportune day to work his hate upon Mordecai and the whole Jewish people, and therefore resorted to the casting of the lots for the auspicious time: "They cast Pur, that is, the lot, before Haman from day to day, month to month, to the twelfth month, which is the month Adar" (3:7). Beginning with the 1st month, all the days and months were tried with unfavorable result, until the last. At Haman's request Ahasuerus caused his scribes to send into all the realm on the 13th day of the 1st month a decree that all Jews should be put to death on the 13th day of the 12th month (3:12). As the narrative shows, the wisdom of Mordecai, Esther's heroism, and fasting and prayer availed to foil the deplorable scheme of Haman, who had already built the gallows on which his hated rival should be hanged. Haman was himself hanged on these gallows, while Mordecai was honored yet more (7:10; 8:12). A second decree was issued on the 23rd day of the 2d month, that on the 13th day of the 12th month (8:9.12), the day appointed in the first decree for their extermination, the Jews should gather together and defend themselves against their foes. On that fateful day not only did the Jews successfully resist the malice of their enemies, but the public officials also, seeing that the royal favor was with the Jews, espoused their cause. In Shushan, the royal city, a second day, the 14th, was granted the Jews for vengeance on their foes (9:11-16). In view of so great a victory, "Mordecai wrote these things . . . unto all the Jews . . . to enjoin them that they should keep the fourteenth day of the month Adar, and the fifteenth day of the same, yearly, as the days wherein the Jews had rest from their enemies" (9:22-23)

3. Manner of Observance

of Purim

Already as early as the times of the Maccabees (2 Macc 15:36), the festival was observed, the 14th day being called "Mordecai's day. Jos refers to it as continuously observed and joyfully observed down to his time. "For this cause the Jews still keep the forementioned days, and call them days of Purim" (Ant, XI, vi, 13). In succeeding centuries as the Jews have passed from one civilization or empire to another, so many causes have arisen
to remind them of the persecutions of Haman as to make the festival of a triumph over such persecutions both attractive and most significant to them. Experiences in Syria, Egypt, Rome, Russia and elsewhere have not been lacking in suggestion of the original occasion of Purim. The 13th day has been observed by fasting in commemoration of Esther's prayer and fasting before she approached the king; in the evening, at the beginning of the 14th day, the Jews repair to the synagogues. On the eve of Purim, one of the nephiloth, is read with interpretations, executions bursting out at the reading of Haman's name, accompanied by noise of rattles and stamping of feet, other persecutors and foes also sometimes observed. The names of Mordecai and Esther receive blessings.

On the following morning of the 14th synagogue services are again held, at which, in addition to the repetition of the Est reading, Ex 17:8-16, which is also read as the lesson from the Law, presents are given to the poor and to friends, and the rest of the day, as also the 15th, observed with feasting and rejoicing, even excesses being condensed in the exuberance of national spirit.

Many attempts have been made to trace the origin of Purim in popular or cosmic festivals, but to the present time without success, without approach to probability to any identifications with nature myths, national festivals, polytheistic legends have all found advocates. The word itself has suggested the possibility of identification with words of similar form or sound in other languages. But the ease of finding such similarities for any word casts doubt upon the reliability of any identification. (1) It has been traced to the Assyry pst, and identified as a Day of the Year when officials entered upon their term of service. (2) The Babylonian Mardi or the 14th day of Adar was claimed as the origin of Purim; Mordecai becomes Mardiuk, Esther is Ishtar, while Haman, Vashiti and Zeresh are Merodach gods. (3) The Jewish identification is in the Pers field, where bahar, "lot," is claimed as the source of Pur, or purdaj, "new year" or farvardigan, the feast of departed souls. (4) Origin also in a 9r harranian occasion has been sought. (5) Others suggest origin in other Jewish experiences than that claimed by the Book of Est itself, such as a captivity in Egypt, or a persecution in Rome, or a cataclysm in Egypt, or the victory of Judas Maccabaeus over Nicanor in 161 BC (1 Macc 7:45-57). No one of these theories has sufficient probability to secure for itself anything like general acceptance; the Book of Est remains as the most reasonable foundation on which to build, and in it are not so great as those of the explanations sought in other languages and religions.


EDWARD MACK

PURITY, puriti: The Bible bears witness to the long struggle over and in man to secure physical, mental, and moral cleanliness. The various forms of purity have relation to each other.

We have a common proverb that "cleanliness is next to godliness." Cleanliness and sanitation are certainly high neighbors. But cleanliness and ethics do not dwell farther apart. What is meant by "purification of person or property he may endanger the health or life of family, or even of society about him— in keeping conditions that develop typhoid fever begins to realize that there is a close tie between cleanliness and morals. Ought the government, its departments, and the whole realm of ethics is open, so are the departments of physical and ethical cleanliness. But now if one hesitates, without explanation, he cannot tell whether it relates to filth or sin.

The perception of this relationship is of very ancient date. Though it is Isaiah who says (66:21), "Cleanse yourselves, ye priests; wash away your filthiness" (Jer. 4:4). All the Jews, except they wash their hands diligently, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders; and when they come from the marketplace, except they bathe themselves, they eat not; and many other things there are, which they have received to do, such as washings of cups, etc.
and pots, and brass vessels," yet such statements are but summaries of directions distributed here and there throughout the whole Levitical Law. We can read therein what sounds like the hygienic orders of a general to his soldiers on the march, or like the rules of the board of health to preserve a city from pestilence. And these Levitical directions for cleanliness are connected inseparably with the worship of Jeh, as though physical purity were to that an essential. The Psalmist blends these two elements physically and spiritually, in the familiar question and answer (24 3-5), "Who shall ascend into the hill of Jeh? and who shall stand in his holy place? He that hath clean hands, and a pure heart; who hath not lifted up his soul unto falsehood, and hath not sworn deceitfully. He shall receive a blessing from Jeh, and righteousness from the God of his salvation."

The ceremonial cleansings called for by the Law had meaning and influence. They were interpretative of something spiritual — were a parable way of illustrating the necessity of purity of heart in order to gain acceptance with God. If in after-days the thing symbolized was forgotten in the symbol, that was owing to "blindness of mind." The darkness was not necessary. But the main subject in respect to which we shall in this art, and right, and purity from the Bible will not be hygiene or aesthetics, but morals.

1. The Sex
When we turn to that department of the Bible which treats of the sex relation, we find that the sex relation is the most primitive and comprehensive of all the human relations. The family. — The attitude of the Bible in respect to that relation is unmistakable. From the vision of the Garden of Eden to that of the New Jerusalem, the Bible rings true to the ideal of purity in family life. The Hebrews were much on the wrong track. This is remarkable, for it is a vast history over which its narrative sweeps, and in it every species of literature is represented. It sets forth the acts and views of a people in all the stages of civilization, from wandering nomads to dwellers in cities embellished by architecture and every device of man to set forth riches and splendor. It sets forth their crime, shame and sin, as well as their virtues, but its tone is approbative of the virtues and repugnant to the shame and sin. In the Magen Charts of the Hebrews — the Ten Commandments — there stands in equal rank with any other principle, "Thou shalt not commit adultery." The sanction of religion and law was thus given to the integrity and purity of family life. The minute regulations against marriage with relatives, and the severe punishments inflicted for disregard of the restrictions (Lev 18 and 20), were a powerful force in the same direction. The adultery of married persons was to be punished by the death of both the parties (Lev 20 10; Dt 22 22).

Such laws may sometimes seem severe. Doubtless they are primitive and date from the time of nomadism. In primitive conditions, penalties for infraction of law are to be severe and swift. Pioneers the world over and through time, for very self-preservation's sake, could show little or tolerance to lawlessness. Be these laws severe, they show the intense earnestness of a people to have a pure family life in which children born should be begotten by the Law. The Levitical restrictions upon intermarriage with relatives fit the sense of propriety and right of civilized people, even to this day.

There is no question about the attitude of the prophets on purity. They were in harmony with the Law. They had no tolerance for corrupt morals or manners leading to impurity or suggesting it. An illustration sometimes has the light of the sun in it. What it is that is illustrated is frequently best seen by looking at the illustration itself. The prophets were passionate monotheists. They wanted above all things that Israel should be true to Jeh and to Him alone. To the prophets, worship of other gods was treason to Jeh. One prophet after another, and over and over again, illustrates this highest virtue by identifying it with the highest relation. That shows in what estimate the family was held. To put any other in the place of Jeh was "to go a-whoring after other gods," or "to play the harlot." That shows as nothing else could how lowly and base the one who sought to pollute the family life. Indulgence was a high treason there, or it never would have furnished language to describe high treason to God.

Prov 5 and 7 indicate the attitude of the book on purity. We may let the book make its own case. The wise man and the stupid folly and destruction of her victim are specially set forth in the chapters mentioned. In the last chapter of the book we have a portrait of a "virtuous woman" in whom domesticity in purity has reached a high stage. "Let her own works praise her in the gates."

It is pleasant to turn from the tense severity of law, since it must deal largely with crime and sin, to the idealism of poetry. The Psalms and the Songs of Songs the relation of husband and wife, see. Bridal love and tenderness and purity are always treated with tenderness and reverence. Here is familiar Scripture (Ps 19): "The heavens declare the glory of God; the firmament showeth his handiwork. In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun, which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as the strong man to run his course. That does not betray any lack of sympathy with the exuberant spirit of a lover. So Is 62 4-5: "For Jeh delighteth in thee, and thy land shall be married. For as a young man marrieth a virgin, so shall thy sons marry thee; and the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride, so shall thy God rejoice over thee." The psalmist clearly discloses the delight in the joy of those who are adjusting themselves under the primal eldest" rule over sex. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh" (Gen 2 24).

It is sometimes thought strange that the Song of Songs should be in the Scripture Canon. But why should there be such doubt? It is but a more particular elaboration of what is boldly brought to notice in the quotations above. There is no more necessity of reading impurity into it than there is of reading into the quotations above or of an illustration of an experience as widely known as any in the life of the human race — an experience in which sin is no necessity. One must go out of his way who imputes sin to a single act or thought that comes to expression in the poem. The maiden is guileless and the lover is marry. The poem is said to be erotic. But the eros is idealized. It may be sensuous, but it is not sensual. It is not selfish. The passion of each finds expression in careful thought and desire for the other. It does not go back to itself in coarse brute craving of lust for its own self-indulgence. The refrain of the poem is—

"Each of you, O daughters of Jerusalem..."

That ye stir not up, nor awake my love;"

—Cant 2 7; 3 5; 8 4.

The watchfulness is as tender as that for an infant. Where will the law lay its indictment of sin against such thoughts and feelings? The lovers are under the charm that has been and is to be from everlasting to everlasting with the human race upon the earth.

Christ also strictest did not set Himself against the charm of love. He said it should be eternally and true in spirit. The maiden in the song goes forth in the light. In the simplicity of her heart and mind (3 2 ff). In the same simplicity, Evangelion wandered all the night of her life to find the object of her affection.
From the same charm in the beginning came the faithfulness of Enoch Arden. Out of the love that springs from the inner life there has endured to the end. The exuberance of the charm, like every other spiritual gift of regulation, but the charm itself is not to be treated as sin.

Paul has said, "Ye are not under law, but under grace" (Rom 6:14). But that depends upon the conditions to which it is applied.

5. Christ and Purity

Christian Law, but we are under the broad realm of ethical, always, even when we are under grace. What grace does is to idealize and spiritualize and make attractive and beautiful what before was perhaps hard, repellent statute and rule. Christ is sometimes thought to have relaxed the severity of "the reign of law." But six times even in the Sermon on the Mount He added to its strictness. Take the idea of the purity of the family as secured by its unity. Under the Mosaic legislation, certain not onerous forms of legal proceeding intervening, the termination of marriage be said to be optional with the parties. All this liberty is swept away in the sentence: "I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery' (Mt 19:9).

That is a law sentence. It was uttered in the realm of law. It was intended to have effect in law. No wonder, considering that it had been allowed in the Law up to that time, that the disciples as soon as they got breath said, "If the case of a man is so with his wife, it is not expedient to marry. They knew that a new law for Christ's disciples was put in place. Even the exception confirmed his rule. If the exception is allowed, polyandry or polygamy is established.

No other sentence of human speech has done more for the purity of family life (see DIVORCE). But Christ did not stop with the utterance of law protective of purity physically; He went behind all acts and laid down law for the thoughts and intents of the heart: "But I say unto you, that every one that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart" (Mt 5:28).

Sometimes it may be thought that there is a look of moral indifference about the way in which Jesus disposed of the woman's case who was taken in adultery (Jn 8:4-11). But it is not so. No man, Lord. And Jesus said, Neither do I condemn thee, go and sin no more. It must first be remembered that it was not her case but that of her accusers that was immediately before the mind of Jesus. They had brought her before Him to trap Him, but He turned and put them on trial. He made moral condition the main issue. Her sin was but an incident. But then, Jesus did not leave her without impressing on her mind that she was a sinner. The last words left ringing in her ears were, "Sin no more." And she was left, as all is sin are left, to wrestle out adjustment with the Holy Spirit, who leaves no soul without conjunction of sin, righteousness and judgment." The words of Jesus no more than the words of anyone else can explain all things to all. They can cover a point in view, but much must always be left to the understanding that comes from known experience under the more revealed God.

The subsequent psychology of a sinner after the words of Scripture leave him in no degree of interest. Psychological action he must have had: what is it? The question arises. Had the prodigal son committed his repentance till he had asked the forgiveness of his mother and his elder brother? What is the subsequent psychology of a sinner as he disappears from our view? We can interpret that, as we know what we know about the operations of the Holy Spirit in the soul, as we know a material object is what it is from without the action of gravitation. Few who have thought on this subject have expressed the truth so well as Whittier in "Our Master's Life" when he speaks of these words: "And men took note of his gauzy air The shame in his eye, the hurt in his prayer The signs of a battle lost, the pain of a soul in the coils of sin."

Into the desert alone rode He Alone with the Infinite Purity; And bowing his head in tender rebuke, As Peter did to the Master's look He measured his path with prayer of path For Grace with God and man again.

There is a recognition of the burning with fire that is infolded in the word "purity.

Paul is like his Master. He seeks for purity in this relation after marriage as well as before—purity of mind and body.

6. Paul how carefully and kindly Paul dis-course about all the complications in matters pertaining to sex. Then again, if Paul has exhorted wives to obedience to husbands, he has also called for equal self-surrender on the part of husbands (Eph 5:22-33): "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself up for it." Can there be any self-surrender greater than that which Christ made? Here let attention be called to the fact that in his catalogue of the fruits of the Spirit (Gal 5:22), if he has put "love" in the first place of emphasis among the nine, he has put "self-control" in the last.

We have only space for a glance at a few departments of action and thought to see what the world has gained in purity from the religion of the Saviour. The age of chivalry ought to have a word put to its credit. The knight took as one of the vows of chivalry the right to die at the word of the church. Take art—compare a Venus and a Madonna. Not only spirituality, but even intellectualism has been wanting in it. There is not a suggestion in a Venus that does not inhore in flesh and sense. Of what would she or could she speak if she were to open her mouth? To judge from her appearance, the utterance would be so "flat, stale and unprofitable" that even the charm of her physical beauty would disappear. In the Madonna you scarce see the physical. If she were to speak, her words would reflect the peace and calm joy of a heavenly realm. If her countenance is suggestive of something far away, it is of something far above.

But art is not dead, and spiritual art did not die with the creation of the Madonna. Take St. Gaudens' "Puritan." He was aware that with an Apollo, again we have the contrast there is between the Madonna and Apollo. He was the physical and the aesthetic in Apollo, but there is no glas of the intellectual. That Apollo thinks is not indicated, much less what he might be thinking about. There is not the faintest suggestion of the philosophical. There is no intent and purpose in him. But in the Puritan there is intent and purpose. He means much. He is just as intent and purpose in his "Puritan" work, and as much as he wants to express with an Apollo, and that if they were to clinch in a tug of wrestling Apollo would come out the winner, that is where the purpose is mastered. You may look through a whole pantheon of Greek gods and meet not a trace of the force concentrated in their sculptured bodies. Apollo's right makes might. He is in the majority because he knows Who gave him his right. If he is right, he can cause himself to be respected throughout the kingdom. He has won the greatest of all victories—self-control.

C. CAVERO

PURLOINING, pur-loin'ing: Lit. "for far off," hence to carry away or steal; the word is the fr. of soroipóma, soroipizomai, "to take away for one's self," "to secrete," "to steal," a word appropriate to those in a master's position in a master's service (Tit 2:10, "not purloining")

PURPLE, pur'p1 (παρπαλα', argàdán; Chal) παρπαλα', argàdân [2 Ch 2:7]; cf Arab. أركوان, 'arkwán, and Pers اروپکار, 'arkwán; πορφυα, porphýa, πορφýras, porphýras [LXX and NT]:

Purple dye was manufactured by the Phenicians from a marine mollusk, Murex trunculus. The shell was broken in order to extract the dye, and the body was removed and crushed. The crushed gland gives a milky fluid that becomes a deep red or purple after aging. Pipes of these broken shells still remain on the coast at Sidon and Tyre. The purple gland is found in various species of Murex and also of Dorsalium.

Purple cloth was used in the furnishings of the tabernacle (Ex 25:5, etc) and of Solomon's temple
Purpose of God
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(2 Ch 2 14; 3 14); in the palanquin of Solomon (Cant 3 10); and in the hangings of the palace of Ahasuerus (Est 1 6). The kings of Midian had purple raiment (Jgs 5 26); the worthy woman of Prov 31 22 has clothing of fine linen and purple. Mordecai was clothed with purple by Ahasuerus

Shells of *Murex trunculus* (the Broken Ones from a Large Shell Heap at Sidon).

(Est 8 15); Jesus by the Roman soldiery (Mk 15 17, 29; Jn 19 2). The rich man of Lk 16 19 and the scarlet woman of Rev 18 12, 16 were arrayed in purple. In Cant 7 5 the bride has hair like purple. Purple is in the merchandise of Babylon (Rev 18 12). It is surprising that Ezekiel speaks of the Tyrians as obtaining purple from the islands of Elishah (Ezk 27 7) and from Syria (Ezk 27 16). See COLORS; DYE; DYEING.

**Alfred Ely Day**

**PURPOSE, púr'püs, OF GOD** (*πρόθεσις*, *prothésis* [Rom 9 11; Eph 1 11]). The word "purpose" seems to be an equivalent of the word "decrees" as used in relation to man's relation to eternity. More correctly stated, it softens the word "decree" and refers back to the cause of the decree as lodged in an intelligent design and forward to an aim consistent with the character of God. See FOREORDINATION; PREDESTINATION.

**PURSE, púrs.** See BAG.

**PURSLAIN, púr'slán, JUICE, jöös, jüs.** See JUICE.

**PURTENANCE, púr'té-nans:** With the significance of "belongings," this word occurs in AV of Ex 12 9 as the tr of ἐπτείξη, *epitexi*, "within," "inward," "roast . . . . with the pertenance thereof," RV "inwards" (cf Lev 1 9; 3 3, etc).


1. Renderings:

In consequence of the identification at the time, the prophets have "Libya" (Ἀλεξ., *Libyes*), except Nah 3 9, where the Gr renders the word as ἐφεις, *phuē*, "flight." The Vulg has "Phut," "Phuth," and in the Prophets "Libyes" and "Libyia"; AV "Phut."

In the "Table of Nations" Put is the third son of Ham (Gen 10 6), the first and second being Cush and Misraim, and the fourth Canaan. Put is the only one of the sons of Ham who is not credited with descendants.

In the Prophets, warriors from Put are referred to, principally in connection with the forces of Egypt. They appear as shield-bearers (Jer 46 9: "Cush and Put, that handle the shield; and the Ludim, that handle and bend the bow"). See also Ezek 30 5, where the order in the Heb is Cush, Put and Lud. In Nah 3 9 Put is the number of No-amon (Thebes in Egypt), and in Ezek 27 10 Put appears with Persia and Lydia (Laud) as being in the army of Tyre.

The common identification of Put is the Egypt *Punt* (or *Pued*), proposed by Ebers. The assimilation of *n* to a following consonant is common in the Sem languages, and would occasion no difficulty if the vocalization be found to agree. The final *t* of Put, however, seems to be the *Egypt* fem. ending, whereas the *t* of Put is radical.

Nevertheless, the district would seem to be rightly identified with the tract to the E. of Abydsinia (Somali-land), and it is described as being on both sides of the sea (the Red Sea, and as being included in connection with this, it is worthy of note that a fragment of a Bab tablet referring to Nebuchadnezzar's campaign in Egypt in his 37th year mentions, as though in the neighborhood, the city (here, apparently, standing for the district) of *Pudu-gaman*—probably not "Ludim (Gr Put)" (Lesbos, according to Winckler), but "Put of Yemen." If this be in contradistinction to the district of Put (Punt) on the African mainland, the latter would be the *Puto* referred to in the Pers inscription of Naqah-Rustem, which mentions, among the tributary-countries, Kushiya, Putiya and Massya, the Babylonian *maβi Pūta, (mαβi) Kūsī, (mαβi) Mūsā* (?), "the land Put, the land Kush (Ethiopia), the land Massā (?)". The soldiers of Put in the army of Tyre may have been either from the African or the Yemenite Put, in which case there was no northern tract of that name, unless settlements had been made in one or more of the areas from the original district. See W. Max Müller, *Asien und Europa*, Leipzig, 1893, 106 ff.

T. G. PincHes

**PUTEOLI, pu-te'ō-lí (Ποταίολοι, *Potaíloi*, "sulphur springs" [Acts 28 13, WH], the modern *Pozzoli*): A maritime city of Campania, which occupied a central position on the northern shore of a recess in the Gulf of Naples, turned toward the W., by the peninsula of Baiae and Cape Misenum. It was originally a colony of the neighboring Gr city Cumae.

The earliest event in the history of Puteoli which can be dated definitely was the repulse of Hannibal before its walls by a Rom garrison in 214 BC. The design of the Carthaginian to secure a seaport as base of supplies and communication was thus thwarted (Livy xxiv.7, 12, 13). A Rom colony was established here in 194 BC, and Puteoli thus became the first Rom port on the Gulf of Naples (Livy xxxiv.45; Strabo v.245; Velleius, i.15). Its subsequent remarkable prosperity and commercial activity are to be attributed to the security of the harbor and the inhospiatability of the character of the coast nearer Rome. For Puteoli became the chief seaport of the capital before the creation of an artificial harbor at Portus Augusti by Claudius, and before Trajan made the mouth of the Tiber the principal converging point for the over-sea carrying trade. The imports at Puteoli consisted of Egypt grain and oriental wares, dispatched from Alexandria and other cities of the Levant (Cicerio *Pro Rabirio* 40; Sestoniis Aug. 98; Strabo xvii. 793; Cicerio *Pro Caelo* 10). The eastern element in the population was very numerous (Petronius 81;
CIL, X, 1797). The harbor was rendered doubly safe by a mole, which is known to have been at least 418 yds. in length, consisting of massive piers connected by means of arches, constructed in solid masonry (Strabo v.215). Extensive remains of this mole still exist. The shore line devoted to purposes of commerce (emporium) extended for a distance of about 11 miles westward from the mole. At the height of its prosperity under Claudius and Nero, the town is thought to have contained a population of nearly 100,000.

The region in which the town was situated is of volcanic formation, the name Puteoli being due to the odor of the sulphureous springs or to the wells of a volcanic nature which abound in the vicinity. The volcanic dust, called pozolana today, was mixed with lime to form a cement of the greatest durability, which was proof against the influence of seawater.

Extensive remains of an amphitheater, whose axes measure 160 and 126 yds. across the space inclosed by the outer façade and 75 and 45 yds. within the arena, bear testimony to the former affluence of Puteoli.

The region about Puteoli together with Baiae became the favorite resort of the Roman nobility, and the foundations of many ancient villas are still visible, although partly covered by the sea. Cicero's villa in the territory of Puteoli (Cicero Ad Fam. v.15, 2; Ad Att. xiv.16, 1; 20, 1) was afterward selected as the place of burial of Hadrian (Sparianus Had. 25). The portion of the bay between Puteoli and Baiae was the scene of the attempt made at the instigation of Nero upon the life of his mother by means of a vessel so contrived that it was to break to pieces while conveying Agrippina toward her villa near the Lucrine Lake (Tacitus Annals xiv.8). See Nero.

The apostle Paul found a Christian community at Puteoli, when he arrived there on his way to Rome, and stopped 7 days with them (Acts 28 13, 14). At that time the ordinary route to Rome, following the Via Appia from Capua, was 155 Rom. or about 142 Eng. miles (Nissen, Italicische Landeskunde, II, 739). Later, Domitian reduced the distance to 139 Rom. miles (about 129 Eng.) by laying out the Via Domitiana along the coast, joining the Via Appia at Nisano (Aelian, Geog. Rarae, IV, 32; Ibn. Ant., 122; Tab. Peut.). See GEORGE H. ALLEN.

PUTHITES, pūthīts (πυθίτης, pūthîs, "simple"; AV Puthitos): One of the families of Kirith-jearim, grandchild of Caleb (1 Ch 2 50 53).

PUTIEL, pū'ti-el (πυτιέλ, pūtîel, "contemned by El"): Father of the wife of Eleazar, Aaron's son, and thus grandfather of Phinehas, Eleazar's son (Ex 6 25). See PHINEHAS, (3).

PUVAH, pū'va. See PUVAH.

PYGARG, pī'garg (πυγαργ, dishôn; LXX τυγαργός, pugargos); of proper nouns, "Dishôn" and "Dishan" (Gen 38 21 30; 1 Ch 1 38 42); according to BDB, Hommel, Säugothiere, derives ִם from ֵיש, dish. Arab. ֽס, dâs, "to tread," and of Assy. dashânu, "mountain-goat"): Dishôn as the name of an animal occurs only in Dt 14 5 in the list of clean beasts. Both AV and RV have "pygarg," which is not the recognized name of any animal whatever. The LXX pugargos (from πυγαργός, puggare, "rump," and ἄργης, ἄργος, "white") was used by Herodotus (iv.132) as the name of an antelope. A white rump is a very common feature of deer and antelopes, and is commonly explained as enabling the fleeing herd easily to keep in sight of its leaders. It has been used as a specific name of Cererus pugargus, the Tartarian roe, and Bubalis pugargus, a small South African antelope. The Arabic Bible has rîm, "a white gazelle," a kindred word to rîdân, AV, "unicorn," RV "wild-ox." Tristram, NHB, considers dishôn to be the addax, Antilope addax or Addax nasomaculatus. There is excellent reason, however, for believing that the range of this African antelope does not extend into Pal, Sinai or Arabia. For a discussion of the animal names in Dt 14 4 5, see ZOÖLOGY.

ALFRED ELY DAY

PYRAMIDS, pîr'â-mids (πυραμίδας, pyramidas): Pyramids are mentioned in connection with the splendid monument reared by Simon Maccabaenus in memory of his parents and brethren at Modin (1 Macc 13 28; cf. Ant. XIII, vi, 6). Jos describes them as "very surprising, both for their largeness and beauty." There is nothing to show how the pyramid allotted to each was distinguished, whether by difference in size or by inscriptions. It is remarkable that in Scripture there is no allusion to the giant structures in Egypt; but these may have supplied the suggestion to Simon's mind.

W. EWING

PYRRHUS, pîr'ús (Πῆρρος, Pirros, "fiery-red"): The name is inserted in the text of RV in Acts 20 4 as that of the father of SOPATER (q.v.).

PYTHON, pî'thōn: Occurs only in Acts 16 16, where RV reads, 'a certain maid having a spirit of divination [in "a spirit, a Python!", met us," Wdwh, Phthōn, or Phthō, Phthō, is the oldest name of Delphi (or the country about Delphi), in which was situated the famous Delphic Oracle. Consequently "Pythonian spirit" came to be the generic title of the supposed source of inspiration of diviners, including the slave-girl of the account in Acts. Exactly what facts underlie the narrative it is rather hard to say, but it is evident that the girl was sincere in her conviction that she spoke with Pythonian inspiration. Probably she represents some hysterical type, of none too strong mentality, whose confused utterances were taken as coming from some supernatural power. Impressed by St. Paul's personality, she followed him about, and, when his command came, was in a state of mind that had prepared her to obey it. The narrative, incidentally, gives an interesting sidelight on a society in which a girl with hysteria had a greater commercial value than she had after her cure. See DIOVINA.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON
birds and live in the open, brooding along roads and around fields. They have a longer, fuller wing than the partridge and can make stronger flight. In Pal they were migratory. They are first mentioned in Ex 16:13: "And it came to pass at even, that the quails came up, and covered the camp: and in the morning the dew lay round about the camp." This describes a large flock in migration, so that they passed as a cloud. Nu 11:31-33: "And there went forth a wind from Jeh, and brought quails from the sea, and let them fall by the camp, about a day's journey on this side, and a day's journey on the other side, round about the camp, and about two cubits above the face of the earth. And the people rose up all at that day, and all the night, and all the next day, and gathered the quails; he that gathered least gathered ten men homers: and they spread them all abroad for themselves round about the camp"; cf Ps 78:26-30:

"He caused the east wind to blow in the heavens; And by his power he guided the south wind. He rained flesh also upon them as the dust: And winged birds as the sand of the seas; And he let it fall in the midst of their camp, Round about their habitation. So they did eat, and were well filled: And he gave them their own desire." Again the birds are mentioned in migration. Those that fell around the camp and the bread that was sent from heaven are described in Ps 105:39-42. Commentators have had trouble with the above references. They cause the natural historian none— they are so in keeping with the location and the laws of Nature. First the Heb s'daw means "to be fat." That would be precisely the condition of the quail after a winter of feeding in the S. The time was early spring, our April, and the quail were flocking from Africa and spreading in clouds—even to Europe. They were birds of earth, heavy feeders and of plump, full body. Migration was such an effort that when forced to cross a large body of water they always waited until the wind blew in the direction of their course, lest they tire and fall. Their average was about 16 birds to each nest. If half a brood escaped, they yet multiplied in such numbers as easily to form clouds in migration. Pliny writes of their coming into Italy in such numbers, and so exhausted with their long flight, that if they sighted a sailing vessel they settled upon it by hundreds and in such numbers as to sink it. Taking into consideration the diminutive vessels of that age and the myriads of birds, this does not appear incredible. Now compare these facts with the text. Israelites were encamped on the Sinai Peninsula. The birds were in migration. The quail followed the Red Sea until they reached the point of the peninsula where they selected the narrowest place, and when the wind was with them they crossed the water. Not far from the shore arose the smoke from the campfires of the Israelites. This bewildered them, and, weary from their journey, they began to settle in confused thousands over and around the camp. Then the Israelites arose and, with the ever-ready "throw sticks," killed a certain number for every soul of the camp and spread the bodies on the sand to dry, just as Herodotus (ii.77) records that the Egyptians always had done (see Rawlinson, Herod, II, for an illustration of catching and drying quail). Nature and natural history can account for this incident, with no need to call in the miraculous.

Gene Stratton-Porter

Quarrel, kwor'el: Originally (1) "a complaint," (cf "querulous"), or (2) "a cause of complaint," and so (3) "a contention." (1) In AV Mk 6:19 (RV 'set herself'); the colloquial "had it in for him" is an exact tr and Col 3:13 (ownikh, momphk, "complaint"); so RV. (2) In 2 K 5:7 (TIN, 'dáph, "be opportune," RV "an occasion"). (3) In AV Lev 26:25 (loose tr of Δρ' , nákhán, "vengence"; so RV). Cf Sir 31:29 AV (RV "conflict") and Prov 20:3 RV (AV "meddling").

Quarries, kwar'iz (ǥ'wər'iz), θηλήμι [Jgs 19:26, "graven images"], Θέλημι, skhébharim [Josh 7:5, "Shebarim," RV "the quarries"]: θηλήμι is elsewhere tr "graven images" (Dt 7:5; Ps 78:65; Isa 10:10; Mic 5:13, etc) and is a pl. form of ποτήρ, "graven image" (Ex 20:4, etc), from ποταμ, "to carve." It occurs in the story of Enosh and Egyptian and refers to images or hewn stones in the vicinity of Gilgal. skhébharim is pl. of skhéhar, "breach," "fracture," more often "destruction" (e.g. Prov 16:18), from skhetter, to break." The form skhébharim is also found in Job 41:25, "constrammon," AV "breakings." In Josh 7:5 Shebarim is the point to which the Israelites were chased after their first attack upon AI. See Shebarim.

Quarries in Pal are not usually very deep because there is plenty of good stone to be found at the surface. The quarryman seeks a thick stratum of firm limestone which has a favorable exposure. The vertical joint-planes divide the stratum into large blocks which the quarryman dislodges with the aid of crowbars. These great blocks he skilfully cleaves by inserting several wedges in a line in holes made by a pick, and driving the wedges in with a heavy hammer. In these days gunpowder is occasionally used, esp. when there are not favorable joint-planes producing blocks capable of being moved by the crowbar. Another method, which is employed where stones of great size are wanted, is to carve the stones out of the rock by cutting channels around them with
the pick. In the limestone quarries of Ba'albek and the granite quarries of Agwān at the first cataract of the Nile, enormous stones may be seen which were abandoned while in process of being removed by this method. The channels are wide enough to admit the body of the workman, and the marks of the picks on the sides of the channels are plainly visible.

Alfred Ely Day

QUARTER, kwôr'tær: Lit., of course, “the fourth part,” and so of the four “ends” (γωνία, kāqōh) in Jer 49 36, and AV of the four “corners” (so RV, γωνία, gōnta) in Rev 20 8. Hence, “any part” and in this sense used freely for various words by AV. RV has usually dropped “quarter,” but unfortunately has retained it in Nu 34 3; Josh 15 5; in his cell between two soldiers, “bound with two chains,” his left hand chained to one and his right to the other. The other two soldiers of the quatermound guard before the door, and are spoken of as “the first and the second guard” (ver 10) whom St. Peter and his angel guide had to pass on the way to liberty. The Gr word thus rendered is not found in LXX or anywhere else in the NT.

T. Nicol

QUEEN, kwên: The Bible applies this term:

1) To the wife of a king (“queen consort”) (מֶלֶכה, malkāh). In the Book of Est it is the title given to Vashti (1 9) and Esther (2 22); cf Cant 6 8 f.
2) Another Heb word for queen consort is מָלֶכָּה, malkāh.
3) מְרִית, lit. “mistress” (cf 1 K 11 19, the wife of Pharaoth; 2 K 10 13, “the children of the king and

STONE IN QUARRIES AT BA'ALBEK.

18 14, 15, and introduced it in Josh 18 12. 14, 20 for פֶּץ, pe'ēk, usually rendered “side.” The result is very obscure. Elsewhere in RV only in the phrase “from every quarter” (Gen 19 4; Isa 56 11; Mk 1 45). Cf Border; Coast.

QUARTUS, kwâr'tus (Κατσέρας, Καταράς): A Christian in Corinth who with “Erasus the treasurer of the city” sent greetings to the Christian community in Rome (Rom 16 23). He is known to Paul only as a Christian, “the brother.”

QUATERNION, kwâ-tur'ni-un (τετράδευς, tetradion): The name given to a company of four soldiers of Herod's army (Acts 12 4). To four such companies St. Peter had been handed over, who would take their turn of acting as guard over the prisoner, each of the four watches of the night according to Roman reckoning, which Herod Agrippa I would follow. In the castle of Antonia St. Peter was thus closely secured, in order that Herod, who had already killed James, the brother of John, with the sword (12 2), might, after the solemnities of the Passover, make sure of his death likewise. On the night before his intended execution he was sleeping the children of the queen”). In Neh 2 6 and Ps 45 9 we find the expression רְשָׁע, shēgal, which some trace back to רְשָׁע, shēgal, “to ravish,” a rather doubtful derivation. Still another term is רְשָׁע, sāḏāh, lit. “princess” (Isa 49 25). The LXX sometimes uses the word βασίλεισα, basilissa; cf Ps 45 9. (2) To a female ruler or sovereign (“queen regnant”). The only instances are those of the queen (malkāh) of Sheba (1 K 10 1–13; cf 2 Ch 9 1–12) and of Candace, the queen (basilissa) of the Ethiopians (Acts 8 27). In Mt 12 42 (cf Lk 11 31) Christ refers to the queen of the south (βασίλεισα νάον, basilissa nāou), meaning, of course, the queen of Sheba. (3) To a heathen deity, רְשָׁע, lekhet ha-shāmayim, “the queen of heaven” (Jer 7 18; 44 17 ff). See Queen of Heaven.

(4) Metaphorically, to the city of Babylon (Rome) (Rev 18 7): an expression denoting sovereign contempt and imaginary dignity and power.

William Bauer

QUEEN MOTHER (מֶלֶכה, malkāh), מְרִית, lit. “mistress,” then a female ruler, and sometimes simply
the wife of a king ("queen," 1 K 11:19); in DoL 5:10 the term נָּשָׁ֫ה, melketha', "queen," really means the mother of the king: It stands to reason that among a people whose rulers are polygamous this practice looked nor at all. Hence becomes a person of great consequence. The records of the Books of K prove it. The גֶּבֶרָה, or queen mother, occupied a position of high social and political importance; she took rank almost with the king. When Bathsheba, the mother of Solomon, desired "to speak unto him for Adoniah," her son "rose up to meet her, and bowed himself unto her, and sat down on his throne, and caused a throne to be set for the king's mother; and she sat on his right hand" (1 K 2:19). And again, in 2 K 24:15, it is expressly stated that Nebuchadnezzar carried away the king's mother into captivity; Jeremiah calls her גֶּבֶרָה (29:2). The king was Jehoiachin (Jec- noiah, Jer 29:2), and his mother's name was Nehushta (2 K 24:8). This was the royal pair whose impending doom the prophet was told to foretell (Jer 13:18). Here again the queen mother is mentioned with the king, thus emphasizing her exalted position. Now we understand why Asa removed Maacah his (grand) mother from being queen (queen mother), as the LXX tells us (cf 1 K 15:2; cf 2 Ch 16:12). She had used her powerful influence to further the cause of idolatry. In this connection Athaliah's corp d'état may be briefly mentioned. After the violent death of her son Ahaziah (2 K 9:27), she usurped the royal power and reigned for some time in her own name (2 K 11:3; cf 2 Ch 22:12). This was, of course, a revolutionary undertaking, being a radical departure from the usual traditions.

And finally, the political importance of the גֶּבֶרָה is illustrated by the fact that in the Books of K, with two exceptions, the names of the Jewish kings are recorded together with those of their respective mothers; they are as follows: Naaman, the Ammonite, the mother of Rehoboam (1 K 14:21; cf 1 K 2:31, and 2 Ch 12:13); Maacah, the daughter of Abishalom (1 K 15:2) or Absalom (2 Ch 11:20), the mother of Abijah; Maacah, the daughter of Abishalom, the mother (grandmother) of Asa (1 K 15:2; cf 2 Ch 12:15); Athaliah, the daughter of Shilhi, the mother of Jehoshaphat (1 K 22:42; cf 2 Ch 20:31); Athaliah, the granddaughter of Omri, the mother of Ahaziah (2 K 8:26; cf 2 Ch 22:2), Zibiah of Beersheba, the mother of Jehoram (2 K 8:22; cf 2 Ch 21:1); Jehoaddan (Jehoaddan, 2 Ch 25:1) of Jerus., the mother of Amaziah (2 K 14:2); Jehochiah (Jec- noiah, 2 Ch 26:3) of Jerus., the mother of Azariah (2 K 15:2) or Ouziah (2 K 15:13; cf 2 Ch 26:3); Jerus. (Jerushah, 2 Ch 27:1), the daughter of Zadok, the mother of Jotham (2 K 15:33); Abi (Abijah, 2 Ch 29:1), the daughter of Zechariah, the mother of Hezekiah (2 K 18:2); Hephzibah, the mother of Manasseh (2 K 21:1); Meshullemeth, the daughter of Haruz of Bethah, the mother of Amon (2 K 21:19); Jedidah, the daughter of Adaias of Bozkath, the mother of Josiah (2 K 22:1); Hamutal, the daughter of Jeremiah of Libnah, the mother of Jehoahaz (2 K 23:1); Zebikah, the daughter of Pedaiah of Ruh- mah, the mother of Jehoiakim (2 K 23:36); Nehushta, the daughter of Ethanah of Jerus., the mother of Jehoichin (2 K 24:8); Hamutal (Hamutal), the daughter of Jeremiah of Libnah, the mother of Zedekiah (2 K 24:18). The exceptions are Jehoram and Ahaz.

QUEEN OF HEAVEN מַלְּכָהָּמֶשֶׁת הָאָדָמִים, melketh ha-adamayim, although there is another reading, מַלְּכָהָּמֶשֶׁת הָאֲדָמִים, "worship" or "godless"

Occurs only in two passages: Jer 7:18; 44:17-19.25, where the prophet denounces the wrath of God upon the inhabitants of Judah and those who have given themselves up to the worship of the host of heaven. This is no doubt a part of the astral worship which is found largely developed among the Jews in the later period of their history in Canaan. It is first mentioned in 2 K 17:13, and was practised by the kings of the Northern Kingdom when Samaria had fallen and the ten tribes were being carried away into captivity. Moses is represented as warning the Israelites against the worship of the sun and moon and stars and all the host of heaven, practised by the people of Canaan (Dt 4:19; 17:3), and the existence of such worship among the Canaanites and neighboring nations is attested from an early period (cf Job 31:26-28).

The worship of the heavenly bodies was widely spread in the East and in Arabia; and the Babylonian pantheon was full of astral deities, where each divinity corresponded either to an astral phenomenon or to some circumstance or occurrence in nature which is connected with the course of the stars (Jerem. The OT in the Light of the Near East, I, 100). From the prophets we gather that before the exile the worship of the host of heaven had become established among all classes and in all the towns of Israel (Jer abu supra; Ezk 8:10). In that worship the queen of heaven was in a prominent place; and if, as seems probable from the cates which were offered, she is to be identified with the Asyr Ishtar and the Canaanite Astarte, the worship itself was of a grossly immoral and debasing character. Thus, in this Babylonian antiquity and widely spread in ancient Babylonia may be seen from the symbols of it found in recent excavations (see Nippur, II, 236). How far the astral theorists like Winckler and Jeremias are entitled to link up with this worship the naming for Josiah, the lamentations over Tammuz, the story of Jephthah's daughter, and even the narrative of the misfortunes and the exaltation of Joseph, is questionable. But that the people of Judah in the days before the exile had given themselves over to the worst and vilest forms of heathen worship and incurred the grievous displeasure of Jeh is made clear by the denunciation of the worship of the queen of heaven by Jeremiah.

T. Nicol

QUEEN OF SHEBA, מִשְׁפּוֹת, mishpohtha, (1 K 10:1-13; 2 Ch 9:1-12, called in Mt 12:42; Lk 11:31, "the queen of the south" [בֶּטֶלֶהוֹת בָּתָא אוֹתָתָא, betlesa naotou], the queen of the south) to Solomon differ slightly from one another, and, of the two, that in 1 K is the older. (1) The words concerning the Accounts of Nebi of Jeh in AK 10:9 are wanting in 2 Ch; while LXX in 1 K has "and the name of Jeh," apparently a correction of the MT. (2) For 1 K 10:9, "because Jeh loved Israel ever," 2 Ch 9:8 has "because thy God loved Israel, to establish them for ever"; LXX in 1 K has "because Jeh loved Israel, to establish it for ever." (3) In the last verse of each account, where 1 K 9:28-30 19 says that Solomon gave to the queen all her desire, besides that which she had brought unto the king," i.e., according to some, besides the equivalent of what she had brought to him; 1 K 10:13 has "besides that which he gave her of his own free will, according to the king's bounty," i.e., besides gifts commensurate with his own wealth and power (sbot), or besides gifts which he gave her gold.

The narrative tells of the queen of Sheba, on hearing of Solomon's great wisdom, coming to test him with perplexing questions or riddles (cf Jgs 14:12). She brought Narrative presents to the king, and interviewed him: "And when the queen of Sheba had seen all the wisdom of Solomon, and the palace that he had built" (i.e. the palace, not the temple) as
well as its arrangements, "and his burnt-offering which he offered in the house of JeH [so read and translate with RV in 1 K 19:5, and also in 2 Ch 9:4]; there was no more spirit in the half of Solomon's wisdom had not been told her. "Happy," she said to him, "are thy wives [so read with LXX, Syr and Old Lat VSS], happy are these thy servants." She then exchanged gifts with him and returned to her own land.

The narrative is a complement of that in 1 K 3:16-28, where the king's justice is exemplified; here his wisdom.

The narrative is referred to by Jesus in Mt 12:42; Lk 11:31, where He refutes to anecdotes the request of the scribes and Pharisees for a sign from Him. He tells them that no sign will be given them except that of Jonah, whose sign was his preaching, one that proved sufficient to the Ninevites; and 'behold something greater than Jonah is here.' The men of Nineveh will be a living condemnation of them "in the judgment" (cf Lk 16:31); and so will the "queen of the south" who came from the ends of the earth after hearing of Solomon's wisdom, and beheld something greater than Solomon is here. The only sign to be given is that of the wisdom of Jesus, a wisdom far greater than that of Solomon (see D. Smith, Days of His Flesh, 176 f.).

Eastern lit. has much to say about the queen of Sheba. The Arabs called her Bilké. Abyssinian legend declares that she came from Ethiopia, her name being Maqësa, and that she had a scribe Solomon. See Delitzsch, J. R., 116-27; ZDMG, X. 191, J Fr T, VI, 523 ff (1880). Gesammelte Abhandlungen, 1905, 413 ff; Bezold, Leben Davids, 1907, 318 ff. For the Mohammedan story, see Koran xxvii, with notes in Sale's tr.

David Francis Roberts

**QUICKEN, kwench, kwench: Where the word is used of fire or of thirst it has the usual meaning: "to allay," "to extinguish," "to suppress," "to cool." In the OT it is frequently applied to the affections and passions (see 2 K 25:17; Cant 4:7; Isa 42:3; Jer 4:4; 21:12). Quenching the coal or the light of Israel may mean slaying a dear one or a brilliant leader. In the NT it is also used figuratively, as in Eph 6:16 the shield of faith quenches the fiery darts of the evil one. In Mk 9:45, εἰρπότων, abominations, and abominations are said to have reference to Gehenna (tr "hell"). The same word is also used of resisting the gifts of the Holy Spirit in 1 Thess 5:19.

**Burton Scott Easton**

**QUESTION, kwes'chon:** The noun for the Septuagint, δάραθον, "word," in 1 K 10:3 & 2 Ch 9:2, with "hard question for the διδοὺς, ἁδικῶν, "dark saying," "riddle," in 1 K 10:1 & 2 Ch 9:1. In the NT for ἰνπάσον, σάλημα, the synonym ἰππασον, σάλησις (and 1 Tim 1:4, εἰρπεσίς, ἐκκλησία), is rendered "questioning" by RV (AV does not distinguish). In Mk 11:29 for λόγος, λόγος, "word" (so RVM). The vb. in the sense "ask a question" in 2 Ch 31:9 for ἰνπάσον, δάραθος, and Lk 2:46: 23:9 for ἐπερετόδῳ (cf ARV,ERVsm Jn 16:23). Elsewhere the vb. is for συρτοῦς, συράνσις, "dispute" (Mk 1:24, etc; of Acts 6:9; 9:29). Called "questioning" in Acts 19:40, represents ἐρετάνως, ἐρετρᾶτος, "call into court" (so Lk 7:26, 24:21), "I am called in question" is for στητόν, κρίσιμως, "I am being judged."
II. Constructive Principles of NT Quotation

1. Unity of the Two Dispensations
2. Biblical Movement Planned as the Beginning
3. The OT Accepted as Authoritative
4. Issue involved in Foregoing Principles of Reference

III. Typical Instances of NT Quotation

1. Unity of the Two Dispensations
2. Biblical Movement Planned as the Beginning
3. The OT Accepted as Authoritative
4. Argumentative Quotations
5. Catena of Passages, Illustrating Principles of Reference

The second great constructive principle of NT quotation, and manifestly in close harmony with the first one, is that the movement from Abraham to Christ was historically one, but that it was from the beginning planned and prepared for. The Bible is one because the history out of which it grew is one. The history is one because God in the history and God is one. According to the writers of the NT in this history as a whole we have the unfolding of an all-embracing plan of God, stretching out into the remotest future and coming to its culmination in the person and the kingdom of the Messiah. The history of the OT through which the plan was disclosed in part beforehand, by way of anticipation and preparation, in order that men might intelligently cooperate with God in the fulfillment of His purpose. This is the idea involved in prophecy and its fulfillment, and in the closely related idea of promise and its realization. One mind, one will, and one central purpose are operating throughout the whole history which is, on the Divine side, the fulfillment of a plan complete in thought before it took shape in creation. This conception, the foreseen plan of God and its gradual revelation to men through messages of hope and warning set in the key of the great future and pointing the way thither, the greater part of the structure of the NT, is also the structure of the Old Testament.

A third principle which really involves a combination of the other two and is prominently brought forward in the use of quotation for purposes of argument is the recognition of the OT as authoritative, a real Word of God, in form occasional, but essentially applicable to all experiences, and hence good for all time. It is evident that the belief in the continuous authority of the Scripture of the old covenant over the men of the new, rests upon the unity of the two dispensations and the acceptance of the same Divine mind and will as operating throughout all outward and historical changes. This is admirably expressed by Paul when he speaks of the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he purposed in him unto an economy of the fulness of times, to sum up all things in Christ (Eph 1:10), and by the author of Hebrews when he says (Heb 1:1-2), 'In the past, through his Son who is to the age of all ages, he made purification for sin and consecrated a kingdom that cannot be shaken.'

The justification of these accepted principles of reference on the part of the NT writers lies beyond the scope of the present discussion.

4. Issue Involving Quotations

It is sufficient to emphasize the fact that any detailed discussion of NT quotations is within the scope of the present discussion.

III. Typical Examples of NT Quotation

With these constructive principles in mind we are prepared to pass in review typical instances in which general principles are embodied. At this point we shall be greatly assisted in the analysis and distribution of the complex material before us by giving careful heed to the formulas, more or less fixed and...
uniform, by which the writers introduce quotations and indicate their sense of the value and significance of that which is quoted. While the form contains certain verbal variations, they are practically reducible to three, which correspond with substantial accuracy to the three constructive principles already noted: the unity of the OT and NT; the prediction of the NT in the OT; the authority of the OT as the Word of God intended for all time.

The unity of the two dispensations is asserted in all those passages introduced by a formula, in which the fulfilment is asserted as a fact, and in which the operation of identical principles in two or more separate events in the field of history is implied. A suggestive example is in Mt 13:14, where our Lord asserts, in connection with the parable of the Sower, that in the unbelief of the people of His day "the prophecy of Isaiah is fulfilled. The prophetic words here quoted (Isa 6:9-10) are not predictive in any immediate sense, but are susceptible of repeated application and realization in the experience of the Church as she contains. They apply to the prophet's own day; they also apply—and in that sense are fulfilled—to the time of Jesus, and by a legitimate extension of meaning, to stubborn unbelief in any age of apostasy.

Another passage in which the same formula is used in a very exceptional way clearly sets forth the fundamental principle upon which this usage rests. Isa 2:23 asserts that the justification of Abraham in the offering of his only son as a sacrifice to God affirms his belief that his seed will be counted for righteousness (Gen 15:6). This passage is not predictive in any sense, nor is there in the narrative any hint of a connection between the passage and the episode on Mt, Moriah. This use of the formula of fulfilment by James involves the principle that any event which realizes the meaning and truth of a Scriptural statement fulfils it. A vast number of quotations in the NT come under this head. Persons, events, doctrines, illustrate and confirm, or embody and concretely realize, principles which are taught in the OT or implied in its history. We are warned by this passage and many others like it against a too rigid and literal interpretation of any fixed or certain verbal passage which affirms that his belief was counted to him for righteousness (Gen 15:6).

In this connection it is to be remembered that a harmony of principle may extend all the way from a comparatively superficial illustrative resemblance to a profound assuance of thought. Not a few OT quotations were made for purposes of parallelism and literary embellishment. Herein lies the significance of Matthew's use (2:17) of Jer 31:15. A glance at this quoted passage indicates that it is a figurative and poetical expression in which Rachel (already for many years in her tomb) is represented as weeping over her exiled children and refusing to be comforted except by their return. There is no strictly predictive element in the passage, save only the promise of return, which is not used by Matthew. Its applicability to the massacre of the children of Bethlehem lies in its poetical parallelism, and nowhere else. Once again the voice of wailing motherhood is heard in Israel. The tender and beautiful imagery is applicable in this sense and is used with true insight, but with no intention of justifying a claim of prediction and fulfilment in the literal sense.

The prediction of events in the life of Jesus and in the history of Christianity is involved in all the quotations in which a necessary concurrence exists between the predictive and the event is asserted, or is referred to. An examination of the OT without reference to its use in the NT seems to justify the conclusion that its bearing upon the future may be particularized under four heads, which in turn with sufficient accuracy and exhaustiveness will classify the pertinent NT quotations.

(1) The prophetic teaching of Israel embodied not only in the messages of the prophets, but also in laws, institutions, and rites, has a twofold dispensational application. Reference is made here only to those explicit references to a future era of especial blessing. For example, in Acts 2:17 ff Peter interprets the Pentecostal experience in the terms of prophecy, referring to Joel (2:28 ff), who promises an outpouring of God's Spirit in a "great and notable day" of the Lord. The promise of a Pentecostal prediction (every promise is such), which in a measure would be fulfilled in any exceptional manifestation of God's Spirit among men. The only question which can possibly be raised in connection with Peter's reference to the Pentecostal outpouring was the climactic realization of the promise: that is, the establishment of the era of blessing foretold by the prophet. Later in the same book (3:20-26) the same apostle sweeps the whole field of prophecy as centering in certain promises fulfilled in Christ and the Christian community.

He instances two, the prophet like Moses (Dt 18:15) and the promised inclusive blessing through Abraham (Gen 12:3). He also includes (Acts 3:26) a hint of the Servant passages of Isa. This identification of the NT movement through two specific predictive promises is wholly justified by the prophetic character of Jesus, the range and richness of the blessings brought from Abraham through Him, and by the fact elsewhere emphasized that no other has measured up to the standard of the ideal servant. Negatively, it may be urged that if these promises were not fulfilled in Christ, history affords no possibility of discovering any fulfilment measureably adequate to fulfill their promise. In He (8:8-12) reference is made to the promise of a new covenant in Jer (31:31 ff) as a justification for believing that the OT dispensation was not complete in itself and that in its very constitution it pointed forward to Christianity as its fulfillment. Combining this passage with that quoted above (Acts 2:17 ff) taken from Joel, the strength of the case for this use of the OT is at once seen. Distinctively Jeremiah's "new covenant" was to be inward and not outward legal and formal. The promise through Joel is an awakening of prophecy through the free outpouring of God's Spirit. The distinctive feature of the gospel is its idea of justification by faith, through grace revealed in Christ and imparted by the Holy Spirit, given according to promise to Pentecost. The "new covenant" foresaid by Jeremiah was established at Pentecost through the outpouring of the Spirit promised through Joel. To deny this as fulfilment is to nullify the entire historical and contemporary history and to erase both promises from the page of credible prophecy.

(2) Contemporary persons or institutions are sometimes interpreted, not in the terms of present actuality, but on the basis of the ideal purposes revealed or realized until the coming of Christ. One striking example of this method is to be found in the
so-called “Immanuel passage” (Mt 1:23, quoting Isa 7:14). Undoubtedly the message of the prophet to Ahaz had an immediate and contemplative effect. But whether any ambition, or any notable prophetic message, it is set in the key of the Messianic King whose unworthy predecessor Ahaz was. “The Messiah comes, but the willfulness of Ahaz has rendered His reign impossible” (G. A. Smith, “Isa,” Expositor’s Bible, 1, 194).

In Acts 2:24–36 passages representative of many others quoted, both the resurrection and ascension of Jesus are interpreted in the light of two quotations from the Ps (16:8ff; 110:1) as predestined and therefore certain events in the plan and purpose of God. In both instances the argument is that the promises nominally made to David, or claimed by him, were couched in terms too vast to find fulfillment in his own experience, but were spoken of the greater King who was to come and in whose experience alone they were realized. In the former instance, a triumph over death was anticipated with assurance which not the Psalmist but only Christ attained; in the latter a royal ascendency was promised that only Christ’s ascension was ever to fulfill. A second examination of the passages shows that Peter’s interpretation is justified not merely by the wording of the promises, which point to a fullness of experience not realized by any OT man, but still more clearly by the detailed side-by-side identity of the person who is the subject of the experience. In the first instance he is spoken of as Jeh’s “Holy One,” in the second as “My Lord!” The triumph over death which the speaker anticipates is grounded in a unity of purposed working, with God’s Logos, which was ideal and still unrealized until Christ came. The logic of the ps is: God’s “Holy One” must not see corruption. The logic of history is: Christ is God’s Holy One and He did not see corruption. The principle that triumph over death is the logical issue of holiness found its justification and proof not directly in the experience of the singer who first glimpsed it as a truth, but in the career of Christ who first realized it as a fact.

The argument here is not affected if one accepts the variant reading “Holy Ones” for the preceding passage.

The second passage is particularly interesting because Our Lord Himself first pointed out its importance in their place of origin, Nazareth. Such a passage as this entire ps (110) would have been impossible had not the powers and responsibilities of the Davidic King been keyed from the beginning at the Messianic level. The logic here is the same as in Ps 16. The Messianic kingdom over all nations awaited the coming of the true Messianic King. The long-delayed triumph followed hard upon the coming of the long-expected King (cf Ps 2:12; Acts 13:32–34).

This passage is invoked in Our Lord’s use of the Servant passage (Isa 61:1ff) in His sermon at Nazareth. Here the issue as to Messianic prophecy is fairly joined at the center. It is central because it occurs in the Lord’s own teaching and also because it concerns, not any external or incidental happenings in the life of Jesus, but the whole trend and movement of prophetic thought, together with the entire meaning and interpretation of His career.

Interpreted altogether apart from the NT, the prophecy has an unmistakable bearing upon the future. As one of the series concerned with the Servant (Isa 42:1ff), the quoted passage focuses attention upon the mission of Israel to the world, still to be carried out. “Ye are my witnesses, saith Jehovah, and my servant whom I have chosen” (44:10). “Yet now hear, O Jacob my servant, and Israel, whom I have chosen” (44:1). It also involves the entire scope and meaning of the prophetic office through which Jehovah’s will was made known to Israel and through Israel to the world. All considerations sweep out into the prophet’s future and both point unerringly to Christ as the historical fulfillment of Israel’s mission and as the actual realization of the ideal and ministry of prophethood.

The very antiquity of the prophetic passage (ch 61), whether to the Servant or to the prophet, and the questions raised as to whether Israel idealized is referred to or some person or personification, serve to make more clear and unmistakable the central fact that only in Christ is the conception embodied in the entire series of passages altogether realized. It thus becomes for sober thought a distinct revelation and portrayal in advance of what Jesus was in His person and work.

(3) In the course of Israel’s training to receive the Messiah, certain external items were given as bearing upon the identification of Him when He should come. We shall instance three items, closely related to each other, and each intensely interesting in itself. These three items are (a) His birth to Mary of Davidic ancestry (Lk 1:30–31), as a Virgin (Mt 1:22ff), (b) His birth at Bethlehem (Mt 2:5). Objection is offered at once to the interpretation of these OT passages as predictive, and to the alleged fulfillments in the life of Jesus, on the ground that they were not definitely foretold. But these passages are not only included within the legitimate scope of prediction; and, secondarily, that being items of this external kind it would be an easy matter to invent fulfillments. It may be granted that such incidents, or statements, not explicitly foretold, may be multiplied by fabricating coincidences, but the fact remains that, in the absence of any visible check upon invention, very few such instances are alleged by NT writers.

Further, there are suggestive variations between the events recorded and the natural interpretations of the OT passages connected with them; that is, the fulfillments arrive by such devious routes as to make it difficult to suppose them to be due to the imaginative stimulation of the passages. For example, the birth at Bethlehem was brought about by circumstances not at all to the liking of Jewish patriots, and was obscured to contemporaries by the previous and subsequent residence at Nazareth. The kinship of Jesus to David was not pronounced by the text (even unless Mary was of that house) by the virgin birth. The interpretation of Isa 7:14 as intimating a virgin birth was not compulsory to one familiar with the Heb text of the passage and would have been thought of in that connection only by one assured of the fact. The virgin birth (see IMMANUEL; VIRGIN BIRTH) is not an etymological but a providential commentary on Isa 7:14. One other consideration of primary importance remains. In the one point where the identification of Jesus with the Messiah by His followers can be tested most severely, they are most completely triumphant. It would be comparatively easy to invent incidents suggested by OT prophecies, and to take dignities and titles wholesale from the same source—but given all these, to find one capable of realizing and fulfilling the expectations so aroused is the chief problem. Here fabrication is impossible. And here too the NT meets and answers the challenge of truth. In view of these considerations it is safe to say that in matters of historical detail the career of Jesus was foreseen and predicted. Such passages belong to the philosophy of preparation as a whole and should be studied in that connection.

(4) In certain instances the original passage and its reappearance in quotation indicate a process
which is continuous throughout all history. For example, the use of Zec 13 7 (Mk 14 27) suggests a deeper view of the connection between prophecy and history, immediate and more remote, than we are often aware of. On the face of them stand within Scripture the two concepts: The Shepherd and the scattered sheep are predictions, and the life of Christ stands as fulfilment. It simply cannot be contended that such passages as these do not find fulfilment and explanation in the career of Jesus as nowhere else in history. Nevertheless, the connection is far from clear, in the archaic, ancient sense of an isolated event and its occurrence. We must recognize that, in a sense, the event is foreseen because it is already a fact. The allegory of the Smitten Shepherd is, as has well been said, "a summary of the history of Israel." But it is more than that. The relationship of God with Israel, which involved a dealing of Divine grace with men, their rejection of it and the consequent vicarious imman- nation of the Divine Friend and Shepherd, which came to His climax in the tragedy of the cross, was established in all essential factors in the early days. Therefore, Christ can say, as the outcome of this profound insight into the meaning of history, "That which concerneth me hath fulfilment" (of Lk 23 44). He can assure more devoutly in the recollection of the doings of an earlier time than being there foreseen. In a real sense, "the Lamb" was "slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev 13 8). In this allegory of the rejected Shepherd and in the successive delineations of the Servant passages, we have the portrait of the Christ as He was—not merely as He was to be. In these quotations deep answers to deep. The only satisfactory interpretation of the tragedy of the cross is that in accordance with prophetic thought in human history, "it would be useless to seek to modify, to repudiate, to repel the fact. The only satisfactory interpretation of the passages cited is that they disclose the actual operation of the forces which in their culmination issued in the tragedy of the cross. This brings the passages in the original and in quotation into the framework of the same course of events. Peter in his sermon in Solomon's porch thus sums up the whole process: "But the things which God showed by the mouth of all the prophets, that his Christ should suffer, he thus fulfilled" (Acts 3 18, 19 33). The argument of the OT involves exactly the same principles which have been dealt with in the foregoing discussion. These principles coalesce in the conception of

4. Argumentative the OT as authoritative.

Quotations (1) Throughout the NT, in the teaching of Our Lord Himself and in the apostolic writings, a clear-cut distinction is drawn between the temporary and permanent offices of the OT. It is recognized that in essential principles the OT is for all time, while in its outward form and in its actualization of underlying and essential truths and in preliminary and preparatory. There are different dispensations, but one economy. Whenever Our Lord uses the OT for purposes of argument (see Mt 4 4; Mt 12 17; Lk 19 11; Mt 24 15) it is on the basis of essential truth which is permanent and unchanging (Mt 5 17-19). On the other hand, He never hesitates to annul that which had a merely temporary or preliminary or dispensational character (Mt 5 21-33; Lk 16 16). Christ can not destroy, but to fulfil, but fulfilment implies a new era—a new and higher stage in the delivery of truth.

(2) In like manner Paul and the other NT writers argue on the basis of an identity of principle which binds the two eras together. Paul contended for (1) the Old Testament, the Messiahship of Jesus, justification by faith, the inclusion of the Gentiles in the plan of salvation (the doctrine of election is a detail of this last argument; see Rom 9 7-9.12. 13.15.17). We shall consider typical examples of Paul's use of the OT in argumentation. Choice has been made of those which have provoked adverse criticism. Among these is the use of Gen 13 15; 17 8 in the Smitten Shepherd. Paul's alleged "rabbinical" misquote: "He is not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." The Heb word "seed" as applied to offspring (Gen 22 17, "zera") is singular. This, of course, means that a man's descendants are looked upon as a single entity. But it is more than that. The relationship of God with Israel, which involved a dealing of Divine grace with men, their rejection of it and the consequent vicarious imman- nation of the Divine Friend and Shepherd, which came to His climax in the tragedy of the cross, was established in all essential factors in the early days. Therefore, Christ can say, as the outcome of this profound insight into the meaning of history, "That which concerneth me hath fulfilment" (of Lk 23 44). He can assure more devoutly in the recollection of the doings of an earlier time than being there foreseen. In a real sense, "the Lamb" was "slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev 13 8). In this allegory of the rejected Shepherd and in the successive delineations of the Servant passages, we have the portrait of the Christ as He was—not merely as He was to be. In these quotations deep answers to deep. The only satisfactory interpretation of the tragedy of the cross is that in accordance with prophetic thought in human history, "it would be useless to seek to modify, to repudiate, to repel the fact. The only satisfactory interpretation of the passages cited is that they disclose the actual operation of the forces which in their culmination issued in the tragedy of the cross. This brings the passages in the original and in quotation into the framework of the same course of events. Peter in his sermon in Solomon's porch thus sums up the whole process: "But the things which God showed by the mouth of all the prophets, that his Christ should suffer, he thus fulfilled" (Acts 3 18, 19 33). The argument of the OT involves exactly the same principles which have been dealt with in the foregoing discussion. These principles coalesce in the conception of
nary habit of quoting authoritative Scripture is sufficiently obvious. In the case of the saying attributed to Christ, it is enough to say that it is so obviously Christlike that we need not hesitate to accept it as genuine, while in the case of Jude nothing is made to depend on whether or not an apparent quotation is genuine. "Textualists" (see Plummer, Expositor's Bible, "James and Jude," 134 ff.).


(2) Based on authority of the OT.—Mt 4:8; 5:38,43.

RAAMA, ra'ma' (רָמָא, ra'ma'; also ra'amah: B, Naamah, Naamiah, A, 'Pa-lud, Rhelma): One of the leading men who returned with Zerubbabel from captivity ( Neh 7:7). In the corresponding passage in Ex 2:2, where the same list is named, a slight variation in form is given, "Relahah," the name found in this passage. One is doubtless a corruption of the other. Both have the same root meaning.

RAAMESES, ra'am-se' (רָמֶסֶס, ra'me'se'; also ra'am'e'se): Gen 47:11; Ex 12:37; Nu 33:35 (אָמֶסֶס, a'me'se'; also ra'am'e'se).

1. Meaning: Papyrus, Rameses; Egyptian Ra-Meses of "Store cities," "Ra created him" [or "it"]: One of the two 'settlements' ( mish'beth) built, or "built up," by the Hebrews for the Pharaoh, the other being Pithom, to which the LXX adds a third, namely, "On which is Helipolis," a town near Cairo (Ex 1:11). The red term mish'beth comes from a root meaning "to set down" (Aaḥb. sakk, settlement, Assyr sakkanu or shaktanu, "to set"); but it is rendered "strong cities" in LXX, "treasure cities" in AV, and (incorrectly) "store-cities" in RV. The "land of Rameses," where Jacob and his sons settled, was apparently the "field of Zoan" (see Zoan), thus lying in the Delta E. of the Bubastic branch of the Nile.

It is often assumed that no city called Rameses would have existed before the time of Rameses II, who lived in the 14th cent. BC, though even before Rameses I the name occurs as of Name of that of a brother of Horemhab under the XVIIIth Dynasty. The usual this "Child of Ra" is grammatically incorrect in Egypt, and as Ra was an ancient name for the "sun" it seems possible that a town may have borne the title "Ra created it" very early. The mention of Rameses in Gen (47:11) is often regarded as an anachronism, since no scholar has supposed that Jacob lived as late as the time of Rameses II. This would equally apply to the other notices, and at most would only serve to mark the age of the passages in the Pentateuch. It may be that Rameses II was more than can be thought to be proved (see Exodus). According to de Rougé (see Pierret, Vocab. Hiéroglyph., 1875, 143) there were at least three towns in Lower Egypt that bore the name Pa Rames-ses ("city of Rameses"); but Brugsch supposes that the place mentioned in the OT was Zau, to which Rameses II gave this name when making it his capital in the Delta. Dr. Budge takes the same view, while Dr. Naville and others suppose that the site of Rameses has still to be found.

There appears to have been no certain tradition preserving the site, for though St. Silvia (about 385 AD) was told that it lay 4 miles

3. Situation from the town of Arabia (see Goshen), she found no traces of such a place. Brugsch ("A New City of Rameses, 1870," Zeitschrift, 69) places one such city in the southern part of Memphis itself. Goodwin (Rec. of Past, Old Series, VI, 11) gives an Egyptian letter describing the "city of Rameses--Miamin," which appears to be Zayan, since it was swamped.

It was a very prosperous city when this letter was written, and a pa-lennu or "palace city." It had canals full of fish, lakes swarming with birds, fields of lentils, melons, wheat, onions and sesame, gardens of vines, almonds and figs. Ships entered its harbor; the lotus and papyrus grew in its waters. The inhabitants greeted Rameses II with garlands of flowers. Besides wine and mace, of the "conqueror's city," beer was brought to the harbor from the Katt (in Cilicia), and oil from the Lake Sagha. There is no reason to suppose that Zayan was less prosperous in the early Hyksos age, when the Hebrews dwelt in its plain, whatever be the conclusion as to the date when the city Rameses received that name. The description above given agrees with the OT account of the possession given by Joseph to his family "in the best of the land, in the land of Rameses" (Gen 47:11).
Rabbah. It was during this siege that Uriah the Hittite by David's orders was exposed "in the forefront of the hottest battle" (2 S 11 15), where, treacherously deserted by his comrades, he was slain. How long the siege lasted we do not know; probably some years; but the end was in sight when Joab captured "the city of waters" (2 S 12 27). This may mean that he had secured control of the water supply. In the preceding verse he calls it the 'royal city.' By the chivalry of his general, David was enabled in person to enjoy the honor of taking the city. Among the booty secured was the crown of Melcom, the god of the Ammonites. Such of the inhabitants as survived he treated with great severity (2 S 12 26-31; 1 Ch 20 1 f).

In the utterances of the prophets against Ammon, Rabbah stands for the people, as their most important, or perhaps their only important, city (Jer 49 2,3; Ezek 21 20; 25 5; Am 1 14). Jer 49 4 speaks of the "flowing valley"—a reference perhaps to the abundance of water and fruitfulness—and the treasures in which she gloried. Ezek 21 21 represents the king of Babylon at "the head of the two ways" deciding by means of the divining arrows whether he should march against Jerusalem or against Rabbah. Amos seems to have been impressed with the palaces of Rabbah.

The city retained its importance in later times. It was captured by Ptolemy Philadelphia (285-247 BC), who called it Philadelphia. It was a member of the league of ten cities. Antiochus the Great captured it by means of treachery (Polyb. v.71). Jos (B J, III, iii, 3) names it as lying E. of the citadel appear to be very old; but it is quite impossible to say that anything Ammonite is now above ground. The citadel is connected by means of an underground passage with a large cistern or tank to the N., whence probably it drew its water-supply. This may be the passage mentioned in the account of the capture of the city by Antiochus.

"It is," says Conder (Heb and Moab, 158), "one of the finest Rom towns in Syria, with baths, a theater, and an odeum, as well as several huge private masonry tombs built in the valley probably in the 2d cent. The fortress on the hill, now surrounding a considerable temple, is also probably of this same date. The church with two chapels farther N., and perhaps some of the tombs, must belong to a later age, perhaps the 4th cent. The fine mosque and the fine Moslem building on the citadel hill
cannot be earlier than the 7th, and are perhaps as late as the 11th cent.; and we have thus relics of every building epoch except the Crusading, of which there appears to be no indication.

The place is now occupied by Arabs and Circassians who profit by the riches of the soil. It is brought into contact with the outside world by means of the Damascus-Hejaz Railway, which has a station here.

(2) hərabbaḥ; B, χασάμη, ἀσάμη, A, 'ארבּאָד, 'ארבּאָד: An unidentified city of Judah named along with Kiriath-jearim (Josh 15 60).

**RABBI**, rab’i, rab (רבי, רבבי), rabβi, or ḫaḇi, ḫaḇi; A, ḫaḇi, ḫaḇi): A term used by the Jews of their religious teachers as a title of respect, from דַּרְבּ, rab, “great,” so “my great one” (cf Lat magister), once of masters of slaves, but later of teachers (Mt 23 7); therefore τρ by διδάσκαλος, διδάσκαλος, “teacher” (Mt 25 8; Jn 1 38; cf ver 49). In AV frequently rendered “Master” (Mt 20 25; 46; Jn 20 22; 25 40; Mk 9 5; 11 21; 14 45; Jn 4 31; 9 2; 11 8). John the Baptist (Jn 3 26), as well as Christ, is addressed with the title (Jn 1 47; 6 25), both by disciples and others. Jesus forbade its use among His disciples (Mt 23 8). Later (Galilean) form of same, Rabbi (q.v.). For Rabbinical literature see TALMUD.

**EDWARD BAGBY POllARD**

**RABBITH**, rab’ith (רַבְבִית, ḫaḇbith; B, דַּבָּפַת, Dabbīn; A, ḫaḇbī, ḫaḇbī): A town in the territory of Issachar (Josh 19 20) which is probably represented today by Raba, a village in the southern part of the Gilboa range and N. of Lodh. The hā is, of course, the def. art.

**RABLE**, rab’i: This word is not found in AV. RV has it once as the tr of ἑγγοι, ἐγγοι (lit. “lounger in the market place”), in Acts 17 5, where it replaces “baser sort” of AV. It has the common meaning of an unruly, lawless set who are ready to join in a mob.

**RABBONI**, rab’ōnī, rab-ō’ni (ךָבָבָבָא, Rabhboni; ḫaḇbōnī, “my great master” [Mk 10 51]; ḫaḇbōnī [WH -vel], ḫаḇbоnі [-net] [Jn 20 16]). See Rabbi.

**RAB-MAG**, rab’mag (רַבָּמָג), rabh-magḥ; LXX as proper noun, ῥαββαμάχ, ῥαββαμάχ: The name of one of the Rab princes who were present at the dedication of the temple (Ezra 3 10; 7 25). It is derived from the two parts seemingly being in apposition and signifying taufologically the same thing. The last syllable or section of the word, magḥ, was the designation among the Medes, Persians and Babylonians for priests and wise men. Its original significance was “great” or “powerful,” Gr μεγάς, μεγάς, Lat magus, magnus. The first, syllable, rab, expresses practically the same idea, that of greatness, or abundance in size, quantity, or power. Thus it might be interpreted the “all-wise” or “all-powerful” prince, the chief magician or physician. It is, therefore, a title and not a name, and is accordingly put in appositive relations to the proper name just preceding, as “Nergal-sharezer, the Rab-mag,” τρ fully, “Nergal-sharezer the chief prince or Kemal.” See NERGAL-SHAREZER.

In harmony with the commonly accepted view, the proper rendering of the text should be, “All the princes of the king of Babylon came in, and sat in the middle gateway, to wit, Nergal-sharezer, Samgar-nebo, Sarsechim, [the] Rab-saris, Nergal-sharezer, [the] Rab-mag; and Nebuzaradan, the captain of the guard sent, and Nebushazban, [the] Rab-saris, and Nergal-sharezer, [the] Rab-mag, and all the chief officers of the king of Babylon” (39 13).

**WALTER G. CLIFFINGER**

**RAB-SARIS**, rab’sa-ris (רַבָּסָרִיס), rabh-gārīṣ): As with Rab-mag, which is not regarded as a name, but a title, so this is to be regarded as a descriptive title for the person whose name precedes it (see RAB-MAG). The first part, rab, signifies “great” or “chief,” the second, gārīṣ, is the title of eunuch or chamberlain. The tr then refers to the chief of such an eunuch or the chief of the eunuchs (or chamberlains).

The oriental custom was for the king to surround himself with a number of eunuchs, who performed varied kinds of service, both menial and dignified. They usually had charge of his harem; sometimes they occupied court positions. Frequently, they superintended the education of the youth. The term itself was sometimes used to designate persons in places of trust who were not eunuchs. The above title describes the highest or chief in rank of these eunuchs. See EUNUCH.

The full title is used 3 t, once in connection with the titles of other important officers who were sent by the king of Assyria with a large army to demand the surrender of Jerusalem. The general term is rendered properly, ‘And the king of Assyria sent the Tartan and the Rab-saris (the chief eunuch) and the Rab-shakeh from Lachish to king Hezekiah’ (2 K 18 17). Again, it refers to a Babylonian; his real name was Sarsechim, who, with the other Babians, sat in the middle gate during the capture of Jerusalem. This event is described as having occurred in the 11th year of Zechariah, king of Judah (Jer 39 3).

The third use is in connection with the name Nebuzaradan, who, with the other chief officers of the king of Babylon, sent and took Jeremiah out of the court of the guard and committed him to Gedaliah, who was to take him home to dwell with his own people (Jer 39 12). Thus it is seen that based upon this accepted theory the three titles would be simply in their connections as follows: (1) simply “the chief eunuch,” (2) Sarsechim, the Rab-saris (or chief eunuch), and (3) Nebushazban, the Rab-saris (or chief eunuch). See also ASSYRIA, X. **WALTER G. CLIFFINGER**

**RABSHAKEH**, rab’sha’ke, rab-sha’ke (ךָבָשָׁךְ, Rabshakah): A compound word, the first part, rab, indicating “head” or “chief” (see RAB-MAG; RAB-SARIS). The second part, which in the Aram., probably meant “cupbearer,” or “bearer,” may be of Euphrates origin and elsewhere, according to later discoveries, an extended significance, and meant chief officer, i.e. chief of the heads or captains.

R. was one of the officers sent by Sennacherib, the king of Assyria, with the Tartan and the Rab-saris to demand the surrender of Jerusalem, which was under siege by the Assyrian army (2 K 18 17; 19.26.27. 25.37; 19 48; Isa 36 2 4.11.12.23; 37 4 8). The three officers named went from Lachish to Jerusalem and appeared by the conduit of the upper pool. Having called upon King Hezekiah, his representatives Eliakim, the son of Hilkiah, Shebnah, the scribe, and Joah, the recorder, appeared. R. sent through them a message to the king in which he represented himself as the spokesman for the king of Assyria. He derided King Hezekiah in an insolent fashion in representing his trust in Egypt as a bruised reed which would pierce the hand. Likewise his confidence in Jehovah was vain, for He also would be unable to deliver them. Then the officers of the king reproached requesting the king of Assyria his Syrian language which they understood, and not in the Jews’ language which the people on the wall understood. This he refused to do, speaking still more loudly in order that they might hear and be persuaded. By bribery and appeal, by promise and by deception he exhorted them to turn traitor.
RACAH, rā'kal, rā'kel (ra'kal, ra'hahk, WH, with codd. סְלָל, etc.; ῥακα, ῥακαθ, Tisch. with סָלַל; דָּרָם, ῥάκα; Tisch., from פָּרָךְ); Vain, worthless fellow; a term of contempt used by the Jews in the time of Christ. In the Bible, it occurs in Mt 5:22 only, but John Lightfoot gives a number of instances of the use of the word by Jewish writers (Hor. Heb., ed by Gandell, Oxford, 1859, II, 108). Chrysostom (who was acquainted with Syr as spoken in the neighborhood of Antioch) says it was equivalent to the Gr σιβί, σι, "thou," used contemptuously instead of a man's name. Jerome rendered it mansus et voto abque cerebro. It is generally explained as expressing contempt for a man's intellecutal capacity (= "so simpleton!"). While μωρό, μορέ (tī "thou fool"), in the same verse is taken to refer to a man's moral and religious character (= "you rascal!") (= "you impious fellow!"). Thus, we have three stages of anger, with three corresponding grades of punishment: (1) the inner feeling of anger (βραγιςμός, ἐραξισμόνας), to be punished by the local or provincial court (τὰ κλητὰ, τὰ κρίσει, τὸ κρίμινα, the judgment); (2) anger breaking forth into an expression of scorn (Raca), to be punished by the Sanhedrin (τὰ κρίμινα, τὸ κρίμινα, the council); (3) anger culminating in abusive and defamatory language (Μονερε), to be punished by the fire of Gehenna. This view, of a double climax, which has been held by foremost Eng. and Ger. commentators, seems to give the passage symmetry and gradation. But it is rejected among others by T. K. Cheyne, who, following J. P. Peters, rearranges the text by transferring the clause "and when his heart is exalted..." to his Raca verse, shall be in danger of the council" to the end of the preceding verse (ESV, IV. cols. 4001 f). There certainly does not seem to be trustworthy external evidence to prove that the terms "the judgment," "the council," "the Gehenna of fire" stand to each other in a relation of lower power and higher legal authority, or would be so understood by Christ's hearers. What is beyond dispute is that Christ condemns the use of disparaging and insulting epithets as a supreme offence against the law of humanity, which belongs to the same category as murder itself. It should be added, however, that it is the underlying feeling and not the verbal expression as such that constitutes the sin. Hence Our Lord can, without any real inconsistency, address two of His followers as "fools" (Mt 23:25, 26), and pass on to His Racas, practically equivalent to Raca, as is also James' expression, "O vain man," Jas 2:20.

**RACAL, rā'kal** (רָכָל, rākhal, "trader"): A place in Judah, enumerated among "the places where David himself and his men were wont to haunt," to the east of the share of spoils (1 Sam 29). The LXX reading "Carmel" has been adopted, by many, because of the similarity of the words in Heb (רָכָל and רָכָל) and because there was a Carmel in the neighborhood of Hebron (Josh 15:55; 1 Sam 15:12), which figures in the story of David's adventures when pursued by Saul (1 Sam 26) in a manner that makes it improbable that he would overlook the place in his good fortune (AV "Rachal"). Nathan Isaacs

**RACE, rā'se. See Table of Nations.**

**RACHAB, rā'kahb (P'asēkh, Rhachāh): AV; Gr form of "Rahab" (thus Mt 1:5 RV).**

**RACHAL, rā'kal. See Ralca.**

**RACHAB, rā'kahb (רַעָכָה, Rākahb); AV, "eave"; P'asēkh, Rhachāh (Gen 29:6; Jer 31:15, AV "Rahel"): An ancestress of Israel, wife of Jacob, mother of Joseph and Benjamin. Rachel was the younger daughter of Laban, the Aramean, the brother of Jacob's mother; so Rachel and Jacob were cousins. They met for the first time upon the arrival of Jacob at Haran, where he had been sent by his father Isaac to find a wife for himself. The two met at the well of water, and Jacob was attracted by the beauty of the girl who was to become his wife. According to the custom of the times Jacob contracted with Laban for her possession, agreeing to serve him 7 years as the stipulated price (Gen 29:17-20). But when the time had passed, Laban deceived Jacob by giving him Leah instead of Rachel. When Jacob protested, Laban gave him Rachel also, on condition that Jacob serve 7 more years (29:21-29). To her great dismay "Rachel was barren" (Gen 30:25). She therefore offered all her household to Laban, in return for the birth of a child. This offer was accepted by Jacob, and Leah, envious of her sister, complained to Jacob, who reminded her that her children are the gift of God. Then Rachel resorted to the expedient once employed by Sarah under similar circumstances (16:2 ff); she bade her maid, Bilhah, who was barren, to "obtain children by her" (30:3). Dan and Naphtali were the offspring of this union. The evil of polygamy is apparent from the dismal rivalry arising between the two sisters, each seeking by means of children to win the heart of Jacob. In her eagerness to become a mother of children, Rachel bargained with Leah for the handmaids, or two wives, which were given to her by her firstborn, whom she named Joseph (30:22-24).

Some years after this, when Jacob fled from Laban with his wives, the episode of the theft of the teraphim of Laban by Rachel, related in 31:19. 34-55, occurred. She hoped by securing the household gods of her father to bring prosperity to her own household. Though she succeeded by her cunning in concealing them from Laban, Jacob later, upon discovering them, had them put away (35:2-4). In spite of all, she continued to be the favorite of Jacob, as is clearly evidenced by 33:2, where we are told that he assigned to her the place of greatest safety, and by his preference for Joseph, her son. After the arrival in Canaan, while they were on the way from Bethel to Ephrath, i.e. Bethlehem, Rachel gave birth to her second son, Benjamin, and died (35:16 ff).

In a marked manner Rachel's character shows the traits of her family, cunning and covetousness, so evident in Laban, Rebekah and Jacob.

2. Char-**acter**: Though a believer in the true God (Gen 30:29), she was yet given to the superstitions of her country, the worshiping of the teraphim, etc (31:19). The futility of her efforts in resorting to self-help and superstitious expedients, the love and strongest faith of her husband (35:2-4), were the preponderating causes of purifying her character. Her memory lived on
in Israel long after she died. In Ruth 4:11, the names of Rachel and Leah occur in the nuptial benediction as the foundresses of the house of Israel.

Rachel's Tomb (רחל הַבָּרוּה, mezzebeth be'bhurath râhel): In Gen 35:20 we read: "Jacob set up a pillar upon her grave: the same is the Pillar of Rachel's grave unto this day," i.e. the time of the writer. Though the pillar, i.e. sepulchral monument, has long disappeared, the spot is marked until this day, and Christians, Jews and Mohammedans unite in honoring it. The present tomb, which, apparently, is not older than the 15th cent., is built in the style of the small-domed buildings raised by Moslems in honor of their saints. It is a rough structure of four square walls, each about 23 ft. long and 20 ft. high; the dome rising 10 ft. higher is used by Mohammedans for prayer, while on Fridays the Jews make supplication before the empty tomb within. It is doubtful, but probable, that it marks the exact spot where Rachel was buried. There are, apparently, two traditions as to the location of the place. The oldest tradition, based upon Gen 35:16-20; 48:7, points to a place one mile N. of Bethlehem and 4 miles from Jerus. Mt 2:18 speaks for this place, since the evangelist, reporting the slaughter of the innocents of Bethlehem, represents Rachel as weeping for her children from her neighboring grave. But according to 1 S 10:22ff., which apparently represents another tradition, the place of Rachel's grave was on the "border of Benjamin," near Bethel, about 10 miles N. of Jerusalem, at another unknown Ephrath. This location, some believe, is corroborated by Jer 31:15, where the prophet, in relating the leading away of the people of Ramah, which was in Benjamin, into captivity, introduces Rachel the mother of that tribe as bewailing the fate of her descendants. Those that believe this northern location to be the place of Rachel's grave take the words, "the same is Beth-lehem," in Gen 35:19; 48:7, to be an incorrect gloss; but that is a mere assumption lacking sufficient proof.

Mr. Nathan Strauss, of New York City, has purchased the land surrounding Rachel's grave for the purpose of erecting a Jewish university in the Holy Land.

S. D. Press

RADDAl, râ'dâ'i, râ'dâ'i (רְדָאִית, radday, "beating down"?): The 5th of the 7 sons of Jesse, father of David, according to 1 Ch 2:14 (LXX Alex, "Rhadaî"); Luc., "Rhedai"; others, "Zaddai").

RADIANT, râ'dî-ant (רָדָא, nâhar, "to sparkle," i.e. [fig.] be cheerful; hence from the sheen of a running stream, to flow, i.e. [fig.] assemble; flow [together], be lightened): ARV substitutes the active "radiant" for the passive "were lightened" in Ps 34:5; Isa 60:5 (ERV, AV "flow together"). As the earth is bathed in the common sun and lighted each other, they are not only lightened, but radiant. So with the believers, "They looked unto him [Jeh], and were radiant." Thus nâhar combines the two ideas of being lightened and flowing together. This appears, also, in a different connection, in Isa 60:5, "Then thou shalt see and be radiant." "It is liquid light—light that ripples and sparkles and runs across the face; . . . the light which a face catches from sparkling water" (G. A. Smith, Ziaah, II, 430). M. O. Evans

RAFT, raft. See SHIPS AND BOATS, II, 1, (2).

RAFTER, raft'er (Cant 1:17). See GALLERY; HOUSE.

RAG: Pl. in Prov 23:21, "Drossiness will clothe a man with rage" (נָבָא, brâ'an, "torn garment"); of 1 K 11:30, and figuratively in Isa 64:6 AV, "All our righteousnesses are as filthy rags," in the sense of "tattered clothes" (נָבָא, beghâth, LXX "garment"). In Jer 38:11:12 ARV translates נבָא, šabbâhâh, as "rag" (AV, ERV "old cast clout"), while AV, ERV use "torn rag" for נבָא, melâh (ARV "worn-out garment"). Both šabbâhâh and melâh mean "worn out."

RAGAUA, râ'gō (Pâyâwâ [WH], Pâyâw, Rhagogâ): AV; Gr form of "Reu" (thus RV) (Lk 3:35).

RAGES, râ'jēz, RAGUA, râ'gō ("Rages,"). Tob 1:14; 4:120; 5:6; 9:12; 9:2; ("Ragia"). Jth 5:15; (Pâyâw, Rhagge, Pâyâw), Pâyâw, Râgô; 1. Location (Pâyâw, Rhagge, Pâyâw, Rhagge; in De- rius' Behistun Inscriptions, II, 71,72, Ragô, a province; in Avesta, Vend, I, 15, Raqga, city and province; perhaps, "the excellent"): In Eastern Media, one forced march from Capisian Gates, 11 days' journey from Ecbatana, 1/3 miles S. of present Tirshân; the capital of the province of the same name, though by Ptolemy called Rhagiana.

(1) Ancient.—A very ancient city, the traditional birthplace of Zoroaster (Zarathushtra), father of Zoroast; Vendishâd, Zâd aspand, XVI, 12, 4. 2. History (Dastâbân i Maqâhï). In Yasna XIX, 15, of the Avesta, it is thus mentioned: "The Zoroastrian, four-chief-possessing Rahta, hers are the royal chiefs, both the house-chief, the village-chief, and the town-chief: Zoroaster is the fourth." In Vend, I, 15: "As the tenth, the best of both districts and cities, I, am Ahura Mazda, did create Rahta, which possesses the three classes," i.e. fire-priests, charioteers, husbandsmen. Later it was the religious center of magaism, a large colony of captive Israelites settled there. Destroyed in Alexander's time, it was rebuilt by Seleucus Nicator (c 300 BC), who named it Europas. Later, Arsacides restored it and named it Arsacis.

(2) Media.—In the early Middle Ages Rahta, then called Bai, was a great literary and often political center with a large population. It was the birthplace of Bâhâ' al-Ma'âb (763 AD). In 1209 AD it was sacked and plundered (1029 AD) by Sulaiman Mahmûd, but became Tugh- rîl's capital. In the Vi o Râmin (c 1048 AD) it is an important place, 10 days' journey according to Kavvâr desert from Merv. It was a small provincial town in about 1200 AD. It was sacked by Mongols in 1220 AD and entirely destroyed under Ghâzî Khan in 258. A Zoroastrian community lived there in 1278 AD, one of whom composed the Zardvâns (c 1278 AD).

(3) Present condition.—Near the ruins there now stands the village of Shâh 'Abêtí, Agin, connected with Târîsh by the Khâbab railway in Persia (opened 1910).

LITERATURE.—Polomeny, Diodorus Siculus, Pliny, Strabo; Ibn't Althir, Jâmi' u Tawârikh, Târikhî
RAGUEL, ra-gú'él (Parovía, Rhagouli): "The friend of God," of Echathana, the husband of Edna, father of Sarah, and father-in-law of Tobias (Tob 3 7-17; 6 10; 7 21; 14 12). In 7 2 he is called "cousin of Tobias," and in Tob 6 10 AV he is erroneously represented as "cousin" of Tobias = "kinsman" in RV. In En 20 4 Ragueul appears as one of the archangels, perhaps by confusion for Raphael (Tob 3 17). Another form of the name is REUEL (q.v.).

RAGUEL, ra-gú'él, ragú'él (תֶּרֶגֶּל, r'g'él; LXX Rhagouli): The Midianite hōthēm, i.e., either father-in-law or brother-in-law of Moses (Nu 10 29 AV, RV "Reuel"), the father of Hobab, called a Kenite, who is likewise described as a hōthēm of Moses (Jgs 4 11). See RELATIONS, FAMILY. Moses' wife's father is called r'g'él in Ex 2 18 where Lucian reads "Iothor" and EV "Reuel," which transliteration is adopted in RV in Nu 10 29 also. In other passages the hōthēm of Moses is called "Jether," the name in Jdg 5 13; "Jethro." Among the harmonizations suggested the following are worthy of consideration: (a) that all are names or perhaps titles of one man (Raah); (b) that Reuel was the father of Hobab and Jethro, that Jethro was the father-in-law of Moses, and that "Jether" is used for grandfather in Ex 2 18; (c) that Reuel was the father-in-law and Jethro and Hobab brothers-in-law; (d) that either Reuel or Hobab is to be identified with Jethro. None of these views is free from difficulty, nor is the view of those who would give Jethro as the name in E and Reuel as that in J and JE. See also REUEL. NATHAN ISAACS

RAHAB, ra'hab: (1) (תֶּרֶגֶּל, r'g'él, "broad"); in Jos, Ant, V. i, 2, 7; (2) Parosh. Ra(h)ab. He 11 31 and Jas 2 5, (Parosh. Rahab). A zónah, that is either a "harlot," or, according to some, an "inkeeper" in Jericho (LXX νηστρός, πόρνη, "harlot"). The two spies sent by Joshua from Shittim came into her house and lodged there (Josh 2 1). She refused to betray them to the king of Jericho, and when he demanded them, she hid them on the roof of her house with stalks of flax that she had laid in order to dry. She pretended that they had escaped before the shutting of the gate, and threw their pursuers off their track. She then told the spies of the fear that the coming of the Israelites had caused in the minds of the Canaanites—"Our hearts did melt ... for you your God, he is God in heaven above, and on earth beneath"—and asked that the men promise to spare her father, mother, brothers and sisters, and all that they had. They promised her to spare them provided they would remain in her house and provided she would keep their business secret. Thereupon she let them down by a cord through the window, her house being built upon the town wall, and gave them directions to make good their escape (Josh 2 1-24). True to their promise, the Israelites under Joshua spared Rahab and her family (Josh 6 18 ff AV); and, says the author of Jos, "she dwelleth in Israel even unto this day." Her story appealed strongly to the imagination of the people of later times. He 11 31 speaks of her as having been saved by faith; James, on the other hand, in demonstrating that a man is justified by works and not by faith only, and accordingly chooses the same example (Jas 2 25). Jewish tradition has been kindly disposed toward Rahab; one hypothesis goes so far as to make her the wife of Joshua himself (Jew Enc, s.v.). Naturally then, the other tr of zónah, deriving it from zón, "to feed," instead of zónah, "to be a harlot," has been preferred by some of the commentators.

(2) (Pāxah, Rhobah): Jos, Ant, V. i, 2, 7, so spells the name of (1) (LXX and NT contra). The wife of Salmon and mother of Boaz according to the genealogy in Mt 1 5. Query, whether there was a tradition identifying (1) and (2); see Lightfoot, Horae Heb on Mt 1 5.

RAHAB, ra'hahb, lit. "storm," "arrogance"): A mythical sea-monster, probably referred to in several passages where the word is tr as a common noun "prided" (Ps 89 13), "the whale" (Job 25 25), with other proverbs of Ps 89 10. It is used in parallelism with tannin, "the dragon" (Isa 51 9). It is most familiar as an emblem of Egypt, "the boaster that sitteth still" (Isa 30 7; Ps 87 4; cf 89 10). The Talm in Babbâ! Bathrâ! speaks of rahab as sar ha-yām, "master of the sea." See also ASTRONOMY.

NATHAN ISAACS

RAHAM, ra'ham ([ם, 'raham, "pity," "love"): Son of Shema, and father of Jorkam (1 Ch 2 44).

RAHEL, ra'heh (Jer 31 15 AV). See RACHEL.

RAID, rād (I 27 10). See WAR, 3.

RAIL, rāl, RAILING, rāl'ing, RAILER, rāl'er: To "rail" (in modern usage "against") anyone is to use insolent or reproachful language toward one. It occurs in the OT as the tr of דָּרְל (2 Ch 32 17, "letters to rail on Jeh"), and ofםָרְל (י 1 S 25 14, of Nahal, "he railed at them," ERV "flew upon them," m "railed on"). In the NT "to rail" is the tr of βασανίζω, blasphémiō, (Mt 15 29; Lk 23 39, "railing," 1 Tim 6 4; 2 Pet 2 11; Jude ver 9). The word lōdōria, rendered "railing" in 1 Pet 3 9 AV, is in RV "reviling," and lôdoros, "railer," in 1 Cor 6 11 is in RV "reviler." See also RACA. W. L. WALKER

RAIMENT, rā'ment. See Dress.

RAIMENT, SOFT (aakado, malakos): In Mt 11 8 EV, where Jesus, speaking of John the Baptist, asks "What went ye out to see? a man clothed in soft raiment?" where "raiment," though implied, is not expressed in the best text, but was probably added from Lk 7 25. It is equivalent to "elegant clothing," such as courtiers wore, as shown by the words following, "Behold, they that wear soft raiment are in kings' houses." John had bravely refused to play courtier and had gone to prison for it. In the early days of Herod the Great some scribes who attached themselves to him laid aside their usual plain clothing and wore the gorgeous raiment of courtiers (Jost, in Plumptr).

GEO. B. EAGER


1. Watering Supply (םָרְל, brēleho; מָלַכָּה, huqōs): In Egypt and Palestine water for vegetation being supplied in great abundance by the river Nile; but in Syria and Pal there are no large rivers, and the people have to depend entirely on the fall of rain for water for themselves, their animals and their fields. The children of Israel when in Egypt were promised by Jeh a land which "drinketh water of the rain of heaven" (Dt 11 11). Springs and fountains are found in most of the valleys, but the flow of the springs depends directly on the fall of rain or snow in the mountains.
The cultivation of the land in Pal is practically dry farming in most of the districts, but even then some water is necessary, so that there may be moisture in the soil. In the summer months there is no rain, and that the rains of the spring and fall, in other years there is a complete failure of the harvest. The lack of this rain in the proper time has often been the cause of complete failure of the harvest. A small difference in the amount of these seasonal rains makes a large difference in the possibility of growing various crops without irrigation. Ellsworth Huntington has insisted on this point with great care in his very important work, *Pal and Its Transformation*. The promise of prosperity is given in the assurance of "rain in due season" (Lev 26:4 AV). The withholding of rain according to the prophecy of Elijah (1 K 17:1) caused the crops to wither and die up (1 K 17:7), and certain famine ensued. A glimpse of the terrible suffering for lack of water at that time is given us. The people were uncertain of another meal (1 K 17:12), and the animals were perishint (1 K 17:5).

Pal and Syria lay on the borderland between the sea and the desert, and besides are so mountainous, that they not only have a great range of rainfall in different years, but a great variation in different parts of the country.

The amount of rain on the western slopes is comparable with that in England and America, varying from 25 to 40 in. per annum, but it falls mostly in the four winter months, when the downpour is often very heavy, giving oftentimes from 12 to 16 in. a month. On the eastern slopes, the western is 15.62 in., the eastern 18.08 in., and the center 15.35 in., per annum. The highest amount falls in the mountains of Lebanon where it averages about 50 in. Damascus the yearly average is 13.39 in. In Jerusalem the yearly average is 26.10 in. and the range is from 13.39 in. to 41.62 in. rainfall for the last hundred years. The highest is 41.62 in., reaching and a data in *FEFO* from 1861 to 1910, 50 years, are given in the accompanying table.

### RAINFALL IN JERUSALEM IN INCHES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>27.30</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>32.21</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>23.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>27.69</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>32.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>26.54</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>32.11</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>41.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>18.51</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>15.65</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>26.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>16.72</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>17.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>31.92</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>21.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>29.42</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>23.96</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>17.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>29.10</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>29.47</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>25.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>18.61</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>31.69</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>18.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>29.51</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>34.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>25.57</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>37.79</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>34.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>22.77</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>35.56</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>27.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>22.72</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>35.51</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>27.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>27.75</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>34.72</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>31.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>27.61</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>31.33</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>21.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>14.41</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>30.54</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>24.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>35.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The amount of rainfall in ancient times was probably about the same as in present times, though it may have been distributed somewhat differently through the year, as suggested by Huntington. Conder maintains that the present amount would have been sufficiently to support the ancient cities (*Tent-Work in Pal*). Trees are without doubt fewer now, but meteorologists agree that trees do not produce rain.

The rainfall is largely on the western slopes of the mountains facing the sea, and the eastern slopes there is very little. The moisture-laden sea air comes up from the sea with the west and southwest wind. When these currents strike the hills they are thrown higher up into the cooler strata, and the moisture condenses to form clouds.

### 4. Dry and Rainy Seasons

In the spring and fall, which increase on the higher hills, the currents descend on the other side to warmer levels, where the moisture is easily held in the form of vapor so that no rain falls and few clouds are seen, except in the cold mid-winter months.

The summer months are practically rainless, with very few clouds appearing in the sky. From May 1 to the middle of October one can be sure of no rain; "The winter is past, the rain is over" (Cant 2:11), so many sleep on the roofs of the houses or in tents of leaves and branches in the fields and vineyards throughout the summer. The continuous hot droughts make the people appreciate the springs and fountains of fresh running water and the cool shade of rock and tree.

The rain season from October to May may be divided into three parts, the former, the winter, and the latter rains, and they are often referred to under these names in the OT.

The "former rains" are the showers of October and the first part of November. They soften the parched ground so that the very first rain may be seen before the heavy continuous rains set in. The main bulk of the rain falls in the months of December, January and February. Although in these months the rains are frequent and heavy, a dark, foggy day is seldom seen. The "latter rains" of April are the most highly appreciated, because they ripen the fruit and stay the drought of summer.

They were considered a special blessing: Jeh will come . . . as the latter rain that watereth the earth" (Gen 27:6). "They opened their mouth wide as for the latter rain" (Job 29:23); and as a reason for worshipping Jeh who sent them, "Let us now fear Jeh our God, that giveth rain, both the former and the latter, in its season" (Jer 5:24).

The rain storms always come from the sea with a west or southwest wind. The east wind is a hot wind and the "north wind driveth away rain" (Prov 25:23 AV). "Fair weather cometh out of the north" (Job 37:22 AV).

The Psalmist recognizes that the showers that water the earth (Ps 72:6) are among the greatest blessings from the hand of Jeh: "The 5. Biblical Uses

The severest punishment of Jeh was to withhold the rain, as in the time of Ahab and Elijah, when Elijah said the rain did not fall for three years (1 K 17): "the anger of Jeh be kindled against you, and he shut up the heavens, so that there shall be no rain, and the land shall not yield its fruit; and ye perish quickly" (Dt 11:17). Too much rain is also a punishment, as witness the flood (Gen 7:4) and the plague of rain and hail (Ex 10:9). Sending of rain was a reward for worship and obedience: "Jeh will open unto thee his good treasure, the heavens, to give the rain of the land in its season and to bless all the work of thy hand!" (Dt 28:12). Jeh controls the elements and commands the rain: "He made a decree for the rain" (Job 28:26); "For he saith to the snow, Fall thou on the earth; likewise to the shower of rain" (Job 37:6).


**ALFRED H. JOY**
RAINBOWS, râ‘n’bô (םָני, ָנֶת, kesheth, tr4 “a bow”; ḥos, ērt, “rainbow”): As most of the rainfall in Palestine is in the form of short heavy showers it is often accompanied by the rainbow. Most beautiful double rainbows are the dead, and occasionally the moon is bright enough to produce the bow. It is rather remarkable that there are so few references to the rainbow in the Bible. The Heb kesheth is the ordinary word for a bow, there being no special word for a rainbow.

RAISE, râ‘z: “To raise” in the OT is most frequently the tr of the Hiphil form of גָּנֶה, קים, “to cause to arise,” e.g. raising up seed (Gen 35:8), a prophet (De 18:18), judges (Jgs 2:10:15), etc.; also of גָּנֶה, צָרָה, “to awake,” “to stir up” (Ezr 1:5 AV; Isa 41:2, etc), with other words. In the NT the chief words are ξενράν, ορνόρ, “to awake,” “arouse” (Mt 3:9; Lk 1:69; 3:8, etc), frequently in the context of the dead, and ανείραν, ανειρέω (Mt 22:24; Jn 6:39, etc; Acts 2:24 [30 AV, etc]), with compounds of the former. Among the RV changes may be noted, “to stir the fire” for “from raising” (Hos 7:4); “raiseth high his gate” for “exalteth his gate” (Prov 17:19); ARV, “can it be raised from the roots thereof?” for “pluck it up by the roots thereof?” (Ezk 17:9 AV and ERV); “raised up” for “rise again” (Mt 20:19; cf Mt 26:32; Rom 8:34; Col 3:1).

RAISIN-CAKES, râ‘zn-kâks: RV gives this rendering for AV “foundations” in Isa 16:7 (Heb דַּשׁהְשָׁפָה from דַּשׁה, “to found,” “make firm,” “press”); the trade in these would cease through the devastation of the vineyards, and AV “cakes of raisins” in Hos 3:1, RV gives “cakes of raisins,” such as were offered to the gods of the land, the givers of the grape (cf Cant 2:5). See next article.

RAISINS, râ‘zn: (1) דָּשַׁהּים, גָּנֶסְלִים; σταφύλα, πσταφύλα, tr4 “dried grapes,” Nu 6:3; mentioned in all other references as a portable food for a march or journey. Abigail supplied David with “a hundred clusters of raisins,” among other things, in the wilderness of Paran (1 S 25:18); David gave two clusters of raisins to a servant of Elisha the Amalekite at Besor (30:12); raisins formed part of the provision brought to David at Hebron for his army (1 Ch 12:40); Ziba supplied David, when flying from Absalom, with a hundred clusters of raisins (2 S 16:1). (2) דָּשַׁהּ, דָּשַׁהּ, something “pressed together,” hence a “cake.” In Hos 3:1, mention is made of דַּשָּׁהּ דַּשָּׁהּ, דַּשָּׁהּ, σταφύλα, πσταφύλα, “cakes of raisins”; “Ich loveth the children of Israel, though they turn unto other gods, and love [not ‘or that love’] cakes of raisins.” These are supposed to have been cakes of dried, compressed grapes offered to false gods. Gritz considers that the Heb words are a corruption of דַּשָּׁהּ וְדַמָּם (sun images). Cf Is 17:8; 27:9. In other passages “cakes” stands alone without the “raisins,” but the cakes are given in 2 S 6:19; 1 Ch 16:3; Cant 2:5 (AV “flagons”); Isa 16:7 m “foundations.”

Raisins are today, as of old, prepared in considerable quantities in Palestine, esp. at en-Salt, E. of the Jordan. The bunches of grapes are dried in a strong solution of potash before being dried.

E. W. G. MANHEIMER

RAKEM, râ‘kem (ךָךְ מֵם, râ‘kemē, the pausal form of כֵּךְ, rekem): The eponym of a clan of Machir (1 Ch 7:16). See RAKEM.

RAKKATH, râ‘kâth (ךָךְ מֵם, râ‘kâkath; B ‘qâbût- nash, Omatobadokath, A Pecâkâth, Râkkâkâth): The Gr is obviously the result of confusing the two names Rakkath and Hammath, taking r in the former for d. Rakkath was one of the fortified cities in Naphtali (Josh 19:35). It is named between Hammath and Chinnereth. Hammath is identified with the hot baths to the S of Tiberias. There are traces of ancient fortifications here. The rabbis think that Tiberias was built on the site of Rakkath. Certain it is that Herod’s town was built upon the ancient site. The name was bestowed on the old inhabitants being disturbed in digging the new foundations (Neubauer, Geogr. dE Jüd. 208).

W. EYING

RAKON, râ‘kon (ךָךְ מֵם, hâ-râ‘kôn; ἱππαδών, Hierakon). See JERKON.

RAM, ram (גָּז, râ‘m, “high,” “exalted”): (1) An ancestor of David (Ruth 4:10 [Apdo, Arran]); Mt 1:34 [Apdo, Arrânon]; in 1 Ch 2:9 he is called the “brother,” but in ver 25, the “son of Jerahmeel” (cf ver 27). Ram as the son of Horez appears more likely than Ram the son of Jerahmeel, since, according to the narratives of 1 and 2 S, David cannot have been a Jerahmeelite.

(2) Name of Elihu’s family (Job 32:2). It is an open question as to whether Ram should be taken as a purely fictitious name, invented by the author of the Elihu speeches, or whether it is that of some obscure Arab tribe. In Gen 22:21 Abram is a nephew of Bus (cf Elihu the Buzite), and the conjecture was at one time advanced that Ram was a contraction of the name Abram; but the theory is no longer held to be tenable. The suggestion that the initial 6 of r (ם) has been changed by a scribal error into 6 (ו) is more acceptable. Rash, the rabbinical commentator, takes the quaint position that Ram is identical with Abraham.

HORACE J. WOLF

RAM, ram (גָּז, râ‘m, “high”): (1) The ordinary word is גָּז, ḣayil, which is remarkably near to גָּז, ḥayil, “deep” (cf Lat carper, capra, “goat,” and caprocaulis, “wild goat” or “roe-buck,” also Gr ἱππαρκός, ἱππόκτος, “roe-buck” or “goat”). (2) גָּז, ḥâ’kâth, lit. “male” (Ezk 24:7; 27:9). (3) גָּז, “battering ram” (Ezk 4:3; 21:22); elsewhere “lamb” (Dt 32:14, etc.). (4) גָּז, ḥâ’kâth, properly “be-goat” (“ram”); Gen 31:10 AV). See SHEEP.

RAM, BATTERING. See SIERRA.

RAMA, râ‘ma (Pâqâ, Rhamâ): AV; Gr form of Ramah (q.v.) (Mt 2:18).

RAMAH, râ‘ma (ךָךְ מֵם, hâ-râ‘mân, without the def. art. only in Neh 11:33; Jer 31:15): The name denotes height, from root גָּז, “to be high,” and the towns to which it applied seem all to have stood on elevated sites.
(1) B, 'osh, Ara²l, A, Pa²a, Rhamá: A fenced city in the lot assigned to Naphtali (Josh 19:36). Only in this passage is the place referred to. It is probably identical with the modern er-Râmeh, a large Christian village on the highway from Safed to the coast, about 8 miles W.S.W. of that city. To the N., rises the mountain range which forms the southern boundary of Upper Galilee. In the valley to the S. there is much rich land cultivated by the villagers. The olives grown here are very fine, and fruitful vineyards cover many of the surrounding hills. Remains of antiquity are to be seen above ground; but the site is one likely to have been occupied in ancient times.

(2) Pa²a, Rhamâ: A city that is mentioned only once, on the boundary of Asher (Josh 19:29). The line of the boundary cannot be followed with certainty; but perhaps we may identify Ramah with the modern Râmiyeh, a village situated on a hill which rises in the midst of a hollow, some 13 miles S.E. of Tyre, and 12 miles E. of the Ladder of Tyre. To the S.W., is a marshy lake which dries up in summer. Traces of antiquity are found in the cisterns, a large reservoir and many sarcophagi. To the W. is the high hill Bêtâd, with ancient ruins, and remains of a temple of which several columns are still standing.

(3) B, Pa²a, Rhamâ, A, I¹sam, Iamâ, and other forms: A city in the territory of Benjamin named between Gibeon and Boereth (Josh 18:25). The Levite thought of it as a possible resting-place for himself and his concubine on their northward journey (Jgs 19:13). The palm tree of Deborah was between this and Bethel (Jgs 4:5). Basheka, king of Samaria, sought to fortify Ramah against Assh, king of Judah. The latter frustrated the attempt, and carried off the materials which Basheka had collected for and sent him from the temple of Benjamin and Mizpah (1 K 15:17; 2 Ch 16:5). Here the captain of Nebuchadnezzar's guard released Jeremiah after he had been carried in bonds from Jerusalem (Jer 40:1). It figures in Isaiah's picture of the Assyrians' approach (10:29). It is named by Hosea in connection with Gibeath (5:8), and is mentioned as being reoccupied after the exile (Ezr 2:26; Neh 7:30). It was near the traditional tomb of Rachel (Jer 31:15; of 1 S 10:2; Mt 2:18, A, 'Ram'.

From the passages cited we gather that Ramah lay some distance to the N. of Gibeath, and not far from Gibeon and Boereth. The first is identified with Tell el-Fûl, about 3 miles N. of Jerus. Two miles farther to the N. (el-Jih) is a village about 3 miles W. of er-Râm and Boereth (el-Biréh) is about 4 miles to the N. of the N. Onom places Ramah 6 Roman miles N. of Jerus; while Jos (Ant. VIII, xii, 3) says it lay 40 furlongs from the city. All this points definitely to identification with er-Râm. The modern village crowns a high limestone hill to the S. of the road, a position of great strength. W. of the village is an ancient reservoir. In the hill are cisterns, and a good well to the S.

1. Rhamathaim: The home of Ekanah and Hannah, and the birthplace of Samuel (1 S 1 19; 2 S 11, etc.). In 1 S 1 it is called "Rhamathaim-zophim" (רַמַּתְיָמִים, hó-rámad- thayim-zophim). The phrase as it stands is grammatically incorrect, and suggests tampering with the text. It might possibly be trl "Rama- thaim, the place of thorns." It was the home of Eliphaïm, within accessible distance of Shiloh, whence Samuel's parents went up from year to year to worship and to sacrifice (1:3). From Ramah as a center Samuel went on circuit annually, to judge Israel, to Bethel, Gilead and Mizpah (17 316). It is very probable that this is the city in which, guided by his servant, Saul first made the acquaintance of Samuel (9:6,10), where there was a high place (ver 12). Hither at all events came the elders of Israel with their demand that a king should be set over them (8:4, 5). After his final break with Samuel, Saul retired to Ramah (16:34). Here, in Naioth, David found asylum with Samuel from the mad king (19:18, etc.), and hence he fled on his ill-starred visit to Nob (20:1). In his native city the dust of the dead Samuel was laid (26 1; 28:3). In verse 11:34 it is named as one of the thirteen toponymies along with Aphaeraem and Lydda, which were added to Judaea from the country of Samaria in 145 BC. Onam places it near Diospolis (Euseb.) in the district of Timnah (Jerome).

There are two serious rivals for the honor of representing the ancient Ramah. (a) Beth Râmâ, a village occupying a height 13 miles E.N.E. of Lydda (Diospolis), 12 miles W. of Shiloh, and about the same distance N.W. of Bethel. This identification has the support of G. A. Smith (HGHL, 254), and Buhl (GAP, 170). (b) Ramathâl, a large and prosperous village occupying a lofty position with ancient remains. It commands a wide prospect, esp. to the W. It lies about 8 miles N. of Jerus, 3 W. of Bethel, and 12 S.W. of Shiloh. The same meaning of the height of Ramathaim may be reminiscent of the high place in the city where Saul found Samuel. In other respects it agrees very well with the Bib. data.

Claims have also been advanced on behalf of Ramathaim, a village 2 miles S.W. of Lydda, in the plain of Sharon. This, however, is out of the question, as the place did not exist before Arab times. Others support identification with Neby Samwil, which more probably represents the ancient Mizpah (q.v.).

(5) Ramathaim-zophim, "the South", AV "Ramath of the South": Ramath is the construct form of Ramah (Josh 19:8) (רַמַּת שְׁוֵי, râmâth négebh; Bâbêf, sêbâ niwa, Bâmeth katâ ibn). A city in that part of the territory of Judah which was allotted to Simeon. It stands here in apposition to Baalath-beer, and is probably a second name for the same place. It seems to correspond also with "Ramoth [pl.] of the South" (1 S 30:27), a place to which David sent a share of the spoil taken from the Amalekites. In this passage LXX retains the sing. form, Râmâd id. In the identification has been made with Kubbet el-Baul about 37 miles S. of Hebron; and with Kurnub a little farther S. There is no substantial ground for either identification.

(6) B, Pa²a, Rhamth, A, Pa²a, Rhamth: Ramath in 2 K 8:28; 2 Ch 22 6, is a contraction of Ramoth-gilead.

W. EWING

RAMATH, rámâth, of the SOUTH (Josh 19 8 AV). See Ramah, (5).

RAMATH-LEHI, rámâth-lehî (רַמַּת לֵהִי, râmâth lehî, "the hill") or "height of Lehi," ʿAnâqēs σαϊγών, Anaireis siâgonos): So the place is said to have been called where Samson threw away the jaw-bone of an ass, with which he had slain 1,000 Philis (Jgs 15:17). LXX seems to have supposed that the name referred to "heaving" or throwing up of the jaw-bone. The Heb, however, corresponds to the form used in other place-names, such as Ramath-mizpeh, and must be read as "Ramah of Lehi. The name Lehi may have been given because of the occurrence of the prominence in the place to the shape of a jaw-bone (Jgs 15:14,19). It may have been in Waday es-Sâra, not far from Zorah and Timnah; but the available data do not permit of certain identification. See JAW-BONE; LEHI.

W. EWING
RAMATH-MIZPEH, r'amath-miz'pe (חֲרוֹם מִזְפֶּה, r'amath ha-miz'peh; B, 'Ar'abôth katâ lîn Mâsphâd, Arâbôth katâ (in Massphath, A, Pa'âmôd . . . Ma'sphôd, Ramôth . . . Masphâd): A place mentioned in Josh 13:26 in a statement of the boundary of Gad, between Heshbon and Betonim. It may possibly be identical with Mizpah, (4).

RAMATHAIM, r'am-atha'im (1 Mac 11:34; AV Ramatham, ram-a-them). See Ramah, (4).

RAMATHAIM-ZOPHIM, r'am-atha'im-zô'fîm. See Ramah, (4).

RAMATHITE, r'amath-it (חֲרוֹמָית, hâ-râ'môthî; B, ô 'îk Pa'âl, ho ek Rhaîl, A, ô Pa'âmãsîn, ho Rhaîma'taïos): So Shimeel was called who was set by David over the vineyards (1 Ch 27:27). There is nothing to show to which Ramah he belonged.

RAMESES, r'am-e'sez, ra-mê'se. See Raamesses.

RAMIAH, r'am-î'a (רמאיה, r'mîyâ; "Jehah hath loosened" or "Jehah is high"): One of the Israelites, sons of Parosh, mentioned in the register of those who had offended in the matter of foreign marriages (Ezr 10:25). The form of the name in 1 Esd (9:26), "Thérmas," presupposes a Heb form ýrmîyâ or possibly ýirmîyâ = "Jehemiah."

RAMOTH, r'amoth:
1. (רָמֹתъ, r'môth; ë Parôb, hê Ramôth: A city in the territory of Issachar assigned to the Geroshite Levites (1 Ch 6:73), mentioned between Daberath and Anem. It seems to correspond to "Remeth" in Josh 19:21, and to "Jarmuth" in 21:29, and is possibly mentioned with Er-Rameh about 11 miles S.W. of Jenin. (2) Ramoth of the South. See Ramah, (5).

RAMOTH, r'amoth (רָמֹת, r'môth), Krê for ýrmôth [Ezr 10:29 AV]; RVV Kôthibh makes the name similar to those in vs 26-27: One of the offenders in the matter of foreign marriages. RVV and ARV, adopting Kôthibh, read Jeremmoth (q.v.).

RAMOTH (Job 38:18 AVm). See Stones, Precious.

RAMOTH-GILEAD, r'amoth-gîl'ê-ad (רָמֹת גִּלְעָד, r'môth gîl'âd; B, Pa'âmuâl Tala'dâh, Ramomôth Galadd, A, Pa'amuâl, Ramomôth, and other forms): A great and strong city E. of the Jordan in the territory of Gad, which played an important part in the wars of Israel. It is first mentioned in connection with the appointment of the Cities of Refuge (Dt 4:43; Jos 20:8). It was assigned to the Merarite Levites (Jos 21:38; 1 Ch 6:80). In these four passages it is called "Ramoth in Gilead" (רָמֹת גִּלְעָד, r'môth ga-gîl'âd). This form is given wrongly by AV in 1 K 22:3. In all other places the form "Ramothe-gilead" is used.

Here Ben-geber was placed in charge of one of Solomon's administrative districts (1 K 4:13), which included Havvoth-jair and "the 1. History region of Argob, which is in Bashan." The city was taken from Omri by the Syrians under Ben-hadad I (2 K 10:32), and even more resoundingly by the defeat of Ben-hadad at Aphek they remained masters of this fortress. In order to recover it for Israel Ahab invited Jehoshaphat of Judah to accompany him in a campaign. Despite the discouragement of Micaiah, the royal pair set out on the disastrous enterprise. In their attack on the city Ahab fought in disguise, but was mortally wounded by an arrow from a bow drawn "at a venture" (1 K 22:1-40; 2 Ch 18). The attempt was repeated by Ahab's son Jehoram; but his father's ill fortune followed him, and, heavily wounded, he retired for healing to Jareel (2 K 8:28 ff; 2 Ch 22:5). During the king's absence from the camp at Ramoth-gilead Jehu was there appointed king of Israel by Elisha (2 K 9:1 ff; 2 Ch 22:7). He proved a swift instrument of vengeance against the doomed house of Ahab. According to Jos (Ant, IX, vi, 1) the city was taken before Joram's departure. This is confirmed by 2 K 9 14 ff. The place is not mentioned again, unless, indeed, it be identified with "Mizpah" in 1 Mac 5:35.

It is just possible that Ramoth-gilead corresponds to Mizpah, (1), and to Ramath-Mizpeh.

The spot where Laban and Jacob parted is called both Gilead and Gedor, and can be seen in the case of Ramoth of the South.

Merrill identifies the city with Jerash, the splendid ruin of which lies in Wady el-Den, N. of the Jebok. He quotes the Bab Talm (Makkah 96) as placing the Cities of Refuge in pairs, so that those on the E. of the Jordan are opposite those on the W. Shechem, being the middle one of the three W. of the Jordan, should have Ramoth-gilead nearly opposite to it on the E., and this would place its site at Gerasa, the modern Jerash (HDB, s.v.). But the words of the Talm must not be interpreted too strictly. It may very probably that Golan lay far S. of a line drawn due E. from Kedes (Kades-naphtali). No remains have been discovered at Jerash older than Gr-Rom times, although the presence of a fine perennial spring makes occupation in antiquity probable. The place could be approached by chariots along Wady 'Ajlûn, and the country adjoining was not unsuitable for chariot evolutions.

Condor and others have suggested Reimun, an ancient site to the W. of Jerash. The absence of any source of good water supply questions the identification. Buhl (GAP, 261 ff) favors el-Jirâd, a ruined site on a hill S. of the Jabok; see Gilead, (1). Eusebius and Jerome (Onom, s.v.) contradict each other, the former placing Ramoth-gilead 15 miles W. of Jerash, and the latter 15 miles E. of Philadelphia. It is clear, however, that this is a mere slip on Jerome's part, as both say it is near the Jabok. Many have identified it with es-Salt, which is indeed 15 miles W. of Amman (Philadelphia), but it is 10 miles S. of the Jabok, and so can hardly be described as near that river. It is also no place for chariot warfare. The case against identification with Ramoth-gilead is conclusively stated by Rev. G. A. Cooke in Driver's Dt, xx.

In suggesting these sites sufficient attention has not been given to what is said in 1 K 4. The authority of the king's officer in Ramoth-gilead extended over the land of Argob in Bashan, as well as over the towns of Jair in Gilead. A situation therefore to the N. of Mahanaim must be sought. Guthe would find it at cr-Reinloth, on the pilgrim road, about 10 miles S. of Mezerib (cf HGL, 556 ff). Cheyne's suggestion of Saltib, away on the crest of the mountain of Bashan, is out of the question.

The name Caleb H. argues in favor of Beit Râs, over 11 miles S.E. of Gadara, a position commanding all Northern Gilead and as favorably situated as Jerash for chariot warfare and communication with the W. of Jordan.
“Here we have the heights of Northern Gilead. Ramoth, Caphtorim, and Beil Rams are in their respective languages idiomatic equivalents. It is improbable that a large city like Caphtorim should have superseded anything but a very important city of earlier times. We must be content to leave the question open meantime. W. Ewing

RAMPART, rampárt (Lam 2 8; Nah 3 8). See Fortification.

RAM’S HORN. See Music.

RAMS’ SKINS: The skin of the sheep, roughly tanned with all the wool on, is the common winter jacket of the shepherd or peasant, the ram’s being considered esp. desirable (cf He 11 37). Hence the appropriateness of these skins in the covering of the tabernacle (Ex 25 5, etc). See Tabernacle; Dye, Dyeing.

RANGE, ránj: “Range” and “ranks” have the same derivation, and in the sense of a “row” (of men, etc) they were formerly interchangeable. “Range” with this meaning is found in 2 K 11 8.15 AV (2 Ch 23 14 (RV “rank”; תDateFormat, s’dherah, “row”). Hence “to range” is “to set in a line” (Jth 2 16; 2 Macc 12 20, diatsiasd) or “to move in a line” or, simply, “to roan,” whence “a ranging bear” (Prov 28 15; יDateFormat, shásak, “run to and fro”). A cooking “range” is a sieve on which pots, etc. can be set in a row, but the kíyrjɪn (םDateFormat) of Lev 11 35 is a much more primitive affair, composed, probably, of two plates (kíyrjím is a dual). In Job 39 8, “range of the mountains” is good modern use, but תDateFormat, yir, should be pointed yáhur (not yár in MT) and connected with yár, “search.” So translate “He searcheth out the mountains as his pasture.” Burton Scott Eason

RANK, rank: (1) תDateFormat, śrah, used in Joel 2 7 of the advance of the locust army which marched in perfect order and in straight lines, none crossing the other’s track. (2) תDateFormat, ma’arakhāh, “battle array” (1 Ch 12 38 AV; cf 1 S 4 16; 17 22 48). See Army.

RANKS, ranks (רDateFormat, prásad, “a square plot of ground”; “a garden-bed”): “They sat down in ranks” (Mk 6 40); the several reclining ranks formed, as it were, separate plots or “garden-beds.”

RANSOM, ran’sum (the noun occurs in the Eng. Bible 12 t [Ex 21 30 AV, תDateFormat, piddáhōn; 30 12; Job 33 24; 36 18; Prov 6 35; 13 8; 21 18; Isa 43 3, תDateFormat, kópher; Mt 20 28; Mk 10 45, לDateFormat, láttron; 1 Tim 2 6, ἀνάντιλτρον, antiltron]; the verbal form occurs 4 t [Isa 35 10; Hos 13 14, תDateFormat, piddáhāh; Isa 51 10 AV; Jer 31 11, תDateFormat, go’al; these two Heb vbs. are generally rendered in other passages by the Eng. “redeem”): 1. Usage by Christ 2. Legal The Law (1) General Cases (2) Redemption Money—the Firstborn (3) Connection with Sacrifice (4) Typical Reference to the Messiah 3. Legal Apostolic Teaching 4. Apostolic Teaching 5. To Whom Was the Ransom Paid? (1) Not to Satan (2) To Divine Justice (a) Redemption by Price (b) Redemption by Power

LITERATURE

The supremely important instance is the utterance of the Lord Jesus Christ as reported by Matthew and Mark (Mt 20 28; Mk 10 45), and in looking at it we shall be able, by way of illustration, to glance at the OT passages. The 1. Usage context refers to the dispute among the disciples concerning position in the kingdom, with the kingdom to the world. The true nature of Christ’s kingdom. Christ makes use of the occasion to set forth the great law of service as determining the place of honor in that kingdom, and illustrates and enforces it by showing that its greatest exemplification is to be found in His own mission: “For the Son of man also came not to be ministered unto, but to minister” (Mk 10 45). His ministry, however, was to pass into the great act of sacrifice, of which all other acts of self-sacrifice on the part of His people would be but a faint reflection—and to give His life [soul] a ransom for many” (ib). He thus gives a very clear intuition of the purpose and meaning of His death; the clearest of all the intimations reported by the synoptists. The word He uses bears a well-established meaning, and is accurately rendered by our word “ransom,” a price paid to secure the freedom of a slave or to set free from liabilities and charges, and generally the deliverance from calamity by paying the forfeit. The familiar vb. בDateFormat, “to look” or “to set free” (Prov 18 20; פDateFormat, láttron, that which secures the freedom, the payment or forfeit; thence come the cognate vb. látroth, “to set free upon payment of a ransom,” “to redeem.” látroth, “the actual setting free; the redemption,” and látroth, “the redeemer,” the favorite NT word for “redemption” is the compound form, ἀπολύτρωσις.

The word láttron was common in Gr classical lit., constantly bearing the sense of “ransom price,” and was frequently connected with sacrificial and expiation. Usage—But for the full explanation of the Law Lord’s great thought we have to look to the OT usage. The two leading Heb vbs. trdy in our version by “redeem,” are generally rendered in the LXX by látroth, and derivatives of these words conveying the idea of the actual price paid are trdy by this very word láttron.

(1) General cases.—In Ex 21 30 we have the law concerning the case of the person killed by an ox; the ox was to be destroyed, and the owner liable to death but the proviso was made, “If there be laid on him a sum of money he shall pay that; but if not, he shall pay as much as the value of his life whatsoever is laid upon him” (AV). The Heb for “sum of money” is kópher, lit. “atone ment.” RV “ransom money” (the word for “redemption”) is piddáhōn (from piddáh); the LXX renders both by látroth either by the pl. form látroth or by the sing. form láttron. In Lev 25, among the directions in relation to the Jubilee, we have the provision (ver 25) that the land was not to be sold “in perpetuity,” but where any portion has been sold, opportunity is to be given for re-purchase: “Yo shall grant a redemption for the land” (lev 25). The Heb is go’uláh, a derivative of go’al, the LXX láttron. In vs 25,26, the case is mentioned of a man who through poverty has sold part of his land to a near kinsman who is able to redeem it he shall do so: if there is no one to act this brotherly part, and the man himself is able to redeem it, there remain a scale of consideration in the Heb it is again go’al that is used with the cognate go’al for “kinsman.” The last clause rendered in AV, “but himself he able to redeem it,” in RV “and he be warded rich and find sufficient to redeem it”), is lit. “and his hand shall advance, and he find sufficient for his redemption”%; LXX has the vb. látroth in the first part, and renders the clause pretty literally, “and there be furnished to his hand and there be found with him the sufficient price [látroth] of it.” In vs 51,52, in reference to the redemption of a Jew sold into slavery, we have in the Heb the word go’uláh, rendered in Eng, accurately “the price of redemption”; LXX has the plural, for accuracy, in both cases, látroth, “the ransom-price.” In Lev 27 31 AV, the phrase “if a man will at all redeem of his house” (cf 13 28) is intended to represent the phraseological Heb idiom, “if a man redeeming will redeem,” which is rendered by LXX κα nos látroth látroth ἀνθρώπων.

(2) Redemption money—the firstborn.—But perhaps the most important passage is the law concern-
ing the half-shekel to be paid by every Israelite from 20 years old and upward when a census was taken. It was to be the same for rich and poor, and it was called "atonement money," "to make atonement for their souls." In the opening words of the law, in Ex 30:12 (AV), we read "Then shall they give every man a ransom for his soul unto the Lord"—the Heb kôpher; the LXX rendering is λύτρα τῆς παύχεις αὐτῶν, "a ransom price for his soul." All the people were thus considered and treated alike, and agreeing to the same amount. It is significant that this atonement money paid at the first census furnished the silver for the sockets of the tabernacle boards, intimating that the typical tabernacle was built upon atonement. The same thought, that the people's lives were forfeited, comes out in the provision for the consecration of the Levites, recorded in full in Nu 3:40-51. The firstborn represented the people. God claimed all the firstborn as forfeited to Himself, teaching that Israel deserved the same punishment as the Egyptians, and was only spared by the grace of Jeh, and in virtue of the sprinkled blood. Now He takes to Himself for His services the Levites as the equivalent of the firstborn, and when it was found that the number of the firstborn exceeded the number of the Levites, equivalence was maintained by ransom at a certain price the surplusage of the firstborn males. In the LXX account, lûtrà occurs 4 times, twice for the phrase "those to be redeemed," and twice for "ransom." Thus the idea of ransom for the forfeited life became familiar to the people as educated by the typical system, and redemption expressed the sum total of their hopes for the future, however faulty might be their conception of the nature of that redemption.

(3) Connection with sacrifice. It is also clear in the text that the sacrificial and the ransom were closely related. Even in classical Gr., as we have noted, the two concepts correspond, and it is not surprising to find it so in the OT. Köpher, we have seen, is lit. "atonement" and comes from kôpher, lit. "to cover," and hence by covering to make atonement, or to cover by making atonement: and so it is in the Piel form, the most common and technical Heb word for making atonement, or expiation, or propitiation, and is frequently rendered in the Gr by hilasomai, often too by the comp. εἰλισθήμενος. In Ex 30:2, 12; Nu 15:21, 35; 31:12; the Heb kôpher is lûtrà in the Gr. In the latter place, where it is twice stated that no satisfaction shall be taken of the life of a man, the Heb is kôpher, LXX lûtrà, RV "ransom," AV "satisfaction.

(4) Typical reference to the Messiah.—Sacrifice was thus linked with ransom. Sacrifice was the Divinely appointed covering for sin. The ransom for the deliverance of the sinner was to be by sacrifice. Both the typical testimony of the Law and the prophetic testimony gave prominence to the thought of redemption. The Coming One was to be a Redeemer. Redemption was to be the great work of the Messiah. The people seem to have looked for the redemption of the soul to God alone through their own vicarious rights, while redemption, in the more general sense of deliverance from all enemies and troubles, they linked with the advent of the Messiah. It required a spiritual vision to see that the two things would coincide, that the Messiah would bring in all phases and fulness by means of ransom, of sacrifice, of expiation.

Jesus appeared as the Messiah in whom all the old economy was to be fulfilled. He knew perfectly the meaning of the typical and prophetic testimony; and that full heath was to fulfill the OT types and accomplish its brightest prophetic anticipations, He deliberately uses this term lûtròn to describe it (Mt 20:28); in speaking of His death as a ransom, He also regarded it as a sacrifice, an expiatory offering. The strong preposition used intensifies the idea of ransom and expiation, even to the point of substitution. It is ἀντί, "instead of," and the idea of exchange, equivalence, substitution cannot be removed from it. In Nu 18:16, "Take the Levites instead of all the first-born," the LXX uses ἀντί, which, like the Eng. "instead of," exactly represents the Heb tabâh; and all three convey most unmistakably the idea of substitution. And as the Levites were to be substituted for the firstborn, so for the surplus of the firstborn the "ransom money" was to be substituted, that idea, however, being clearly enough indicated by the use of the genitive. Indeed the simpler way of describing a ransom is to be with the genitive, the ransom of many; or as our version renders, "a ransom for many," but just because the ransom here is not simply a money payment, but is the actual sacrifice of the life, the substitution of His soul for many, He is appropriately said to "give his soul a ransom instead of many." The Kingdom of God which Christ proclaimed was so diverse in character from that which Salome and her sons anticipated that, so far from appearing in dazzling splendor, with distinguished places of power for eager aspirants, it was to be a spiritual home for renegades. Men held captive by sin needed to be ransomed that they might be free to become subjects of the Kingdom, and so the ransom work, the sufferings and death of Christ, must lie at the very foundation of that Kingdom. The need of ransom supersedes life forfeited; the ransom paid secures life and liberty; the life which Christ gives comes through His ransoming death.

Besides the passages in the Pent which we have noted, special mention should be made of the two great passages which bear so closely upon the need of spiritual redemption, the Ps and Job and come into line with this great utterance of Christ. Ps 49:7-9, "None of you can by any means redeem [pādāḥ; lûtrā] his brother, nor give to God a ransome [kôpher; exîlassmosa] for him (for the redemption of their life is costly, and it faileth for ever.)." (The Eng. gives pîkîyôn for "reparation", the Gr. the price of the redemption of a soul.)"

No human power or skill, no forfeit in money or service or life can avail to ransom any soul from the doom entailed by sin. But in the same ps (ver 15) the triumphant hope is expressed that God will redeem [pādāḥ; lûtrā] my soul from the power of Sheol." In Job 33:24, "Deliver him from going down to the pit, I have found a ransome"; God is the speaker, and whatever may be the particular exegesis of the passage in its original application, it surely contains an anticipation of the gospel redemption. This Divine unction is explained in the light of Christ's utterance; it finds its realization through the cross: "I have found a ransome," for "the Son of Man" has given "his soul a ransom for many.;

This great utterance of the Saviour may well be considered as the germ of all the apostolic teaching concerning redemption, but it is 4. Apostolic not for us to show its unfolding beyond Teaching, not that in apostolic thought the redemption was always connected with the death, the sacrifice of Christ.

Thus Paul (Eph 1:7), "In whom we have our redemption through his blood," Thus Peter (1 Pet 1:18, 19), "Ye were redeemed not with corruptible things, such as silver or gold, but with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Jesus Christ; through the eternal Spirit..." (Rev 5:9) the song is, "Thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe;" etc.
In all but the last of these passages there is an echo of the very word used by Christ, _aphora_ and _aphorism_, both being cognate with _lutoris_. In Tim 2 5-6 Paul has a still closer verbal coincidence when he says, "Christ _aphorism_ which he gave himself a ransom for all" (_aparturation_). The word used in the Apocalypse is _aphora_, to buy in the open market, and is frequently used of the redeeming work of Christ (Rev 5 9-10; 1 Cor 1 27). In the two places where Paul uses it he adds the means of purchase: "To were bought with a price," which from his point of view would be equivalent to ransom. In the passage in Gal 3 13; 4 5, Paul uses the compound word _aphoriphora_ which is equivalent to "re- deem, buy off, deliver by paying the price."

The question "Who receives the ransom?" is not directly raised in Scripture, but it is one that not unnaturally occurs to the mind, and theologians have answered it in various ways.

5. To Whom was the Ransom (1) Not to Satan.—The idea entertained by some of the Fathers (Irenaeus, Origen) that the ransom was given to Satan, who is conceived of as having through the sin of man a righteous claim upon him, which Christ recognizes and meets, is grotesque, and not in any way countenanced by Scripture. (2) To Divine justice.—But in repudiating it, there is no need to go so far as to deny that there is anything answering to a real redeeming transaction. All that we have said goes to show that, in no mere figure of speech, but in tremendous reality, Christ gave "his life a ransom," and if our mind demands an answer to the question to whom the ransom was given it does not seem possible for us to be able to think of the justice of God, or God in His character of Moral Governor, as requiring and receiving it. In all that Scripture asserts about propitiation, sacrifice, reconciliation in relation to the work of Christ, it is implied that there is at least a veiling of it, and it is implied that there is wrath to be averted, something to be appeased, or satisfied, and while it may be enough simply to think of the effects of Christ's redeeming work in setting us free from the penal claims of the Law—the just doom of sin—it does not seem going beyond the spirit of Scripture to draw the logical inference that the ransom price was paid to the Guardian of that holy law, the Administrator of eternal justice. "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us" (Gal 3 13). This essential, fundamental phase of redemption, that Christ, theologians, with good Scriptural warrant, have called redemption by blood, or by price, as distinguished from the practical outcome of the work of Christ in the life which is redemption by power.

(1) Redemption by price: As to Satan's claims, Christ by paying the ransom price, having secured the right to redeem, exercises His power on behalf of the believing sinner. He does not recognize the right of Satan. He is the "strong man" holding his captives lawfully, and Christ the "stronger than he" overcomes him and spoils him, and sets his captives free (Lk 11 21-22). In one sense men may be said to have sold themselves to Satan, but they had no right to sell, nor he to buy, and Christ ignores that transaction and brings "to _drown_ him that had the power of death, that is, the devil" (Heb 2 14), and so is able to "deliver all them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage" (Heb 2 15).

(b) Redemption by power: Many of the OT passages about the redemption wrought on behalf of God's people illustrate this redemption by power, and the redemption by power is always founded on the redemption by price; the release follows the ransom. In the case of Israel, there was first the redemption of the sprinkled blood of the Paschal Lamb which sheltered from the destroying angel (Ex 12)—and then followed the redemption by power, when by strength of hand Jeh brought His people out from Egypt (Ex 13 14), and in His mercy led forth the people which He had redeemed (Ex 15 13). So under the gospel when "he hath visited and wrought redemption for his people" (Lk 1 68), He can "grant unto us that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies should serve him without fear" (Lk 1 74). It is because we have in Him our redemption through His blood that we can be delivered out of the "power of darkness" (Col 1 13, 14). See further, _REDEEMER_, _REDEMPTION_.

LITERATURE.—See works on NT Theology (Weiss, Schmid, Stevens, etc.); arts. in _RDB_; _DCC_.

ARCHAEOLOGY.—M'CAG.

RAPE, räp. See CRIMES; PUNISHMENTS.

_The Rapha_, _Rapha_, _rāfa_ (Nf, _raphā_): (1) In RV these names are substituted for the "giant" in 1 Ch 20 4-6 and in 2 S 21 16.15.20.22. The latter passage states that the Philistines were slain by the raphād in Gath. The text is corrupt; _Raphah_ is probably an eponym. Originally the name of one of the Philis who was of the body "Raphaites" stood in the text. The plural of this word, or at least a plural of this stem, is _Raphaim_ (qv.).

(2) _Rapha_ (AV "Rapha"), a descendant of Saul (1 Ch 37). See _Raphael_.

_Horace_ J. _Wolfe_

RAFAEL, rā'aff-al, rā'aff-ēl (Nf, _raphā'ēl, from _raphā_ "él, "God has helped"; _Raphaël, Raphael_): The name of the angel who, as Azarias, guides Tobias to Ecbatana and _Raguel_ (qv.). The purpose of his mission is, in accordance with his name, to cure Tobit of blindness, and to deliver Sarah, the daughter of Raguel, from the power of the evil spirit Asmodeus (Tob 3 8; 12 15). Later, in addition, when he reveals himself (12 15), he declares that he is "one of the seven holy angels, which present the prayers of the saints, and go in before the glory of the Holy One." These seven angels are derived, according to some, from the seven Am-shapards (Amesh-shapetos) of Zoroastrianism (cf Rev 4 5). At the head of the elaborate angelology of the Enoch books there are "four presences," and Raphael is one of them (En 40 9; 54 6). In the first of these passages Raphael is theheader; in the second, he with Michael, Gabriel and Phanuel lead the wicked away to punishment. These four presences seem related to the four "living creatures" of Ezek (1 5) and of the Apocalypse (4 6). While in the general representation of Raphael's position in En, in 20 3 he is named among the angels who "watch," whose number according to the Gr text is seven. Raphael shared in the function assigned to the archangels, in the _Oracula Sibyllina_, of leading souls to the judgment seat of God (II, 215, Alexandre's text). He occupies a prominent place in Jewish mediaeval writings: he with Michael and Gabriel cured Abraham (Yoma 37n); according to the book _Zähir_, Raphael conveyed to Abraham a book containing 72 kinds of wisdom in 670 writings. The painters of the Renaissance frequently depicted Raphael.

J. E. H. _Thomson_

_Raphaim_, rā'ā-īm, rā'ā-īm (B omit; N and A have "'Pa<|)ē|τēv", _Raphai|ēn_): An ancestor of Judith (Jth 8 1).

_Raphon_, rā'ōn (_Pa<|)ē|tōn_, _Raphö|ēn_): The place where in his campaign E. of Jordan Judas inflicted disastrous defeat on the host of Timotheus, the fugitives fleeing for refuge to the temple at Caraim (1 Macc 5 37f; _Ant_, XII, vili, 4). The same place is doubtless referred to by Pliny as "Raphana" (_NH_, v 16). It may possibly be represented by the modern _'Rafah_, on the E. of the pilgrimage road, about 47 miles N. of _Dar'āb_, and 11 miles N.E. of
Tell el-'Ash'ary. It is a mile and a half N. of Wady Kanawat, which would thus be the "brook" mentioned in the narrative. It is perhaps far enough away from Carnaim, if this is rightly placed at Tell el-'Ash'ary.

W. Ewino

RAPHU, ῥαφός (rapāhō, "one healed"): The father of Palti, the spy selected from the tribe of Benjamin (Nu 13:9).

RASSES, ῥασῆς (from ῥασσέας, ῥασσές, A B, ῥασσές, ῥασσές; Vulg Tharsus; Oki Lat Thrasis et Rassus): The children of Rasses are mentioned with Put, Lud and the children of Ishmael as having been subdued by Holofernes (Jth 2:23).

Their identity is a matter of conjecture only. Some think Vulg Tharsus (σταυρός) is meant, others Rhesus (Ezk 38:13; 39:1), others Rhodes, a mountain range and city s. from Anamur, on the Gulf of Issus. Most probably a district, not a town, is named, situated in the eastern part of Asia Minor.

S. F. Hunter

RATHUMUS, ῥαθυμός (Ῥαθύμος, ῥαθυμός): One of those who joined in writing a letter to protest against Artaxerxes against the Jews (1 Esd 2:16 ff.). In 2:17 he is styled "story-writer," RV 

Ra'v'n (ra'v'n, ῥάβν; κόρας, κόρας; Lat Corvus corax): A large family of the smaller birds of prey belonging to the genus Corvus corax. A bird of such universal distribution that it is known from Iceland to Japan, all over Asia, Europe and Africa, but almost extinct and not of general distribution in our own country. In no land is it more numerous than in Pal. In general appearance it resembles the crow, but is much larger, being almost two feet long, of a glossy black, with whiskers around the beak, and rather stiff-pointed neck feathers. A bird exhibiting as much intelligence as any, and of a saucy, impudent disposition, it has been an object of interest from the beginning. It has been able to speak sentences of a few words when carefully taught, and by its uncanny acts has made itself a bird surrounded by superstition, myth, fable, and is connected with the religious rites of many nations. It is partially a carrion feeder, if offal or bodies are fresh; it also eats the young of other birds and very small animals and seeds, berries and fruit, having as varied a diet as any bird. It is noisy, with a loud, rough, emphatic cry, and its young are clamorous at feeding time.

Aristotle wrote that ravens drove their young from their location and forced them to care for themselves from the time they left the nest. This is also the usual habitat. Bird habits and characteristics change only with slow ages of evolution. Our ravens of today are, to all intents, the same birds as those of Pal in the time of Moses, and ours follow the young afield for several days and feed them until the summer. Happening to see a raven, record him that in time of drought a raven found a bucket containing a little water beside a sepulcher and raised it to drinking level by drooping its wings.

Pal has at least 8 different species of ravens. This bird was the first sent out by Noah in an effort to discover if the flood were abating (Gen 6:8–9). Because it partially fed on carrion it was included among the abominations (see Lev 11:15; Dt 14:14). On 1 K 17 4–6, see Elisha and the present writer's Birds of the Bible, 401–5. Among the marvels of creation and providence inJob 38:41, we have this mention of the raven,

"Who provideth for the raven his prey, / When his young ones every one cry. / And wander for lack of food?"

The answer to this question is in Ps 147:9:

"He giveth to the beast his food, / And to the young ravens which cry."

Both these quotations point out the fact that the young are peculiarly noisy. In Prov 30:17 it is indicated that the ravens, as well as eagles, vultures and hawks, found the eye of prey the vulnerable point, and so attacked it first. The Heb 'ērebh means "black," and for this reason was applied to the raven, so the reference to the locks of the bridegroom in the Song of Solomon becomes clear (Cant 8:11). The raven is one of the birds indicated to prey upon the ruins of Edom (Isa 34:11). The last reference is found in Lk 12:24: "Consider the ravens, that they sow not, neither reap; which have no store-chamber nor barn; and God feedeth them. This could have been said of any wild bird with equal truth."

Gene Stratton-Porter

RAVEN, rav'n, RAVIN, ray'in: "Raven" (vb.) is from "rapine," "violent plundering," used for τῆς ἀράφης, tēs āraphēs, in Gen 49:27; Ps 22:13; Ezek 22:5–21, while "ravin" (noun) is the object ravened, in Nah 2:12 the two terrorizing carcases (ῥαβδίως, ῥαβδίως). So a "ravenous" bird (Isa 46:11; Ezek 39:4) is a bird of prey (not a "hungry bird"), ὄραφας, ὄραφα, "afright, lit. a screacher." "Ravenous beast" in Isa 36:9 is for ῥαβδίως, ῥαβδίως, "violent one." In the NT ἀπατοῦν, ἀπατοῦσα, ἀπατοῦσα, is tr. "ravining" in Mt 7:15, while for the cognate ἀπατάω, ἀπαταπάω (Lk 11:38), AV gives "ravining," RV "extortion."
READING, red'ing (םְרֵד, mikrd; מִשְׁרֵד, anqypravo, andgnbôsâ): As a noun occurs once in the OT (Neh 8 8) and 3 t. in the NT (Acts 13 15; 2 Cor 3 14; 1 Tim 4 13), each time with reference to the public reading of the Divine Law. The vb. "to read" (םְרֵד, kdrî; מִשְׁרֵד, anqypwv, anqypodô) occurs frequently both in the OT and in the NT: (1) often in the sense of reading aloud to others, esp. of the public reading of God's Law or of prophecy, as by Moses (Ex 24 7), Ezra (Neh 8 3.18), Jesus in the synagogue at Nazareth (Lk 4 16), of the regular reading of the Law and the Prophets in the synagogues (Acts 13 27; 16 21), and of the reading of apostolic ep. in the Christian church (Col 4 16; 1 Thess 5 27); (2) also in the sense of reading to one's self, whether the Divine word in Law or prophecy (Dt 17 19; Acts 8 28-30, etc), or such things as private letters (2 Ki 5 7; 19 14; Acts 23 34, etc).

D. MIALL EDWARDS

READY, red'i (םָרָד, mâhr): Occurs twice in the sense of apt, skilful (Ex 7 6; Ps 45 1). RV gives "ready" for "fit" (Ex 24 27), for "asketh" (Mic 7 15), for "prepared" (Mt 14 13), for "not negligent" (2 Pet 1 12).

REIAH, râ-a'ya, râ-'a (םַרְיאָה), r'â'ah, "Jeh has seen": LXX B, Pedé, Rekkd, A, Ped, Rheid; the name of a Calebite family (1 Ch 4 2). The word "Reiah" should probably be substituted for "Haroeh" in 1 Ch 2 52, but both forms may be corruptions.

(2) A Reubenite (1 Ch 5 5, AV "Reuia"). See Jos. 13 4.

(3) The family name of a company of Nethinim (Ezr 2 47; Neh 7 50 = 1 Esd 5 31).

REAPING, râ'pîng (מָסָרְפ, ָפַסָר תְּעִיזָה), theriaï): Reaping in ancient times, as at present, consisted in either pulling up by the roots or cutting it with a sickle (see Sickle), and then binding the stalks into bundles to be carried to the threshing-floor. If the Egypt sculptures are true to life, reaping was sometimes divided into two operations, the heads of grain and the stalks being reaped separately. In Pal and Syria both pulling and cutting are still practised, the former when the ground is stony and the sparc scarce. Even where the sickle is used, much of the grain comes up by the roots, owing to the toughness of the drum stalks or the dullness of the sickle. The reaper sometimes wears pieces of cane on the fingers of the hand which gathers the grain in order to protect them from injury by the sharp grasses or the sickle. There were definite laws established by the Hebrews in regard to reaping (Lev 19 9; 23 10; 25 5.11; Dt 16 9). Samuel mentions the task of reaping the harvest as one of the requirements which would be made by the king for whom the people were clomarng (1 S 8 12).

Futurative: The certainty of the consequences of good and evil doing were often typified by the sowing and the reaping of harvests (Job 4 8; Prov 22 8; Hos 8 7; 10 12.13; 2 Cor 9 6; Gal 6 7.8). "They that sow in tears shall reap in joy"

is found in the liberated captives' song (Ps 126 5). "He that regardeth the clouds shall not reap," i.e. a lack of faith in God's care will be punished (Ecc 11 4); cf also the lesson of trust drawn from the birds (Mt 6 26; Lk 12 24). Sowing and not reaping the harvest is mentioned as a punishment for disobedience (Job 31 8; Jer 12 13; Mt 24 36; Lk 17 18). Reaping where he sowed not, showed the injustice of the landlord (Mt 25 26), as did also the withholding of the reapers' wages (Jas 5 4). In God's Kingdom there is a division of labor: "He that soweth and he that reapeth may rejoice together" (Jn 4 36-38). In John's vision he saw an angel reap the earth (Re 14 15.16). See AGRICULTURE; GLEANING. JAMES A. PATCH

REARWARD, râr'word (םַרְאָה), 'qaaph, "to gather," Nu 10 25; Josh 6 9 (AVm "gathering host"); Isa 52 12). See ARMY; DAN, TRIBE OF; WAR, 3.

REASON, râz'n, REASONABLE, râz't-n-b'l, REASONING, râz'n-ing (םָרֵאָן, yâkhôkh, etc); kâvâ, báshô, 'bâshô, 'bâshôh, 'bâshôh, 'bâshôh, 'bâshôh; 'bâshôh (American "principal"). "Reason," with related terms, has a diversity of meanings, representing a large number of Heb and Gr words and phrases. In the sense of "cause" or "occasion" it stands in 1 K 9 15 for dôbhar, "a word" (RVM "accompanying"). In cases renderes propositional forms as "from," "with," "because of," "for the sake of," etc. (as the ground or argument for anything, it is the tr of ta'am (Prov 26 16, RVM "answers discreetly"), of yâkhôh, as in Isa 1 18, "Come now, and let us reason together" (cf Job 13 3; 15 3); in 1 S 12 7, the word is šâbhoš, RV "that I may plead," etc. The principal Gr words for "reason," "reasoning," are those given above. The Christian believer is ready to give a reason (logos) for the hope within him (1 Pet 3 15 AV). "Reason" as a human faculty or in the abstract sense appears in Apoc in Wis 17 12 (logismôs); Ecclus 37 16, "Let reason [logos] go before every enterprise," RV "be the beginning of every work." In Acts 18 14, "reason would" is lit. kâvâhôn, "according to reason"; in Rom 12 1, for "reasonable [logikos] service," RV has "spiritual," and in m in "Gr belonging to the reason." In RV "reason," etc occurs much oftener than in AV (cf Lev 17 11; Dt 28 47; Jgs 5 22; Job 20 23; 27 3; etc; Lk 3 15; 12 17; Acts 17 17, etc).

W. L. WALKER

REBA, râ'bah (םַרְבָּה), rebha, "fourth part"; LXX B, PoBe, Rhôbe, A, PôBe, Rôhek). One of the five chieftains of Midian who were slain by the Israelites, under Moses (Nu 31 8; Josh 13 21). Like his comrades, he is termed a "king" in Nu, but a "chief" or "prince" in Josh.

REBEKAH, râbã'kha (םַרְבָּקה), râb'hâkh; LXX and NT Pôrâbôcia, Rôhekba, etc), the usual Eng. spelling Rebecca): Daughter of Bethuel and an unknown mother, granddaughter of Nahor and Milcah, sister of Laban, wifc of Isaac, mother of Esau and Jacob.

Her name is usually explained from the Arab, ַרְבָּךַו, rabkat, "a tie-rope for animals," or rather, "a noose" in such a rope: its application would then by figure suggest the beauty (q.) of her that beareth it, by means of which men are snared or bound. The root is found in Heb only in the noun meaning "hitching-place," as "stall," in the familiar phrase of the rambled calf. The word is used in view of the meaning of such names as Rachel and Leah, as if He that conceptually figurative, like ַרְבָּkah, ַרְבָּקה, ַרְבָּקה, ַרְבָּקה, ַרְבָּקה, ַרְבָּקה, ַרְבָּקה, ַרְבָּקה, ַרְבָּkah, "a tied-up calf" or "a lamb," one therefore peculiarly choice and fat.

Rebekah is first mentioned in the genealogy of the descendants of Nahor, brother of Abraham (Gen
22 20–24). In fact, the family is there carried down just so far as is necessary in order to introduce this woman, for subsequent the reference and rôle the genealogy is obviously intended as a preparation. All this branch of the family of Terah had remained in Aram when Abraham and Lot had migrated to Canaan, and it is at Haran, "the city of Nomad", that we first meet Rechabah, when in ch 24 she is made known to Abraham's servant at the well before the gate.

That idyllic narrative of the finding of a bride for Isaac is too familiar to need rehearsal and too simple to require comment. Besides, the substance of what is told about the career of Rechabah is treated in connection with the sketches of the other actors in the same scenes. Yet we note from the beginning the maiden's decision of character, which appears in every line of the narrative, and prepares the reader to find in subsequent chapters the positive, ambitious and energetic woman that she there shows herself.

Though the object of her husband's love (Gen 24 67), Rechabah bore him no children for 20 years (Gen 25 20). But when Sarah, she too was barren, it was only after that score of years and after the special intercession of Isaac that God at length granted her twin sons. "The purpose of God according to election," as Paul expresses the matter in Rom 9 13, "was the cause of that strange oracle to the wondering, inquiring parents, 'The elder shall serve the younger'" (Gen 25 23).

Whether because of this oracle or for some other reason, it was that younger son, Jacob, who became the object of his mother's special love (Gen 25 28). She it was who led him into the deception practised upon Isaac (Gen 27 5–17), and she it was who devised the plan for extirpating Jacob from the dangerous situation into which that deception had brought him (vv 42–46). When the absence of Jacob from home became essential to his personal safety, Rechabah proposed her own relations in Aram as the goal of his journey, and gave as motive the desirability of Jacob's marrying from among her kindred. Probably she did not realize that in sending her favorite son away on this journey she was sending him away from her forever. Yet such seems to have been the case. Though younger than Isaac, who was still living at an advanced age when Jacob returned to Canaan a quarter of a century later, Rechabah had given birth to the line which we learn definitely only this, that she was buried in the cave of Machpelah near Hebron (Gen 49 31).

Outside of Gen, Rechabah is alluded to in Scripture only in the passage from Rom (9 10–12) already cited. Her significance there is simply that of the wife of Isaac and the mother of two sons of such different character and destiny as Esau and Jacob. And her significance in Gen, apart from this, lies in her contribution to the family of Abraham of a pure strain from the eastern stock, thus transmitting to the founders of Israel both an unmixed lineage and that tradition of separateness from Can, and other non-Heb elements which has proved the greatest factor in the ethnological marvel of the ages, the persistence of the Heb people. J. OSCAR BOYD

REBUKE, re-buk': As a vb. "rebuke" is in the OT the tr of διώκω, délêkô, in RV "correction": another word, ῥίπτω, in Neh 5 7, is in RV tr "contended with." Rechabite, son (Gen 25 20), whose subsequent the reference and rôle the genealogy is obviously intended as a preparation.

**RECEIPT, re-sët', of Custom.** See Custom.

**RECEIVER, re-së-vër': Found in AV (Isa 33 18); but RV substitutes "thee that weighed the tribute." The Heb is skôd, which means "one who weighs," a "weigher."

**RECHAB, re-kâb, RECHABITES, rek'a-bits (רֶכָּב, rekâb, רֶכְּבָה, rekkbâm): Rechab is the name of two of men of some prominence in the OT records:

1. (A Benjamite of the town of Beeroth, son of Rimmon (2 S 4 2); and he and his brother Baanah were "captains" of the military host of Ish-bosheth. On the death of Abner (2 S 3 30) the two brothers treacherously entered Ish-bosheth's house, and, at the hour when he was resting and helpless, beheaded him, and escaped with the head to David at Hebron (4 6–8). They expected to receive reward and honor from David for the foul deed, which left him without a rival for the throne of all Israel. But the just and noble-minded king ordered their immediate execution (4 9–12), as in the case of the Amalekite, who asserted that he had killed Saul (2 S 1). For some reason the Beerothites left their old town and fled to Gittaim, another town in Benjamin, where they were still living when the Books of S were written (2 S 4 3).

2. (The more prominent of the men bearing this name was a KENITE (q.v.), a descendant of Hamath (1 Ch 2 5–6). In NT the name is also granted to the Christian church (Rev 2 17). Rechab was the ancestor or founder of a family, or order, in Israel known as the Rechabites, who at various times were conspicuous in the religious life of the nation. The most notable member of this family was Jehonadab (2 K 10 15 ff.25), as one who maintained against the ever-increasing tendencies of sensuality, and as a covenant of fidelity to Jeh, to whom they wholly devoted themselves when they joined themselves to Israel. Jeremiah used the Rechabites, who had been driven into exile by Nebuchadnezzar's invasions of the land, as an object-lesson to covetant-
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breaking Jeush. The Rechabites, hungry and thirsty, refused wine when it was set before them, because of the command of their ancestor Jonadab (Jer 35:8–10). In Jer 35:19, Judah refused to heed Jeh's commands or to keep His covenant (vs 14–15).

If the Rechab of Neh 3:14 is the same as this Kenite, then his descendant Malchiah, who assisted Nehemiah in rebuilding the wall of Jerusalem, may have abandoned the vow of his ancestors, for he was "ruler of the district of Beth-haccerem" (i.e. "house of the vineyard").

RECHAB, rē'kə (נְכָּב, rēkhā). See RECHAB.

RECONCILE, rek'on-sil', RECONCILIATION, rek-on-sil-i'shun (καταλλάσσω, katallássō, καταλλαγή, katallagē, also the compound form ἀπόκαταλλάσσω, apokatallάšsω; once the cognate διαλλάσσω, diallassō is used in Mt 5:24).

1. The Terms

(1) NT Usage

OT Usage

(3) Special Passage in 1 Sam 15:29–30

(4) Usage in the Apocalypse

2. Non-doctrinal Passage

3. Doctrinal Passages

(1) Rom 5:18–20

(2) Eph 2:16

(3) Gal 1:23, the compound). The word "reconcile" has a double meaning and usage, and the context must in each case determine how it is to be taken. The great doctrine is the reconciliation of God and men, but the question to be decided is whether it is God who is reconciled to men, or men who are reconciled to God, and different schools of theology emphasize one side or the other. The true view embraces both aspects. The word "to reconcile" means literally to exchange, to bring into a changed relationship. Some maintain that it only is the party in the sinner that is intended, a laying aside of his enmity, and coming into peaceful relations with God. But that manifestly does not exhaust the meaning, nor is it in the great Pauline passages the primary and dominant meaning. The meaning is not limited to the idea of securing or renewing friendship; it is more comprehensive. It comprehends the entire work of the cross, the substitution of Christ for the sinner, the satisfaction of the law, the propitiation of God on account of his people. The idea of relationship is but the result of the work of Christ. The central idea is the appeal of Christ to the Father, the acceptance of Christ by the Father, and the consequent acknowledgment of the Father of the Son, in whom He sees the righteousness of God accomplished. The cross is the means by which man is restored to God. This is a reconciliation in the broadest and widest sense, and this is the meaning of "reconciliation" in Christ's prayer, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." (Acts 1:22).

(2) The OT usage does not materially help in the elucidation of the NT terms, for though the word occurs in a number of passages in AV, it is in RV generally changed to "atonement," which more accurately represents the Heb kābār, which is generally rendered by "atonement," and by ἀφιλακτονοι or ἀφιλακτωσις in the Gr. (In one passage of the NT [He 2:17], the phrase "to make reconciliation" represents the Gr kathalassomai, and is better rendered in RV by "to make propitiation.") The making atonement or propitiation is the basis of the reconciliation, the means of its accomplishment, and the fact that the translators of AV sometimes rendered kābār by "reconcile" shows that they understood reconciliation to have the Godward aspect. Whatever may be said of the nature of the atonement or propitiation in the old dispensation, it was something contemplated as appeasing or satisfying, or at least in some way affecting God so as to make Him willing, or render it possible for Him to enter into a new relationship with men. In one passage in the OT where "reconciliation" occurs (2 Ch 29:21) it represents a different Heb word, but here RV has changed it into "sin-offering," which is in harmony with the general meaning and usage of the Heb.

(3) Special passage in 1 Sam 15:29–30.—There is yet another Heb word rendered "reconcile." In 1 Sam 24, and inasmuch as this passage in the LXX has as the equivalent of the Heb word diallassō, it seems probable that this is the word used in guiding to the NT meaning. On one occasion when the Philistines gathered together to battle against Israel, David and his men went out in the mist to Gath to the muster-place. "The princesses of the Philistines" did not at all speak to the present case. David, and although Achish testified in favor of David's fidelity, they were very indignant, and demanded that David and his men should go back. "Let not an adversary or a foe be an adversary or a foe to you: for wherewith should this fellow reconcile himself to his lord? should it not be with the heads of these men?" The Heb is rēkhā, which means "to be pleased with" or "to accept favorably and the Hiphil form here used is used to make men pleasing or acceptable," "to reconcile himself." But assuredly the Philistines' idea of David reconciling himself to his lord was not that he should lay aside his enmity against Saul, and so become friends with him. The enmity was on Saul's side, and the thought of the princes was that David by turning against them in the battle would gratify Saul, and lead him to lay aside his enmity against David.

(4) Usage in the Apocalypse.—It may be noted that in 2 Macc 5:18 God is said to "reconcile" the Jews with the Godward side: "And the place which was forsaken in the wrath of the Lord was, at the end of the days of great Sovereign, restored again with all glory." The vb. occurs in 2 Macc 5:15 when again the Godward side seems intending to do great harm not only to God, but to God ... be reconciled to your supplications, and be reconciled with you." But in the context, "being of the grace and I will reconcile you and to you in 7:33: "If for rebuke and changing our living Lord has been angered a little while, yet shall he again be reconciled with his own servants, and in 8:9: "They have sought the mean for the Lord to be wholly reconciled with his servants." In these two esp. in the last, it is undeniably the laying aside of the Divine displeasure that is meant.

Before passing on to look at the great utterances in the Epp., we may look at the passages referred to at the beginning. There is, indeed, another non-doctrinal instance in 1 Cor 7:11, where the same event is brought back by the husband. But the whole statement shows that it is not a question of the one who is offering the gift laying aside his enmity against his brother, but the reverse. If therefore thou art offering thy gift at the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath a grudge against thee, —the brother was the offended one, he is the one to be brought round, and not he who gives the gift. This is not, then, to be regarded as a general rule for the whole passage, but it is, at least, a beautiful application of the principle of reconciliation in a passage where it is least expected.

2. Non-doctrinal Passage

(1) Rom 5:5—Turning now to Rom 5:5, how stands the matter? Paul has been speaking of the blessed results of justification; one of these is love in the death of Christ, a love that was displayed to the ungodly, having no righteousness. Then the richest sin and unloving state we were embraced by the love of God, a fortiori that love will not be less now that it has already begun to take effect. If He loved us when we were under His condemnation sufficient to give Himself to die for us, much more shall His love bestow upon us the blessings secured by that death. "Much more then, being now justified by his blood, shall we be saved from the wrath of God through him" (Rom 5:9).

(a) The fact of Divine wrath: It is well to note, then, that the word is 'varied' in meaning in the Hebrew text. 3. Doctrinal results is the shedding abroad of the love of God in the heart. Then he dwells upon the manifestation of that love in the death of Christ, a love that was displayed to the ungodly, having no righteousness. Then the richest sin and unloving state we were embraced by the love of God, a fortiori that love will not be less now that it has already begun to take effect. If He loved us when we were under His condemnation sufficient to give Himself to die for us, much more shall His love bestow upon us the blessings secured by that death. "Much more then, being now justified by his blood, shall we be saved from the wrath of God through him" (Rom 5:9).

(a) The fact of Divine wrath: It is well to note, then, that the word is 'varied' in meaning in the Hebrew text. 3. Doctrinal results is the shedding abroad of the love of God in the heart. Then he dwells upon the manifestation of that love in the death of Christ, a love that was displayed to the ungodly, having no righteousness. Then the richest sin and unloving state we were embraced by the love of God, a fortiori that love will not be less now that it has already begun to take effect. If He loved us when we were under His condemnation sufficient to give Himself to die for us, much more shall His love bestow upon us the blessings secured by that death. "Much more then, being now justified by his blood, shall we be saved from the wrath of God through him" (Rom 5:9).
is reconciled from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men." (18) And, the coming day of judgment is the 'the day of the judgment of God' (95). And because of this stern fact, the gospel is a revelation not only of love, but specifically "a righteousness of God" (18). And he shows that the essence of the gospel is found in the propitiatory death of the Lord Jesus Christ (24.25.26), through whom alone can men who have been "brought under the judgment of God" (19) find justification, salvation, deliverance from the wrath of God (4.25; 5-6). Christ, the perfect propitiator, is the means by which the wrath of God is not to be thought of as having any unworthy or capricious element in it—it is the settled opposition of His holy nature against sin.

(b) Reconciliation, Godward, as well as manward: The apostle proceeds (ver 10): "For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by His life." Now if, as many maintain, it is only the reconciliation on the manward side that is meant, that the manifested love led to the sinner laying aside his enmity, it would entirely reverse the apostle's argument. He is not arguing that if we have begun to love God we may reckon upon His doing so and for so us, but that He has done so, we may expect Him to do more. The verse is parallel to the preceding, and the being reconciled is on the same plane as being justified; the being justified was God's action, and so is the reconciling. Justification is a declaration of the favor of God; reconciliation takes effect upon enemies.

(c) The meaning of the word "enemies": The word "enemies" is important. By those who take the manward aspect of reconciliation as the only one, it is held that the word must be taken actively—those who hate God. But the passive meaning, "hated of God," seems far preferable, and is indeed demanded by the context. Paul uses the vb. eichthriō, "enemies," in Rom 11.28, in antithesis to "beloved of God," and that is the consistent sense here. The enemies are those who are the objects of the wrath of the previous verse. And when we were thus hated of God, the objects of His just displeasure on account of our sin, "we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son." God laid aside His enmity, and in the propitiatory death of Christ showed Himself willing to receive us into His favor.

(d) The manward side: By this propitiation, therefore, the barrier was removed, and God having assumed a gracious attitude toward the sinner, it is possible for the sinner now, influenced by His love, to come into a friendly relationship with God. And so in the second phrase, the two meanings, the Godward and the manward, may coalesce: "being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life." The reconciliation becomes mutual, for there is no kind of doubt that sinners are enemies to God in the active sense, and require to lay aside their hostility, and so be reconciled to Him. But the first step is with God, and the reconciliation which took place in the death of His Son could only be the Godward reconciliation, since at that time men were still uninfluenced by His love. But, perhaps, just because that first reconciliation is brought about through the Divine transaction, the manward aspect avoids saying "God is reconciled," but uses the more indirect form of speech. The manward aspect is emphasized in the next verse, although the Godward is not lost sight of: "We also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, who there have now received the reconciliation" (6.11). It is therefore something that comes from God and does not proceed from man. God is the first mover; He makes the reconciliation as already indicated, and then the fruit of it is imputed to faith. The fact that our receiving the reconciliation, or being brought into a state of reconciliation, follows the being reconciled of ver 10, shows that the other is Divine reconciliation as the basis of the human.

(2) 2 Cor 5.18-20: The Godward aspect primary: In the same way the great passage in 2 Cor 5.18-20 cannot be understood apart from the conception that there is a reconciliation on the Divine side. There is unquestionably reference to the human as next, but the warning is that the Godward aspect is primary and dominating: "All things are of God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation. It might be possible to argue from AV that this describes the process going on under gospel influences, men being brought into gracious relations with God, but the arorist of the Gr rightly rendered by RV, "who reconciled us to himself," points back to the historic time when the transaction took place. It cannot be simply the surrender of the sinner to God that is meant, though that comes as a consequence; it is a work that proceeds from God, is accomplished by God, and because of the accomplishment of that work it is possible of God's ministry. As a result of this, we are intrusted to men. To make this mean the human aspect of the reconciliation, it would be necessary unduly to confine it to the reconciliation of Paul and his fellow-workers, though even then it would be a strained language, to translate the historic act described, "and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation." The plain meaning is that through Jesus Christ, God established the basis of agreement, removed the barrier to the sinner's approach to Himself, accomplished the work of propitiation, and, having done so, He intrusts His servants with the ministry of reconciliation, a ministry which, basing itself upon the great propitiatory, reconciling work of Christ, is directed toward men, seeking to remove their enmity, to influence them in their turn to be reconciled with God. This is more clearly set forth in the verse which follows, which in explaining the ministry of reconciliation says: "To wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, accomplished the work of propitiation, and, having done so, He intrusts His servants with the ministry of reconciliation." Here there can be no question that the historic Incarnation is meant, and the reconciling of the world can be nothing other than the objective work of atonement culminating in the cross. And in that transaction there can be no thought of the sinner laying aside his hostility to God; it is God in Christ so dealing with sin that the doom lying upon the guilty is canceled, the wrath is averted, propitiation is made.

(5) The manward side also prominent: God, in a word, enters into gracious relations with a world of sinners, becomes reconciled to man. This being done, gracious influences can be brought to bear upon man, the chief of which is the consideration of this stupendous fact of grace, that God has in Christ dealt with the sin of man. This is the substance of the "word of reconciliation" which is preached by the apostle. So he continues, "We are ambassadors therefore on behalf of Christ, as though God were entreating by us: we beseech you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God." Here is the human side. The great matter now is to get the sinner to lay aside his enmity, to respond to the gracious overtures of the gospel, to come into harmony with God. But that is only possible because the propitiation in the historic transaction has already been accomplished. If the first reconciliation, "the reconciliation of the world unto himself," had been the laying aside of human
encyclopedia, there could now be point in the exhortation to "Be reconciled to God."  

(3) Eph 2 16.—The two passages where the compound word occurs are in complete harmony with this interpretation. Eph 2 16: "And might reconcile them both [Jew and Gentile] in one body unto God through the cross, having slain the enmity thereby," is the outcome of Christ 'making peace' (2 15), and the reconciling work is effected through the cross, reconciliation both Godward and manward, and, having made peace, it is possible for Christ to come and preach peace to them that are far off through the reconciling work of the cross has been accomplished.  

(4) Col 1 20–22.—So in Col 1 20, "And through him to reconcile all things unto himself, having made peace through the blood of his cross; through him, I say, whether things upon the earth, or things in the heavens." Here the thought of the apostle trembles away into infinity, and there seems a parallel to the thought of He 9 23, that according to the typical teaching even "the things in the heavens" in some way stood in need of cleansing. May it be, that the work of Christ in some sense affected the angelic intelligences, making it possible for harmony to be restored between redeemed sinners and the perfect creation of God? In any case, the reconciling all things unto Himself is not the last paragraph crucially of the Westminster, but the determining of the Divine attitude. Then comes the specific reference to the human side, "And you, being in time past alienated and enemies in your mind in your evil works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death there, as in Rom, the two phases coalescing, God appearing gracious through the work of Christ, sinners coming into gracious relation with Him. "Having made peace through the blood of his cross," the ground of peace has been established. Christ has done something by His death which makes it possible to offer peace to men. God has laid aside His holy opposition to the sinner, and shows Himself willing to bring men into peace with Himself. He has found satisfaction in that great work of His Son, has been reconciled, and now calls upon men to be reconciled to Him—to receive the reconciliation. See Atonement; Propitiation; Wrath.  

RECORD.—See the works on NT Theology of W. H. Schmid, Stevens, etc; Denney, Death of Christ; arts on "Reconciliation" in DB, DCG, etc.  

ARCHIBALD M'CAIG  

RECORD, rek'ord, rek'erd (hen). (1) The Eng. word, where it occurs in the OT and the NT in the sense of testimony, is trd in RV "witness" (Dt 30 19; 31 28; Jn 1 19, 20; 13 14; Rom 10 2, etc). See Witness. But in Job 19 16 for AV "my record," RV "he that voucheth for me." (2) In Ex 4 15; 6 2 (dokhrán, díkrhón), and Est 6 1 (zikkhrón), the word denotes Pers state chronicles; of 1 Mace 14 23; 2 Mace 2 1.  

RECODER, ré-kôrdér (dókrēdē, mazkir; RVm "chronicler"). A high functionary in the court of the Jewish kings, part of whose duty seems to have been to chronicle the events of the reign, but who also occupied a position corresponding with that of the modern official of state. (2 Sm 8 16; 20 24; 1 Ch 15 15, etc.). His high rank is shown by his use of public faith and with other officers, he represented Hezekiah in speaking with Rabshakeh (2 K 18 18), and, in the reign of Josiah, superintended the repairs of the temple (2 Ch 34 8).  

RECOVER, ré-kuv'ér: "Recover" has (1) the transitive meaning of "to retrace" or "regain" (anything); (2) the intransitive sense of "to regain health" or "become well." In Jth 14 7 it means "restore to consciousness." In the former sense it is in the O.T. the tr. of ḫ̄ēr, nāqāp, "to snatch away" (Jgs 11 26, 1 S 30 8, 22; in Hos 2 9, RV "bluck away"); also of ḥārān, ḥālāh (Kal and Hiph. 1 S 30 19 AV; 2 S 8 3, etc), and of various other words in single instances. In 2 K 3 6.17, 11, "to restore to health" is ḥārān, ḥālāh. In its intransitive sense "recover" is chiefly the tr. of ṭōlāh, ṭētē, "to live," "revive" (2 K 1 2, etc; Isa. 38 9.21). "Recover" appears only twice in AV of the NT: Mc 18 18 (for kalhē haubat), and 2 Tim 2 26 (from ἀναθήματος, RVm "G the return to soberness"); but RV has "recover" for "do well" in Jn 11 12 (σωθήσαται; m "Gr be saved"). "Recovering" (of sight) (πάθειακας) occurs in Lk 4 18. W. L. WALKER  

REDE. See COLORS, (10).  

RED DRAGON. See REVELATION OF JOHN.  

RED HEIFER. See HEIFER, RED.  

RED HORSE. See HORSE, RED; REVELATION OF JOHN.  

REDE SAA (dókrēdē, mazkir; RVm [Ex 10 19 and often], by many passages it is simply ḥālāh, ḥārān, "the sea"); LXX with 2 or 3 exceptions renders it by ἡ ὑπάρχουσα ἡθάλασσα, ἡ ἅθλασα, ἡ ἅθλασα, the Red Sea; Lat geographers "Mar bleum":  

1. Name  
2. Peculiarities  
3. OT References  
4. Passages of, by Israelites  
5. Observations  
6. Streams Formed by the Water  
7. The East Winds  
8. The Miraculous Set Aside  

LITERATURE  

The Heb name ḥārēsh is given rise to much controversy. ḥārēsh is the general word for sea, and when standing alone may refer to the Mediterranean, the Dead Sea, the Red Sea, or the Sea of Galilee. In several places it des-  

RECORD.—See the works on NT Theology of W. H. Schmid, Stevens, etc; Denney, Death of Christ; arts on "Reconciliation" in DB, DCG, etc.  

ARCHIBALD M'CAIG  

RECORD, rek'ord, rek'erd (hen). (1) The Eng. word, where it occurs in the OT and the NT in the sense of testimony, is trd in RV "witness" (Dt 30 19; 31 28; Jn 1 19, 20; 13 14; Rom 10 2, etc). See Witness. But in Job 19 16 for AV "my record," RV "he that voucheth for me." (2) In Ex 4 15; 6 2 (dokhrán, díkrhón), and Est 6 1 (zikkhrón), the word denotes Pers state chronicles; of 1 Mace 14 23; 2 Mace 2 1.  

RECODER, ré-kôrdér (dókrēdē, mazkir; RVm "chronicler"). A high functionary in the court of the Jewish kings, part of whose duty seems to have been to chronicle the events of the reign, but who also occupied a position corresponding with that of the modern official of state. (2 Sm 8 16; 20 24; 1 Ch 15 15, etc.). His high rank is shown by his use of public faith and with other officers, he represented Hezekiah in speaking with Rabshakeh (2 K 18 18), and, in the reign of Josiah, superintended the repairs of the temple (2 Ch 34 8).  

RECOVER, ré-kuv'ér: "Recover" has (1) the transitive meaning of "to retrace" or "regain" (anything); (2) the intransitive sense of "to regain
Until in recent times it was discovered that the Gulf of Suez formerly extended 30 miles northward to the site of the present Ismailia and the ancient Pitom, the course of the Biblical Israelites was known only by the east wind mentioned in Scripture (Ex 14 21) to have opened a passage-way sufficiently wide to have permitted the host to have crossed over in a single night. The bar leading from Suez across, which is now a shoal, is 100 fathoms deep. An attempt to have furnished a passage-way as Robinson supposed (BR 1, 56–59). Besides, if the children of Israel were S. of the Bitter Lakes when there was no extension of the Gulf N. of its present limits, with swamps, and the top of simple clay without open stubble to hold the brick together (see Naville, "The Store-City Pitom and the Route of the Exodus," Egypt Exploration Fund, 1885; M. G. Kyle, "A Redetermination of Naville’s Works," Records of the Past, VIII, 1901, 304–7). The next day’s journey brought them to Suez, a station probably identical with Thath, close upon border line separating Egypt from Asia. Through the discoveries of Naville in 1883 this has been identified as Pitom, one of the store-cities built by Pharaoh in the Nile Delta during the time of Joseph, and the site of which was about 7 miles S. of the modern Suez (Ex 1 11). Here Naville uncovered vast store pits for holding grain, and the works which were constructed according to the description given in Ex 1: the lower portions of brick made with straw, the middle with mud, and the top of simple clay without open stubble to hold the brick together (see Naville, "The Store-City Pitom and the Route of the Exodus," Egypt Exploration Fund, 1885; M. G. Kyle, "A Redetermination of Naville’s Works," Records of the Past, VIII, 1901, 304–7). At this change of course Pharaoh was delighted, seeing that the children of Israel were "entangled in the land" and "the wilderness" had "shut them in" instead of issuing a flank movement upon them, Pharaoh’s army now followed them in the rear and overtook them, Pharaoh being on the sea beside Bithah-irbit, the location of which is essential to a proper understanding of this passage.

In ver 2 Phihahiroth, between Migdol and the sea, before Bial-zaphen (Ex 13 17; Nu 33 6–7). At this change of course Pharaoh was delighted, seeing that the children of Israel were "entangled in the land" and "the wilderness" had "shut them in" instead of issuing a flank movement upon them, Pharaoh’s army now followed them in the rear and overtook them, Pharaoh being on the sea beside Bithah-irbit, the location of which is essential to a proper understanding of this passage.

In ver 2 Phihahiroth, between Migdol and the sea, before Bial-zaphen (Ex 13 17; Nu 33 6–7). At this change of course Pharaoh was delighted, seeing that the children of Israel were "entangled in the land" and "the wilderness" had "shut them in" instead of issuing a flank movement upon them, Pharaoh’s army now followed them in the rear and overtook them, Pharaoh being on the sea beside Bithah-irbit, the location of which is essential to a proper understanding of this passage.
called Tiasr at E. of Lake Timnah, where there is a shrine at the present day, visited every year about July 14 by thousands of pilgrims to celebrate a religious festival; how Jerusalem existed were seeming reason to connect it with any sanctuary of the Canaanites. Dawson favors the general location which we have assigned to Pithom, but would place it beside the narrow southern portion of the Bitter Lakes.

Somewhere in this vicinity would be a most natural place for the children of Israel to halt, and there is no difficulty, such as Naville supposes, to their passing between Jebel Genefeh and the Bitter Lakes. The contour is low, and does not slope abruptly to the lake, but leaves ample space for the passage of a caravan, while the mountain on one side and the lake on the other would protect them from a flank movement by Pharaoh and limit his army to harassing the rear of the Israelite host. Protected thus, the Israelites found a wide plain over which they could spread their camp, and if we suppose them to be as far s. as Cheloof, every condition would be found to suit the narrative which follows. Moses was told by the Lord that in the third day of the children of Israel after they had passed through the Red Sea, the waters would be divided and the children of Israel could cross over on dry ground. And when, in compliance with the Divine command, Moses stretched out his hand over the sea, “Jehovah hearkened and did what was right with the sea all the night, and made the sea dry land, and the waters were divided. And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground: and the waters were a wall unto them on this right hand, and on that left hand.” And the Egyptians pursued, and went in after them into the midst of the sea, all Pharaoh’s horses, his chariots, and his horsemen” (Ex 14:21–30). But when the children of Israel were safely on the other side the waves returned and overwhelmed the entire host of Pharaoh. In the Song of Moses which follows, describing the event, it is said that the waters were piled up by the “blast of thy [God’s] nostrils” (Ex 15:8), and again ver 10, “Thou didst blow with thy wind, the sea covered them.” Thus the wind is mentioned as the means employed by God in opening the water. The competency of the wind temporarily to remove the water from the passage connecting the Gulf of Suez with the Bitter Lakes is clearly shown by the fact that it was only a wind of the sea, which is hourly and daily seen to rise in great force, and sometimes to be driven for miles inland. This effect is well illustrated by the following story of Captain Tucker, of the British army (Proc. Victoria Inst., XXVIII, 267–80) reports having witnessed the driving off of the water from Lake Marsehal by the wind, to such an extent as to lower the level 6 ft., thus leaving small vessels over the shallow water stranded for a while in the muddy bottom. According to the report of the Suez Canal Co., the difference between the highest and the lowest water at Suez is 10 ft. 7 in., all of which must be due to the effect of the wind, since the tides do not affect the Red Sea. The power of the wind to affect water levels is strikingly witnessed upon Lake Erie in the United States, where according to the report of the Deep Waterways Commission for 1896 (165, 168) it appears that strong wind from the S.W. sometimes lowers the water at Toledo, Ohio, on the western end of the lake to the extent of more than 7 ft., at the same time causing it to rise at Buffalo at the eastern end a similar amount; while the same wind and the wind during the time of a single storm reverses the effect, thus sometimes producing a change of level at either end of the lake of 14 ft., in the course of a single day. It would require far less than a tornado to lower the water at Cheloof to a level 10 ft. below normal, which is the level on which we have supposed at that time to separate Egypt from the Sinaitic Peninsula. See Exodus, the.

Several objections to this theory, however, have been urged which should not pass without notice.

1. Some have said that the children of Israel would have found an insuperable obstacle to their advance in the steep banks on either side of the supposed channel. But there were no steep banks to be encountered. A gentle slope to the center of the depression and a correspondingly gentle rise leads up on the other.

2. Much has also been made of the statement (Ex 14:22) that “the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand, and on their left hand.” Consider the rhetorical use of this word “wall” it presents no difficulty. In Prov 18:11 we are told that “The rich man’s wealth is his strong city, And as a high wall in his own imagination.” In Isa 26:1 we are told that God will appoint salvation “for walls and bulwarks.” Again Nahum (3:8) says of Egypt that her “rampart was the sea [in “the Nile”), and her wall was of the sea.” The water upon either side of the opening served the purpose of a wall for protection. There was no existence for the idea of a wall by a actual movement. Nor is there need of paying further attention to the poetical expressions in the Song of Moses, where among other things it is said “that the deeps were congealed in the heart of the sea,” and “the waters stood up as a heap.” (“the deeps were congealed in the heart of the sea, and the waters stood up as a heap.”) (3) Again it is objected that an east wind does not come from the right direction to produce the desired result. On the other hand it is an east wind only which could have freed the channel from water. A north wind would have blown the water from the Bitter Lakes southward, and owing to the quantity of water impounded would have increased the depth of the water in the narrow passage from the southern end of Suez. An east wind, however, would have pressed the water out from the channel both ways, and from the contour of the shore lines would be the only wind that could have done so. (4) Again, it is objected that this explanation destroys the miraculous character of the event. But it should be noted that little is said in the narrative about the miraculous. On the other hand, it is a straightforward statement of events, leaving their miraculous character to be inferred from their nature. On the explanation we have adopted we have to do with a phenomenon that calls a mediate miracle, that is, a miracle in which the hand of God is seen in the use of natural forces which it would be impossible for man to command. If anyone should say that this was a mere coincidental thing and that the east wind was at no other time that Moses reached the place of crossing, the answer is that such a coincidence could have been brought about only by supernatural agency. There was at that time no weather bureau to forecast the approach of a storm. There are no takes on the Red Sea with respect to ebb and flow. It was by a miracle of prophecy that Moses was emboldened to get his host into position to avail themselves of the temporary opportunity at exactly the right time. As to the relation of the Divine agency to the event, speculation is useless. The opening of the sea may have been a foreordained event in the course of Nature which God only foreknew, in which case the direct Divine agency was limited to those influences upon the human actors that led them to believe themselves where they could take advantage of the natural opportunity. Or, there is no a priori difficulty in supposing that the east wind was directly aroused for this occasion; for man himself produces disturbances among the forces of Nature which are as insuperable as any other. The east wind is a storm produced by direct Divine agency. But in this case the disturbance is at once seen to be beyond the powers of human agency to produce.
It remains to add an important word concerning the evidential value of this perfect adjustment of the narrative to the physical conditions involved. So perfect is this conformity of the narrative to the obscure physical conditions involved, which only recent investigations have made clear, that the account becomes self-verifying. There is not much need to invent a story so perfectly in accordance with the vast and complicated conditions involved. The argument is as strong as that for human design when a key is found to fit a Yale lock. This is not a general account which would fit into a variety of circumstances. It is not only one place in all the world, and one set of conditions in all history, which would meet the requirements; and here they are all met. This is scientific demonstration. No higher proof can be found in the inductive sciences. The story is true. It has not been remodeled by the imagination, either of the original writers or of the transcribers. It is not the product of mythological fancy or of legendary accretion.

REDEEEMER, re-dëm'er, REDEMPTION, re-dem'pshun (Heb. pârâh, "to tear loose," "to rescue," פָּרָה, pârâh, ἡν, gê'al; ἀφέω, agôrâ, refer-
ing to purchase, λυτρώματα, λυτρώματα, from λύτρον, λάτρων, an ransom).

1. Gradual Moralizing of Idea of Redemption
2. Redemption as Life in Individual
3. Redemption as Social
4. Redemption as Process
5. Moral Implications in Scriptural Idea of Redeemer
6. Epitomizations of Son of God as Redeemer

LITERATURE—Dawson, Egypt and Syria; Bull, Mt. Sinai as a Scientific Fount, From Pithom and the Route of the Exodus; Equip Exploration, 1906-1907; Wright, Science and the Records of the Past, 1901, 304-7; Wright, Scientific Confirmations of OT History, 83-117.

George Frederick Wright

The idea of redemption in the OT takes its start from the thought of property (Lev 25 26; Ruth 4 4 ff). Money is paid according to law to buy back something which must be delivered or rescued (Nu 3 51; Neh 5 8). From this start the word "redemption" throughout the OT is used in the general sense of deliverance. God is the Redeemer of Israel in the sense that He is the Deliverer of Israel (Dt 9 26; 2 7 23; 1 Ch 15 21; Isa 26 20). The words redemption and deliverance from all forms of evil lot, from national misfortune (Isa 52 9; 63 9; cf Lk 2 38), or from plague (Ps 78 35.52), or from calamity of any sort (Gen 46 16; Nu 25 4.9). Of course, the general thought of the relation of Israel to God was that God had both a claim upon Israel (Dt 16 15) and an obligation toward Israel (1 Ch 17 21; Ps 25 22). Israel belonged to Him, and it was by His own right that He could move into the life of Israel so as to redeem Israel. On the other hand, obligation was upon Him to redeem Israel.

In the NT the idea of redemption has more a suggestion of ransom. Men are held under the curse of the law (Gal 3 13), or of sin itself (Rom 7 24 f). The Redeemer purchases their deliverance by offering Himself as payment for their redemption (Eph 1 7; 1 Pet 1 18).

Throughout both the OT and the NT there is to be observed a gradual moralizing of the meaning of redemption. The same process of redemption meaning has continued throughout all the Christian ages. Starting with the idea of redemption price, conceived almost in material terms, religious thought has advanced to conceptions entirely spiritual and spiritual. Through the same process of redemption meaning has become more specific with the progress of Christian revelation. In the beginning God is the Redeemer from distresses of all kinds. He redeems from calamity and from sorrows. This general idea, of course, persists throughout the revelation and enters largely into our thinking of today, but the growing moral discernment of the Bib. writers comes to attach more and more importance to sin as the chief disturber of man’s welfare. We would not minimize the force of the Scriptural idea that God is the Deliverer from all misfortune to which man falls heir, but the Scriptural emphasis moves more and more to deliverance from sin. Paul states this deliverance as a deliverance from one strong long lasting repressing evil, but we must not conceive his idea in any artificial fashion. He would have men delivered not only from the law, but also from the consequences of evil doing and from the spirit of evil itself (Rom 8 2). 

In trying to discern the meaning of redemption from sin, toward which the entire progress of Bib. and Christian thought points, we may 2. REDEMPTION—well keep in mind the Master’s words on this very subject and the words of the Redeemer in individual life and might have it more abundantly (Jn 10 10). The word “life” seems to be the final NT word as a statement of the purpose of Christ. God sent His Son to bring men to this life (Jn 5 21). The word life is indeinite. Life means more at one period of the world’s history than at another. It has the advantage, nevertheless, of always being entirely intelligible in its essential significance. Our aim must be to keep this essential significance in mind and at the same time to provide for an increasing fullness and enlargement of human capacity and endeavor. The aim of redemption can only be to bring men to the fullest use and enjoyment of their powers. This is really the conception implicit even in the earliest statements of redemption. The man redeemed by money payment comes out of the prison to the light of day, or he comes out of slavery into freedom, or he is restored to his home and friends. The man under the law is redeemed from the burden and curse of the law. Paul speaks of his experience under the law as the experience of one chained to a dead body (Rom 7 24). Of course, relief from such bondage would mean life. In the more spiritualized sense of the NT, the evil in man’s heart is like a blight which paralyzes their higher activities (Jn 8 33-51).

In all redemption, as conceived of in Christian terms, there is a double element. There is first the deliverance from a curse—either a man or weights him down; redemption relieves him from this load. On the other hand, there is the positive movement of the soul thus relieved toward larger and fuller life. We have said that the Bib. emphasis is always upon deliverance from sin as the essential in redemption, but this deliverance is so essential that the life cannot progress in any of its normal activities until it is redeemed from evil. Accordingly in the Scriptural thought all manner of blessings follow deliverance. The man who seeks first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness finds all other things added unto him (Mt 6 33). Material, intellectual and social blessings follow as matters of course from the redemption of the inner spirit from evil. The aim of redemption, to beget in men’s hearts the will to do right, once the lie is found, leads men to seek successfully along all possible avenues for life. But, this, of course, does not mean that the redeemed life gives itself up to the cultivation of itself toward higher excellencies. It means that the redeemed life is a life of happiness in every form of selfishness. In the unselfish seeking of life for others the redeemed life finds its own greatest achievement and happiness (Mt 16 25).
3. Redemption. But as the redemption of the individual leads to large social transformations. It is impossible to strike out of the Scriptures the idea of a redeemed humanity. But humanity is not conceived of in general or class terms. The object of redemption is not humanity, or the human kind, or the masses. The object of redemption is rather men set in relation to each other as members of a family. But it would do violence to the Scriptural conception to conceive of the individual's relations in any narrow or restricted fashion (1 Cor 12:12-27).

An important enlargement of the idea of redemption in our own time has come as men have conceived of the redemption of individuals in their social relationships. Very often men have thought of redemption as a snatch from the perils of a world in itself absolutely wicked. Even the material environment of men has at times been regarded as containing something inherently evil. The thought of redemption which seems most in line with the moral ideal would seem to be that which brings the material and social forces within reach of individual wills. Paul speaks of the whole creation groaning and travailing in pain waiting for the revelation of the sons of God (Rom 8:22). This graphic figure sets before us the essentially Christian conception of the redemption of the forces in the midst of which men are placed. Those redeemed for the largest life, by the very force of their life, will seize all powers of the process of redemption, their own purposes. The seer saw a great multitude which no man could number, of every kindred and nation and tongue, shouting the joys of salvation (Rev 7:9), yet the implication nowhere appears that these were redeemed in any other fashion than by surrendering themselves to the forces of righteousness.

We have said that the aim of redemption is to bring men to the largest and fullest life. We have also said that "life" is a general term. We have also said that "life" is a general term. In various passages we would best say that the Process aim of redemption is to make men like Christ (Rom 8:9). Otherwise, it might be possible to use the word "life" so as to imply that the idea of life refers to a system of values which we mean by redemption. The idea of redemption, as a matter of fact, has been thus interpreted in various times in the history of Christian thinking. Life has been looked upon as sheer quantitative existence--the lower pleasures of sense being reckoned as about on the same plane with the higher. We can see the moral and spiritual anarchy which would thus be brought about. In Christ's words to His disciples He once used the expression "Ye are the salt of the earth.

"Ye are the salt of the earth which I have spoken unto you" (Jn 15:3). In this particular context the idea does not seem to be that of an external washing. Christ seems rather to mean that His disciples are cleansed as a vineyard is cleansed by pruning away some of the branches that others may bear fruit. In other words, the redemption of life is to be interpreted so that stress is laid upon the qualitative rather than the quantitative.

Christ indeed found place in His instructions and in His own life for the normal and healthy activities of Scriptural interpretation which we call the eclectic; He went to feasts and to weddings, but His emphasis was always upon life conceived of in the highest terms. We can say then that the aim of redemption is to beget in men life like that in Christ. Moreover, redemption must not be conceived of in such fashion as to do away with the need of response upon the part of the individual will. The literal suggestion of ransom in Scriptural teaching has to do with a man's deliverance, whether the man is willing to be delivered or not. Of course, the assumption in the mind of the Bib. writers was that any man in prison or in slavery or in sickness would be overjoyed at being redeemed; but in dealing with men whose lives are more or less always under some provocation. The dreadfulness of sin is largely in the love of sinning which sinning begets. Some thinkers have interpreted redemption to mean almost a seizing of men without regard to their own will. It is very easy to see how this conception arises. A man who himself hates sin may not stop to realize that some other men love sin. Redemption, to mean anything must touch this inner attitude of will. We cannot then hold to any idea of redemption which brings men under a cleansing process without the assent of their own wills. If we keep ourselves alive to the growing moral discernment which moves through the Scriptures, we must lay stress always upon redemption as a moral process. Not only must mankind beget a life in which they can do as men like Christ, but we must say also that the method of redemption must be the method of Christ, the method of appealing to the moral will. There is no Scriptural warrant for the idea that men are redeemed in the sense that we can get from the words of Christ is a statement of the persistence of God in His search for the lost: [He goeth] after that which is lost, until he finds it' (Lk 15.4).

Some would interpret these words to mean that the true Christian life is a recovery of something that has been brought into the kingdom. We cannot, in the light of the NT, limit the redeeming love of God; but we cannot, on the other hand, take passages from figurative expressions in such sense as to limit the freedom of men. The redemption must be conceived of as respecting the moral choices of men. In our thought of the Divine search for the control of inner human motive we must not stop short of the idea of men redeemed to the love of righteousness. Out of the plan of redemption as taught we have come away with the plan of redeeming men by merely relieving them of the consequences of their sins. Out of a changed life, of course, there must come changed consequences. But the Scriptural teaching is that the very faculties by which men are moral, the turning to life because of what life is.

Having thus attempted to determine, at least in outline, the content of the Christian idea of redemption, it remains for us to point out some implications as to the work of the Redeemer. Throughout the entire teaching on redemption in the Scriptures, redemption is set before us primarily as God's own affair (Jn 3:16). God redeems His people; He redeems them out of love for them. But the love of God is not to be conceived of as mere indulgence, partiality, or good-humored affection. The love of God rests down upon moral foundations. Throughout the Scriptures, therefore, we find implied often, if not always clearly stated, the idea that God is under obligations to redeem His people. The progress of later thinking has expanded this implication with fairness of moral discernment. We have come to see the obligations of power. The more powerful the man the heavier his obligations in the discharge of this power. This is a genuinely Christian concept which we do not apply to the character of God, feeling confident that we are in line with Scriptural teaching. Hence we may put the obligations of God somewhat as follows: God is the most obligated being in the uni-
verse. If a man is under heavy obligations to use aright the power of controlling the forces already at work in the world, how much heavier must be the obligations on the Creator who started these forces! The obligation becomes appalling to our human thought, and any voice that inclines to calling of human beings into existence and endowing them with the unsolicited boon of freedom. Men are not in the world of their own choice. Vast masses of them seem to be here as the outworking of a blind, infinite and unchangeable will. The shading of men make it very easy for them to sin. The tendencies which at least seem to be innate are too often tragically inclined toward evil. Men, seen, of themselves, utterly inadequate for their own redemption; by itself, there to be redemption it must come from God, and the Christian thought of a moral God would seem to include the obligation on the part of God to redeem those whom He has sent into the world. Christ has made clear forever the absolutely binding nature of moral considerations. If the obligation to redeem men meant everything to Christ, it must also mean everything to the God of Christ. So we feel in line with true Christian thinking in the doctrine that redemption comes first as a discharge of the obligations on the part of God Himself.

If we look for the common thought in all the Christian statements of God's part in redemption we find it in this: that in all these statements God is conceived of as doing all. He can do for the redemption of men; He can give the redemption of men. In earlier times men conceived of the human race as under the dominion of Satan, and of Satan as the fiend by the deliverance of man and therefore entitled to some compensation, they also conceived of God Himself as paying the ransom to Satan. If they thought of God as a feudal lord whose dignity had been offended by sin, they felt that He paid the cost of this offended dignity. If their idea was that a substitute for sinners must be furnished, the idea included the thought of God Himself as paying the ransom to Satan. If they conceived of the universe as a vast system of moral laws—beings whose dignity must be upheld, they thought of God Himself as providing the means for maintaining the dignity of the laws. If they conceived of men as saved by a vast moral influence set at work, they thought of this influence as proceeding, not from man, but from God. The common thought in theories of redemption then, so far as concerns God's part, is that God Himself takes the initiative and does all He can in the direction upon which He has set His face. Each phrasing of the doctrine of redemption is the attempt of an age to express the idea that God has done all that He can for men.

It is from this standpoint that we must approach the part played by Christ in redemption. This is not the place for an attempt at formal demonstration of this. Some have thought to find such a statement in the conception that Christ is a prophet. They would empty the expression, "Son of God," of any unique meaning; they would make Christ the Son of God in the same sense that any great prophet could be conceived of as Son of God. Of course, we would not minimize the teaching of the Scripture as to the full humanity of Christ, and yet we may be permitted to voice our belief that the representation of Christ as the Redeemer merely in the same sense in which a prophet is a redeemer does not do justice to the Scripture teaching; and we feel, too, that such a solution of the problem of Christ would be inadequate for the practical task of redemption. If Christ is just a prophet giving us His teaching we rejoice in the teaching, but we feel constrained to ask how to make the teaching effective. If it be urged that Christ is a prophet who in Himself realized the moral ideal, we feel constrained to reply that this really puts Christ at a vast distance from us. Such a doctrine of Christ's person would make Him the supreme religious genius, but the human genius stands apart from the ordinary mass of men. He may gather up into Himself and realize the ideals of men; He may draw men to His ideal as a magnet draws iron; He may be the perfection of man's aspirations; but He may not be able to make men like unto Himself. Shakespeare is a consummate literary genius. He has said once and for all many things which the common man thinks or half thinks. When the common man comes upon a phrase of Shakespeare he feels that Shakespeare has said for all time the things which he himself have said if he had been able. But the appreciation of Shakespeare does not make the ordinary man like Shakespeare; the appreciation of Christ has not proved successful in itself in making men like unto Christ.

If, on the contrary, without attempting formal theological construction, we put some real meaning into the idea of Christ as the Son of God and hold fast to a unique relationship between Christ and God which makes Christ the greatest gift that God can give us, we find indeed that Christ is lifted up to essentially Divine existence; but we find also that this divinity does not estrange Him from us. Redemption, it seems feasible, we may have a revelation of how far up man can go, but when we have also a revelation of how far down God can come. If we can think of God as having in some real way come into the world through His Son Jesus Christ, that revelation makes Christ the Lord who can lead us to redemption.

Such a conception furnishes the dynamic which we must have in any real process of redemption. We need not only the idea, but we need power by which to realize the idea. If the entire universe is under the sway of a moral God, a God who is under obligations to bear the burdens of men, and who willingly assumes these obligations, we really feel that moral life at its fullest and best is the greatest fact in the universe. Moreover, we must be true to the Scriptures and lift the entire conception of redemption beyond the realm of conscience to the realm of the heart. What the conscience of God calls for, the love of God willingly fulfills. The Cross of Christ stands as the revelation of the righteousness of God and the love of God. Power is thus put back of human conscience and human love to move forward toward redemption (Rom 8:35-39).

The aim and elements of redemption in Christ then is to lift men out of death toward life. The mind is to be quickened by the revelation of the true ideals of human life. The conscience is to be reinforced by the revelation of the moral God who carries on all things in the interests of righteousness. The heart is to be stirred and won by the revelation of the love which sends an only begotten Son to the cross for our redemption. And we must take the work of Christ, not as a solitary incident or a mere historic event, but as a great movement of the world which has been at work from the beginning and works forever. The Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world (Rev 13:8); the spirit of God revealed in the cross of Christ is the same yesterday, today, and forever. We have in the cross a revelation of holy love which, in a sense, overpowers and at the same time encourages. The cross is the revelation of the length to which God is willing to go in redemption rather than set aside one jot or tittle of His moral law. He will not redeem men only to forgive, but to save them. He will not overwhelm them in any such manner as to do away with their power of free choice. He will show men His own feeling of holiness and love. In the name of a holy love which they can forever
aspire after, but which they can never fully reach, men call to Him for forgiveness and that forgiveness men find forever available.

It remains to add one further item of Scriptural teaching, namely that redemption is a continuous process. If we may again use the word “life,” which has been the key to this discussion, we may say that the aim of redemption is to make men progressively alive. There are not limits to the development of human powers touched by the redemptive processes of God. The cross is a revelation of Divine willingness to bear with men who are forever being redeemed. Of course, we speak of the redeemed man as redeemed once and for all. By this we mean that he is redeemed once and for all in being faced about and started in a right direction, but the progress toward full life may be faster or slower according to the man and the circumstances in the midst of which he is placed. Still the chief fact is the direction in which the man is moving. The revelation of God who aids in redemption is of the God who takes the direction as the chief fact rather than the length of the stride or the rate of the movement. Every man is expected to do his best. If he stumbles he is supposed to find his way to his feet; if he is moving slowly, he must attempt to move faster; if he is moving at a slower rate than he can attain, he must strive after the higher rate, but always the dynamic force is the revelation of the holy love of God.

The Scriptures honor the prophets in whatever land or time they appear. The Scriptures welcome goodness under any and all circumstances. They have a place for a “light that lighteneth every man that cometh into the world,” but they still make it clear that the chief force in the redemption of men is the revelation of holy love in Jesus Christ. The redemption, we repeat, is never conceived of in artificial or mechanical terms. If any man hath not the spirit of Christ he does not belong to Christ (Rom 8 9). The aim of redemption is to beget this spirit, and this spirit is life.

Literature:—H. C. Sheldon, Systematic Theology; Clarke, Outline of Christian Theology; Brown, Christian Theology in Outline; Mackintosh, Doctrine of Person of Christ; Bowne, Studies in Christian Doctrine; Tyman, The Christian Atonement.

Francis J. McConnell

Redness, red’ness, of eyes. See drunkenness, II.

Redound, re-dound’ (from re, “back,” and undare, “to surge as a wave’’): To be sent back as a reaction, to overflow; occurs only as the tr of περισσών, perissóidó, “to be over and above,” “to superabound” (frequent in the NT); in 2 Cor 4 15, “might through the thanksgiving of many redound to the glory of God,” RV “may cause the thanksgiving to abound.”

Red, réd: (1) ἱλικία, ἱλίκα, tr4 “reed-grass” (Gen 41 218; Job 8 11 m). See Flag. (2) ἰλίθιος, ἰλίθι, tr4 “swift,” m “reed!” (Job 9 26). The “ships of red” are the light skiffs made of plated reeds used on the Nile; cf “vessels of papyrus” (Isa 18 29). (3) ἱλικιον, ἱλικιον, tr4 “reeds,” m “marshes,” Heb “pools” (Jer 51 32); elsewhere “pools” (Ex 7 19; 8 5; Isa 14 23, etc). See Pools. (4) ἱλιαῖος, ἱλιαί, tr4 “meadows,” AV “paper reeds” (Isa 19 7). See Meadows. (5) ἰλική, ἰλική, ἱλικός, ἱλικός, (the Eng. “canes” comes from Heb. ve-laye and Gr. kannos), “stalk,” “stalk” (Gen 41 522); “shaft” (Ex 37 17, etc); “reed,” or “reeds,” (I K 14 15; 2 K 18 21; Isa 36 6; 42 3; Ps 88 30, AV “spearman”); “calamus” (Ex 30 23; Cant 4 14; Ezk 27 19); “sweet cane,” m “calamus” (Isa 43 24; Jer 6 20); “bone” (Job 31 22); used of the cross-beam of a “balance” (Isa 46 6); “a measuring reed” (Ezk 40 3); “a staff of reed,” i.e. a walking-stick (Isa 36 6; Ezk 29 6); the “branches” of a candlestick (Ex 37 18). (6) κάλαμος, κάλαμος, “a reed shaken with the wind” (Mt 11 7; Lk 7 24); “a bruised reed” (Mt 12 20); they put “a reed in his right hand” (Mt 27 29.30); “They smote his head with a reed” (Mk 15 19); “put it on a reed” (Mt 27 45; Mk 15 36); “a measuring reed” (Rev 11 1; 21 15.16); “a pen” (3 Jn ver 13).

It is clear that kāneh and its Gr equivalent kalamos mean many things. Some refer to different uses to which a reed is put, e.g. a cross-beam of a balance, a walking-stick, a measuring rod, and a pen (see above), but apart from this kāneh is a word used for at least two essentially different things: (1) an ordinary reed, and (2) some sweet-smelling substance.

Red (Arundo donax).

(1) The most common reed in Pal is the Arundo donax (N.O. Gramineae), known in Arab. as kāshafarasi, “Persion reed.” It grows in immense quantities in the Jordan valley along the river and its tributaries and at the oases near the Dead Sea, notably around Ain Pezghibah at the northwest corner. It is a lofty reed, often 20 ft. high, of a beautiful fresh green in summer when all else is dead and dry, and of a fine appearance from a distance in the spring months when it is in full bloom and the beautiful silky panicles crown the top of every reed. The “covert of the reed” (Job 40 21) shelters a large amount of animal and bird life. This reed will answer to almost all the requirements of the above references.

(2) Kāneh occurs in Jer 6 20 qualified בְּנֵית נַר, kāneh ha-foh, “sweet” or “pleasant cane,” and in Ex 30 23, בֵּית נַר, krūth bhōns, “sweet calamus,” or, better, a “cane of fragrance.” Cant 4 14; Isa 43 21; Ezk 27 19 all apparently refer to the same thing, though in these passages the kāneh is unqualified. It was an ingredient of the holy oil (Ex 30 23); it was imported from a distance (Jer 6 20);
The resulting lead oxide, called in the Bible silver dross, was used for glazing pottery (Prov 26:23), a use to which it is still put by Syrian potters. The description of refining in Ezk 22:22-25 indicates that a flux (of "as with lye," Isa 1:25 AV) was sometimes added to the melted metal to dissolve the oxides of copper, lead, tin and iron as they formed, thus leaving the silver pure. Crude processes similar to those described above are used in the Taurus Mountains today.

Figurative: In the various Bible references the refining of precious metals is used figur. to illustrate the kind of trial God's children are called upon to go through. If they are of the right metal the dross will finally be blown away, leaving pure, clear, shining silver. If of base metal they will be like the dross described in Jer 6:29.30. The refiner may blow more fiercely, but in vain, for nothing but lead dross appears.

James A. Patch

REFORM, re-form' (θέραμα, yāsar): The word in RV is found only in Lev 26:23, in the phrase "ye will not be reformed." The meaning is, "to be instructed," or, more fully, "to let one's self be chastened." It is a word by church.

JAMES ORR

REFORMATION, re-or-mā'shun: The word is found only in He 9 10, being the tr of σκόπος, diathesis, in its only occurrence. This Gr word means etymologically "making straight," and was used of restoring to the normally straight condition that which is crooked or bent. In this passage it means the rectification of conditions, setting things to rights, and it is a description of the Messianic time.

REFRESH, re-fresh', REFRESHING, re-fresh'-ing: "Refresh" occurs a few times in the OT as the tr of דחמ, nāḇaš, "to take breath," figurative "to be refreshed" (Ex 23 12; 31 17; 2 S 16 14); of יבש, rēḇāy, "to have room" (1 S 16 23; Job 32 20, m "find relief," AV "may breathe"); of יבש, yāʾada, "to support" (1 K 13 7); and in the NT as the tr of σκόπος, anapēsō, "to give rest" (1 Cor 16 18; 2 Cor 7 13; 1 Th 5 24; 2 Th 3 13; 1 Cor 16 13 32 AV); in compound words from it: οἰκονομία, oikonomia, "to invigorate," "revive" (2 Tim 1 10), and other words. "Refreshing" is in Isa 28 12 marg'oth, "rest" or "quiet;" and in Acts 3 19, ἀναφέρομαι, and πορεύομαι, "seasons of refreshing," through the coming of Jesus, the Christ; cf 2 Ed 11 46 and Av Sir 43 22 (דָּשָׁב). W. L. WALKER

REFUGE, re-fūj': A place of resort and safety. The principal words in the OT are דַּשָּׁב, dāshāv, and יָדָח, yāḏāh. The last appears in Deut 33 27, and in Ps 9 9, "high tower." Conversely, RV "has refuge" for AV "shelter" in Ps 61 3, and "hope" in Jer 17 17.

REFUGE, CITIES OF (דַּשָּׁב, dāshāv, "are ha-mīb- lāt;" πόλεις τῶν φυλακῶν, poleis tôn phylakew- terion [cf 1 Macc 10 28], and other

1. Location forms: Six cities, three on each side of Jordan, were placed in the hands of the Levites, to serve as places of asylum for such as might shed blood unwittingly. On the
Refuse
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E. of the Jordan they were Bezer, Ramoth-gilead in the tribe of Gad, and Golan in the territory of Manasseh. On the W. of the Jordan they were Hebron in Judah, Shechem in Mt. Ephraim, and Kedesh in Naphtali (Nu 35 6, 14; Josh 20 27 ff.; 21 13.21.27.32.38; Bezer is named in ver 36, but not described as a City of Refuge). An account of these cities is given in separate arts. under their names. Dt 19 2 speaks of three cities thus to be set apart, referring apparently to the land W. of the Jordan.

From time immemorial in the East, if a man were slain the duty of avenging him has lain as a sacred obligation upon his nearest relative.

2. Purpose

In districts where more primitive conditions prevail, even to this day, the distinction between intentional and unintentional killing is not too strictly observed, and men are often done to death in revenge for what was the purest accident. To prevent such a thing where possible, and to provide for a right administration of justice, these cities were instituted. Open highways were to be maintained along which the manslayer might have an unobstructed course to the city gate.

The regulations concerning the Cities of Refuge are found in Nu 35; Dt 19 1-13; Josh 20. Briefly, everything was to be done to facilitate the flight of the manslayer, lest the nearest of kin, who had purposed his death, should overtake him, and, overtaking him, should slay him mortally. On reaching the city he was to be received by the elders and his case heard. If this was satisfactory, they would give all care and protection until trial could be carried out. They took him, apparently, to the city or district from which he had fled, and there, among those who knew him, witnesses were examined. If it were proved that he was not a willful slayer, that he had no grudge against the person killed, and had shown no sign of purpose to injure him, then he was declared innocent and conducted back to the city in which he had taken refuge, where he must stay until the death of the high priest. Then he was free to return home in safety. Until that event he must on no account go beyond the city boundaries. If he did, the avenger of blood might slay him without blame. On the other hand, if he were found guilty of delicto, and it were proved that no protection was given, he was handed over to the avenger of blood, who, with his own hand, took the murderer's life. Blood-money, i.e. money paid in compensation for the murder, in settlement of the avenger's claim, was in no circumstances permitted; nor could the refugee be ransomed, so that he might "come again to dwell in the land" until the death of the high priest (Nu 35 32).

A similar right of refuge seems to have been recognised in Israel as attaching to the altar in the temple at Jerusalem (1 K 1 50; 2 28; cf Ex 31 12 f.). This may be compared with the right of asylum connected with the temples of the heathen. W. Ewing

"convict," has the powerful support of A.C. the best critics. Vulg. Memphitic. Armenian and Ephraimi. Vis and is placed in the text by Lachmann. Tischendorf and Fregellius (WH in list of "Suspected Readings": "Some primitive error perhaps; perhaps the first clause of an interpolation"). Cf mark 15, where the same Gr word occurs in the same sense (Av. "convict"); cf also 1 Tim 2 10; Tit 1 9, where the same idea of refuting the sinful occurs.

D. M. ALLIARDS

REDEMPTION, ré-gém (G5157, regem, "friend" [?] A Calebite, son of Jahdai (1 Ch 2 47), mentioned as the eponym of a Calebite family or clan.

REDEMPTION MELECH, ré-gém-me-lék, -melek (G5397, regem melekh): One of a deputation sent to inquire concerning the propriety of continuing the commemoration of the destruction of the temple by holding a fast (Zec 7 2). The text of the passage is in disorder. The name may mean "friend of the king." hence some have sought to remove the difficulty by interpreting regem melekh as a title, a personal name, "befriended," "of the king.
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I. The Term Explained.

The theological term "regeneration" is the Lat. tr. of the Gr expression παλαίγενεσις, palingenesia, occurring twice in the NT (Mt 19 28; Tit 3 5). The word is usually written παλαίγενεσις, palingenesia, in classical Gr. Its meaning is different in the two passages, though an easy transition of thought is evident.

In Mt 19 28 the word refers to the restoration of the world, in which sense it is synonymous to the expressions ἀποκατάστασις πάντων, "restoration of all things" (Acts 3 21; the vb. is ἀποκαταστάνω, apokatastano, "to restore all things"), and ἄφεςτος, ἀποκαταστάσις, ἀφιέρωσις, "to make purification, consecrate, dedicate," which signifies a gradual transition of meaning to the second sense of the word under consideration. It is supposed that regeneration in this sense denotes the final stage of development of all creation, by which God's purposes regarding the same are fully realized, when "all things are put in subject under his feet" (1 Cor 15 27). This is a "regeneration in the proper meaning of the word, for it signifies a renovation of all visible things when the old is passed away, and heaven and earth become new" (cf Rev 21 1). To the Jew the regeneration thus prophesied was inseparably connected with the reign of the Messiah.

We find this word in the same or very similar senses in profane literature. It is used of the renewal of the world in Stoical philosophy. Jos (Ant. XI. il. 9) speaks of the ανακαίνεσις τοῦ παλαιοῦ πάντων, "a new foundation and regeneration of the fatherland," after the return from the Bab captivity. Philo (ed. Manger, I. 144) uses the same expression, pointing of the past and the future of the earth, as of a new world, and Marcus Aurelius Antoninus (IX. 1, of a periodical restoration of all things, laying stress upon the constant recurrence and uniformity of all happenings, which thought the Preacher expressed by the "there is nothing new under the sun." There is no transition of meaning under the same circumstances. In the philosophical, literary, and Pythagorean doctrine of the transmigration of souls (Plut., ed. Xylander, f. 99 a; Clem. Alex., ed. Potter, 185) or else of a revival of life (Philob. 1139). Cleve uses
the word in his letters to Atticus (vi.6) metaphorically of his own nature from a new exile of life granted to him. See Ecclesiastes of the NT, ix.

This sense is undoubtedly included in the full Bib. conception of the former meaning, for it is unthinkable that a regeneration in the eschatological sense can exist without a spiritual regeneration of humanity toward the heart. It is, however, quite evident that this latter conception has arisen rather late, from an analysis of the former meaning. It is found in Tit 3:5 which, without absolute certainty as to its meaning, is here interpreted in agreement with the numerous nuns and v.s. which have given the dogmatical setting to the doctrine of regeneration in Christian theology. Clem. Alex. is the first to differentiate this meaning from the former by the addition of the adj. pneumatikos, pneumatic, "spiritual" (cf. anapanasis, Acts 3:20; see REFRESHING). In this latter sense the word is typically Christian, though the OT contains many allusions of the spiritual process expressed thereby.

II. The Biblical Doctrine of Regeneration

1. In the OT

It is well known that the earlier part of the OT, and to a certain degree all through the OT, religion is looked at and spoken of more as a national possession, the benefits of which are largely visible and tangible. The idea of regeneration here occurs therefore—though no technical expression has as yet been coined for the process—in the first meaning of the word elucidated above. Whether the Divine promises refer to the Messianic end of times, or are to be realized at an earlier date, they all refer to the nation of Israel as such, and to individuals only as far as they are partakers in the benefits bestowed upon the commonwealth. This is even true where the blessings prophesied are only spiritual, as in Isa. 60:21,22. The mass of the people of Israel are therefore as yet scarcely aware of the fact that the conditions on which these Divine promises are to be attained are more than ceremonial and ritual ones. Soon, however, great disasters, threatening to overthrow the national entity, and finally the captivity and dispersion which caused national functions to be almost, if not altogether, discontinued, assisted in the growth of a sense of individual or personal responsibility before God. The sin of Israel is now looked at as the sin of the individual, which can be removed only by individual repentance and cleansing. This is best seen from the stirring appeals of the prophets of the exile, where frequently the necessity of a change of attitude toward Jeh is preached as a means to such regeneration. This cannot be understood otherwise than as a turning of the individual to the Lord. Here, too, no ceremony or sacrifice is sufficient, but an interposition of Divine grace, which is represented under the figure of a water, as from all iniquity and sin (Isa. 1:18; Jer 13:23). It is not possible now to follow in full the development of this idea of cleansing, but already in Isa. 62:15 the sprinkling of many nations is mentioned and is soon understood in the sense of the "baptism" which is to come upon them before their reception into the covenant of Israel. It was the symbol of a radical cleansing like that of a "new-born babe," which was one of the designations of the proselyte (cf. Ps 87:5; see also the tractate Yib haHokmah). Would it be surprising if Israel, which had been guilty of many acts of the Gentiles, needed a similar baptism and sprinkling? This is what Ezek. 36:25 suggests: "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you." In other passages the cleansing and refining power of fire is alluded to (e.g. Mal 3:2), and there is no doubt that John the Baptist found in such passages the ground for his practice of baptizing the Jews who came to him (Mt. 3:2-28).

The turning of Israel to God was necessarily meant to be an inward change of attitude toward Him, in other words, the sprinkling with clean water, as an outward sign, was the emblem of a pure heart. It was Isaiah and Jeremiah who drew attention to this (Isa. 57:15; Jer 24:7; 31:33-35; 32:38-40, et passim). Here again reference is made to individuals, not only to the people in general (Jer 31:34). This promised regeneration, so lovingly offered by Je, is to be found between God and His people (Jer 31:31; Ezek. 11:19-21; 18:31;32; 37:23-24).

The renewing and cleansing here spoken of is in reality nothing else than what Dt 30:6 had promised, a circumcision of the heart in contradistinction to the flesh, the token of the former (Abrahamic) covenant (of circumcision, Jer 4:4). As God takes the initiative in making the covenant, the conviction that root human sin and depravity can be effectually eliminated only by the act of God Himself renewing and purifying the heart of the man of heart (Hos 14:4). This we see from the testimony of some of Israel's best sons and daughters, who also knew that this grace was found in the way of repentance and humiliation before God. The elucimation of this conviction is found in the prayer of David: "Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right (in "steiffast") spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy holy Spirit from me. Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation, and uphold me with a willing spirit" (Ps 51:10-12). Jeremiah puts the following words into the mouth of Ephraim: "Turn thou me, and I shall be turned" (Jer 31:18). Clearer than any passages of the OT, John the Baptist, forerunner of Christ and last blazing torch of the time of the earlier covenant, spoke of the baptism, not of water, but of the Holy Spirit and of fire (Mt. 3:11; Lk. 3:16; Jn. 1:33), leading thus to the realization of OT foreshadowings which became possible by faith in Christ.

In the teaching of Jesus the need of regeneration has a prominent place, though nowhere are the reasons given. The OT had succeeded and overthrown—under conscience agreed with it—in convincing the people of this need. The clearest assertion of it and the explanation of the doctrine of regeneration is found in the conversation of Jesus with Nicodemus (Jo. 3). It is based upon (1) the observation that man, even the most pugnacious in the observance of the Law, is dead and therefore unable to "live up" to the demands of God. Only He who gave life at the beginning can give the (spiritual) life necessary to do God's will. (2) Man has fallen from his virginal and Divinely appointed sphere, the realm of the spirit, the Kingdom of God, living now the perishing earthly life. Only by having a new spiritual nature imparted to him, by being "born anew" (Jn. 3:3), Rvm. "from above," Gr. ápou, from above), by being "born of the Spirit" (3:6,8), can he live the spiritual life which God requires of man.

These words are a NT exegesis of Ezekiel's vision of the dead bones (37:1-10). It is the "breath from Je," the Spirit of God, who alone can give life to the spiritually dead.

But regeneration, according to Jesus, is more than life, it is also purity. As God is pure and sinless, none but the pure in heart can see God (Mt 5:8). This is always reasserted as a new and more human endeavor. Bilhadi the Shuhite declared, and his friends, each in his turn, expressed
very similar thoughts (Job 4:17; 14:4): "How then can man live with God? Or how can he clean that is born of a woman? Behold, even the moon hath no brightness, and the stars are not pure in his sight: how much less man, that is a worm! and the son of man, that is a worm?" (26:4–6).

To change this lost condition, to impart this new life, Jesus claims as His God-appointed task: "The Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost" (Lk 19:10); "I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly" (Jn 10:10). This life is eternal, imperishable: "I give unto them eternal life; and they shall abide in me, and I in them." (Jn 10:28). This life is imparted by Jesus Himself: "It is the spirit that giveth life; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life." (Jn 6:63). This life can be received on the condition of faith in Christ or by coming to Him (Jn 14:6). By faith power is received which enables the sinner to overcome sin, to "sin no more" (Jn 8:11).

The parables of Jesus further illustrate this doctrine. The prodigal is declared to have been "dead" and to be "alive again" (Lk 15:24). This new life from God is compared to a wedding garment in the parable of the Marriage of the King's Son (Mt 22:11). The garment may have been refused by the unhappy guest, who, in consequence, was "cast out into the outer darkness" (Mt 22:13).

Finally, this regeneration, this new life, is expressed in the knowledge of God and His Christ: "And this is life eternal, that they may know thee the only true God, and thee whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ." (Jn 17:3). This seems to be an allusion to the passage in Hos (4:6): "My people are destroyed through want of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me." It may be said in general that the teaching of the apostles on the subject of regeneration is a development of the teaching of Jesus on the lines of the adumbrations of the OT.

3. In Apostolic Teaching

Considering the differences in the personal character of these writers, it is remarkable that such concord of views should exist. There is a more stress on the specific facts of justification and sanctification by faith than on the more comprehensive head of regeneration. Still the need of it is plainly stated by St. Paul. It is necessary to "save all men, that they might taste the goodness of the 'new life'" (Rom 8:3–11; Eph 2:1). The flesh is at enmity with God (Eph 2:15); all mankind is "darkened in their understanding, alienated from the life of God." (4:18). Similar passages might be multiplied. Paul then distinctly teaches that this is a new life in store for those who have been spiritually dead. To the Ephesians he writes: "And you did he make alive, when you were dead through your trespasses and sins" (2:1), and later on: "God, being rich in mercy, for his sake made us alive together with Christ" (2:4,5). A spiritual resurrection has taken place. This regeneration causes a complete revolution in man. He has thereby passed from under the law of sin and death and has come under "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus!" (Rom 8:2).

The change is so radical that it is possible now to speak of a "new creature" (2 Cor 5:17; Gal 6:15, "new creation"), of a "new man," that after God had been created in righteousness and holiness with infallible power (Eph 2:22). The new man, then, being renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him" (Col 3:10). All "old things are passed away: behold, they are become new" (2 Cor 5:17).

St. Paul is equally explicit regarding the authority of this change. He says, "The Spirit of Christ" has been given from above to be the source of all new life (Rom 8); by Him we are proved to be the "sons" of God (Gal 4:6); we have been adopted into the family of God (viviparia, huiostheia, Rom 8:15; Gal 4:5). Thus St. Paul speaks of the "second Adam," by whom the life of righteousness is initiated in us; just as the "first Adam" became the leader in transgression, He is "a life-giving spirit" (1 Cor 15:45). St. Paul himself experienced this change, and henceforth expounds the benefits of the new life in his life of service. "It is no longer I that live," he exclaims, "but Christ liveth in me: and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me:" (Gal 2:20).

Regeneration is to St. Paul, no less than to Jesus, connected with the conception of purity and knowledge. We have already noted the second NT passage in which the word "regeneration" occurs (Tit 3:5): "According to his mercy he saved us, through the washing [in 'layer'] of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he poured out upon us richly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour," (Tit 3:5). In 1 Cor 12:13 such cleansing is called the "baptism of the Spirit," and the repeated promise (Job 2:28 [in the Heb text 3:1]; Mt 3:11; Mk 1:8; Lk 3:16; Acts 1:5; 11:16). There is, of course, in these passages no reference to mere water-baptism, any more than in Ezek 36:25. Water cleanseth the outer body, so the spirit purifieth the inner man (cf 1 Cor 6:11; 1 Pet 3:21).

The doctrine that regeneration redounds in true knowledge of Christ is seen from Eph 3:15–19 and 4:17–24, where the lack of knowledge, ignorance of natural man are placed in contradistinction to the enlightenment of the new life (see also Col 3:10). The church redeemed and regenerated is to be a special "possessions," an "heritage" of the Lord (Eph 1:11,18), and the whole creation is to participate in the final redemption and a doption (Rom 8:21–23).

St. James finds less occasion to touch this subject than the other writers of the NT. His Ep. is rather ethical than dogmatical. Indeed, he lays more stress on the specific facts of justification and sanctification by faith than on the more comprehensive head of regeneration. Still the need of it is plainly stated by St. Paul. It is necessary to "save all men, that they might taste the goodness of the 'new life'" (Rom 8:3–11; Eph 2:1). The flesh is at enmity with God (Eph 2:15); all mankind is "darkened in their understanding, alienated from the life of God." (4:18). Similar passages might be multiplied. Paul then distinctly teaches that this is a new life in store for those who have been spiritually dead. To the Ephesians he writes: "And you did he make alive, when you were dead through your trespasses and sins" (2:1), and later on: "God, being rich in mercy, for his sake made us alive together with Christ" (2:4,5). A spiritual resurrection has taken place. This regeneration causes a complete revolution in man. He has thereby passed from under the law of sin and death and has come under "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus!" (Rom 8:2).

The change is so radical that it is possible now to speak of a "new creature" (2 Cor 5:17; Gal 6:15, "new creation"), of a "new man," that after God had been created in righteousness and holiness with infallible power (Eph 2:22). The new man, then, being renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him" (Col 3:10). All "old things are passed away: behold, they are become new" (2 Cor 5:17).
pletion of God's plans concerning the whole creation, and accordingly looks here at God's people as a whole. In a similar sense he says in his Second Ep., after mentioning "the day of God": "We look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Pet 3 13). Still he alludes very plainly to the regeneration of individuals (1 Pet 1 23). The idea of a second birth of the believers is clearly suggested in the expression, "newborn babe" (1 Pet 2 2), and in the explicit statement of 1 Pet 1 23: "Having been begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the word of God, which liveth and abideth." It is in this sense that the apostle calls God "Father" (1 17) and the believers "children of obedience" (1 14), i.e. obedient children, or children who ought to obey. We have seen above that the agent by which regeneration is wrought, the incorruptible seed of the word of God, finds a parallel in St. Paul's and St. James's theology. All these expressions go back probably to a word of the Master in Jn 3 5-8. We are made partakers of the word by having received the spirit. This spirit (cf. the Pauline "life-giving spirit," 1 Cor 15 45), the "mind" of Christ (1 Pet 4 1), is the power of the resurrected Christ active in the life of the believer. Peter refers to the same thought in 1 Pet 3 15-21. By regeneration we become "an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession," in whom Divine virtues, the excellencies of him who called you" (1 Pet 2 9), are manifested. Here the apostle uses well-known OT expressions foreshadowing NT graces (Isa 61 6; 66 21; Ex 19 6; Dt 7 6), but he individualizes the process of regeneration in full agreement with the increased light which the teaching of Jesus has brought. The theology of St. Peter also puts out the concept of regeneration with purity and holiness (1 Pet 1 15.16) and true knowledge (1 14) or obedience (1 14; 3 16). It is not surprising that the idea of purity should invite the OT parallel of "cleansing by water." The flood washed away the iniquity of the world "in the days of Noah," when "eight souls were saved through water"; which also with a true likeness (RVm "in the antitype") doth now save you, even baptism, not the putting away of the old man of sin (RVm "inquiry," "appeal") of a good conscience toward God, through the resurrection [-life] of Jesus Christ! (1 Pet 3 20.21).

The teaching of St. John is very closely allied with that of Jesus, as we have already seen from the multitude of quotations we had to select from St. John's Gospel to illustrate the teaching of the Master. It is esp. interesting to note the cases where the apostle didactically elucidates certain of these pronouncements of Jesus. The most remarkable apostolic gloss or commentary on the subject is found in Jn 7 39. Jesus had spoken of the change which faith in Him ("coming to Him") would cause in the lives of His disciples; how Divine regeneration "rivets over" men and should issue forth from them; and the evangelist continues in explanation: "But this spake he of the spirit, which they that believed on him were to receive: for the Spirit was not yet given; because Jesus was not yet glorified." This recognition of a special manifestation of Divine power, transcending the experience of OT believers, was based on the declaration of Christ, that He would send "another Comforter" (RV "advocate," "helper," Gr Paraclete), that he may be with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth" (14 16).

In his Ep. St. John shows that this Spirit be- stows the elements of a Godlike character which makes us to be "sons of God," before who were "children of the devil" (1 Jn 3 10.24; 4 18, etc.). This regeneration is "eternal life" (1 Jn 5 13) and moral similarity with God, the very character of God in man. As "God is love," the children of God will love (1 Jn 4 20). At the same time it is also the "new birth," a changed life, or a new manifestation of the life of the Son of God, who also called fellow-believers to life as Christ, victorious life which conquers the world (1 Jn 5 4); it is purity (1 Jn 3 3-6) and knowledge (1 Jn 2 20).

The subject of regeneration lies outside of the scope of the Ep. to the He, so that we look in vain for a clear dogma, for in no place contradict the dogma, which, on the other hand, underlies many of the statements made. Christ, "the mediator of a better covenant, which hath been enacted upon better promises" (8 6), has made "purification of sins" (1 3). In contrast to the first covenant, in which the people approached God by means of outward forms and ordinances, the "new covenant" (8 13) brought an "eternal redemption" (9 12) by means of a Divine cleansing (9 4). Christ, brings man "out of glory" and is "author of their salvation" (2 10). Immature Christians are spoken of (as were the proselytes of the OT) as babes, who were to grow to the stature, character and knowledge of "full-grown men." (13 12-13)

III. Later Development of the Doctrine.—Very soon the high spiritual meaning of regeneration was obscured by the development of priestcraft within the Christian Church. With the initiation into the mysteries of baptism as accomplished by the mediation of ministers thereto appointed, the ceremonies hereby employed became means to which magic powers were of necessity ascribed. This we see plainly in the view of baptismal regeneration, which, based upon half-understood passages of Scripture quoted above, was taught at an early date. While in the post-apostolic days we frequently find traces of a proper appreciation of an underlying spiritual value in baptism (cf Didache, vii), many of the expressions used were lifted from apocryphal Gnostic sources (e. g., ascensions, xi 5) calls baptism the second of the three births of a child of God: first experience of regeneration (birth), the third the resurrection). This birth is "of the day, free, delivering from passions, taking away the veil of our nature or life, i.e. everything hiding the Divine image in which we are created, and leading up to the life above." (Ullmann, Geiger v. Nazianz, 325.) Cyril of Jerusalem (Cat., xvii, c. 37) ascribes to baptism the power of absorption from sin and the power of endowment with heavenly virtues. According to Augustine baptism is essential to salvation, though the baptism of blood (martyrdom) may effect it also. The exercise of baptism is not as in the case of the thief at the cross (Aug., De Anima et Vite Originals I, 9; Ep. 73). Nevertheless, the Great compares the spirit-filled water of baptism with the spirit-filled womb of the Virgin, in which the Holy Spirit engenders the sinless child (Ep. 94, xxv. 5; see Hagenbuch, Dogmengeschichte, § 137).

In general this is still the opinion of pronounced sacramentarians. With the evangelists Christianity has gone back to the teaching of the NT.

IV. Present Significance.—Although a clear distinction is not always maintained between regeneration and other experiences of the spiritual life, we may summarize our belief in the following theses:

(1) Regeneration implies not merely an addition of certain gifts or graces, a strengthening of certain innate good qualities, but a radical change, which revolutionizes our whole being, contradicts and overcomes our old fallen nature, and places our spiritual center of gravity wholly outside of our own powers in the realm of God's causation.

(2) It is the will of God that all of us be made partakers of this new life (1 Tim 2 4) and, as it is clearly stated that some fall short of it (Jn 5 40), it is plain that the fault thereof lies with man. God requires all men to repent and turn unto Him (Acts 27 30) before He will or can effect regeneration.

Conversion, resulting in men dying to faith in Christ, is therefore the human response to the offer of salvation which God makes. This response gives occasion to and is synchronous with the Divine act of renewal (regeneration). The Spirit of God enters into us with the believing, accept-
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ing spirit of man. This is fellowship with Christ
(Rom 8 10; 1 Cor 6 17; 2 Cor 5 17; Col 3 3).

(3) The process of regeneration is outside of our
observation and beyond the scope of psychological
analysis. It takes place in the sphere of subconcious
phenomena, as psychological investigation has
thrown a flood of light on the psychic states
which precede, accompany and follow the work of
the Holy Spirit. "He handles psychic powers;
He works upon psychic energies and states; and
this work of regeneration lies somewhere within the
psychological realm that is of highest value and
greatest importance. The facts of Christian experience
cannot be changed, nor do they lose in value by the most
searching psychological scrutiny.

Psychological analysis does not eliminate the direct
workings of the Holy Spirit. Nor can it disclose its
process; the "underlying laboratory where are wrought
radical remedial processes and structural changes in
the psychological being as portrayed in explicit scriptural utterances:
'Create in me a clean heart' (Ps 51 10). Ye must
be born again' (John 3 7). But as if that be in Christ
he is a new creation: old things are passed away; behold
all things are made new' (2 Cor 5 17; 2 Pet 3 18); is in
the region of subconsciousness. To look in the region of
consciousness for this Person or for His work is fruitless and
with such a conclusion, Christian psychology thus traces to its deep-lying retreat the Divi-
si ear. It is here that regeneration occurs. 'Where God works
in the depths of the soul as silently and secretly as if on
the remotest world of the stellar universe' (H. E. W. Dress, Psychology of the Christian Life, 117).

(4) Regeneration manifests itself in the conscious
soul by its effects on the will, the intelligence and
the affections. At the same time regeneration supplies
a new life-power of Divine origin, which enables the component parts of human nature to fall
under the law of God, to strive for the coming of
God's kingdom, and to accept the teachings of God's
spirit. Thus regenerate man is conscious of the facts of justification and adoption.
The former is a judicial act of God, which frees
man from the law of sin and absolves him from the
state of enmity against God; the latter an endue-
ment with the Spirit, which is an earnest of his
inheritance (Eph 1 14). The Spirit of God, dwelling
in man, testifies to the state of sonship (Rom 8 16;
Gal 4 6).

(5) Regeneration, being a new birth, is the
starting-point of spiritual growth. The regenerated
man needs nurture and training. He receives it
not merely from outside experiences, but from an
immanent principle - himself now recognized as
the power of the life of the indwelling Christ (Col
26 27). Apart from the mediate dealings of God
with man through word and sacraments, there is
therefore an immediate communication of life from
God to the regenerate.

(6) The truth which is mentioned as the agent
by whom regeneration is made possible (Jn 3 32;
Jas 1 18; 1 Pet 2 3), is nothing else than the
Divine Spirit, not only the spoken or written word
of God, which may convince people of right or
wrong, but which cannot enable the will of man
to forsake the wrong and to do the right, but He
who calls Himself the Truth (Jn 14 6) and who has
become the motive power of regenerated life (Gal
2 5).

(7) Recent philosophy expressive of the reaction
from the mechanical view of bare materialism, and
also from the depreciation of personality as seen in
socialism, has again brought into prominence the
realities and need of personal life. Johannes Müller
and Rudolf Eucken among others emphasize that
a new life of the spirit, independent of outward
conditions, is not only possible, but necessary for
the attainment of the highest development. This
new life is not a fruit of the free play of the tend-
dencies and powers of natural life, but is in sharp
conflict with them. Man as he is by nature stands
in direct contrast to the demands of the spiritual
life. Spiritual life, as Professor Eucken says, can
be implanted in man by some superior power only
and must constantly be sustained by superior life. It
breaks through the order of causes and effects; it
severs the continuity of the outer world; it makes
impossible a rational joining together of realities;
it prohibits a monistic view of the immediate
condition of the world. This new life derives its power
not from Nature; it is a manifestation of Divine
life within us (Hauptprobleme der Reli-
gionsphilosophie, Leipzig, 1912, 17 ff; Der Kampf
um einen geistigen Lebensinhalt, Leipzig, 1907; Grundlinien einer neuen Lebensanschauung, Leipzig,
1907; Johannes Müller, Bauernliebe für persönliche
Kultur, 3 vols, München, 1908). Thus the latest
development of idealistic philosophy corroborates
in a remarkable way the Christian truth of regen-
ration. See also Conversion.
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JOHN L. NULSEN
Regeneration, Baptismal. See Bapti-
smal Regeneration.

REGION, rē'jün: A "district," as in modern
Eng. The word "region" is used by EV inter-
changeably with "country," "coasts," etc., for
various Heb and Gr terms, but "region round
about" is usually in AV and invariably in RV
the tr of ἐρήμωσις, ἐρήμωσις, "surrounding country.
For a possible technical use of "region" in Acts
16 6 and RV 18 23; see Galatia.

REGISTER, rē'ja-tèr. See Genealogy; Quin-
nitus.

REHABIAH, rē-häb'ā (רֶחָבָיָה, r'habiyāh,
רֶחְבָּיָה, r'habiyāh, "Jeh is wide"): Son of Eliezer,
and grandson of Moses. Eponym of a Levitical
city (1 Ch 23 17; 24 21; 26 25).

REHEARSE, rē-hu'rs (רְחַעֲשׁ, šām, רְחַעֲשׁ, ḫāba
ций, ḫābā; ḫāmāh, ḫāmāh, "Jeh is wide"); Usually means simply "to relate," "to tell," "to
declare" (Ex 17 14; Jgs 5 11; 1 Sa 8 21; 17 31;
Acts 14 27); with "rehearse from the beginning"
(Acts 11 4, for παρειμα, ἐρήμωσις, "begin" (so RV).
RV has preserved uniformity by translating ἀναγγέλλω
by "rehearse" also in Acts 16 4, and has introduced
"rehearse" as the tr of ἐρήμωσις, ἐρήμωσις, through-
out (Lk 24 35; Acts 10 8; 15 12 14; 21 19), except
in Jn 1 18 ("declare"). Sir 27 7, AV has "rehearse"
for ἀναγγέλλω, ἐρήμωσις, "repeat" (so RV).

REHEB, rē'hoḇ (רֶהֶב, ṭḥōb; פֹּדָב, Rhōb, Rhōb,
פֹּדָב, Rhōb): (1) Etymologically the word means "broad"
and might be applied either to a road or a plain.
Rehoab is given (Nu 13 21) as the northern limit
of Israel as reached by the spies. This agrees with the position assigned to Beth-rehob in the narrative of the settlement of the Danites (Jgs 18:28). It is mentioned again along with the kingdom of Zobah in connection with the wars of Saul (1 S 14:47; 1 Xx 14:6) and as having been associated with Zobah and Maacah against David in the Ammonite war and as having been defeated by him (2 S 10:6). Robinson sought to identify it with Hinnun, but it hardly suits the references. Buhl (GA, 240) following Thomson (LB, 11, 547) seeks it at Pancaes (modern Banias). This would suit all the requirements of the capital, Beth-rehob, which might then be the second Rehob, assigned as part of the territory of Sidon to the tribe Asher (Josh 19:25-30; Jgs 18:28). We must, however, assign to the kingdom of Rehob a territory extending from the settlements of the Danites to the "entering in of Hamath" or to Libo (modern Lebanon), i.e. the Great Plain of Coele-Syria bounded by Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon and within the limits indicated.

(2) Two separate towns belonging to Asher (Josh 19:28; 19:30). One of them was given to the Gersomite Levites (Josh 21:31), and one is mentioned as remaining in the hands of the Canaanites (Josh 19:30).

(3) Father of Hadadezer, king of Aram Zobah, who was overwhelmed by David at the Euphrates (2 S 8:3,12).

(4) One of the Levites who sealed Nehemiah's covenant on the 24th Tishri, 4th BC (Neh 10:11).

W. M. Chumley: REHOBOAM, rě-hō-bā'am (־רְבֹּבָאָם), Ḳ̄rbōbā'ām, "the people is enlarged," or perhaps "Am is wide;" "Rōbōbām, Rehobōm; "Robocam," Mt 1:7 AV:

1. The Disruption of the Kingdom
2. Underlying Causes of Disruption
3. Shemaiah Forbids Civil War
4. Rehoboam's Prosperity
5. Shishak's Invasion
6. His Death

The son and successor of Solomon, the last king to claim the throne of old Israel and the first king of Judah after the division of the kingdom. He was born c. 967 BC. His mother was Naamah, an Aramean princess. The accession of his reign is not exactly dated in 1 K 14:21-31; 2 Ch 10:12. The incidents leading to the disruption of the kingdom are told in 1 K 11:43--12:24; 2 Ch 9:31--11:4. R. was 41 years old when he began to reign (1 K 12:14; 13:1) and he reigned 19 years. He ascended the throne at Jerusalem immediately upon his father's death with apparently no opposition. North of the Kingdom of Israel, however, was dissatisfied, and the people demanded that the king meet them in popular assembly at Shechem, the leading city of Northern Israel. True, Israel was no longer, if ever, an elective monarchy. Nevertheless, the people claimed a constitutional privilege, based perhaps on the transaction of Samuel in the election of Saul (1 S 10:25), to be a party to the conditions under which they would serve a new king and he become their ruler. David, in making Solomon his successor, had ignored this wise provision, and the people, having lost such a privilege by default, naturally deemed their neglect the cause of Solomon's burdensome taxes and forced labor. Consequently, they would be more jealous of their rights for the future, and R. accordingly would have to accede to their demands. Having come together at Shechem, the people agreed to accept R. as their king on condition that he would lighten the grievous service and burdensome taxes of his father. R. asked for three days' time in which to consider the request. Against the advice of men of rigorous judgment, who assured him that he might win the people by becoming their servant, he chose the counsel of the younger men, who were of his own age, to rule by sternness rather than by kindness, and returned the people a rough answer, saying: "My father's yoke was heavy, but I will add to your yoke: my father chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions" (1 K 12:14). R., however, misjudged the temper of the people, as well as his own ability. The people, led by Jeroboam, a leader more able than himself, were ready for rebellion, and so force lost the day where kindness might have won. The threat of the king was met by the Marseilles of the people. What portion have we in David? Is he our king? We have Yhwh, an our God" (1 K 12:16). Thus the ten tribes de-throned R., and elected Jeroboam, their champion and spokesman, their king (see JEROBOAM). R., believing in his ability to rule the nation, sent Adoram, his taskmaster, who no doubt had quelled other disturbances, to subdue the populace, which, insulted by indignities and enraged by R.'s renewed insolence, stoned his messenger to death. Hence, for the first time, the secession of the revolt. R. fled ignominiously back to Jerus, king only of Judah and of the adjacent territory of the tribe of Benjamin. The mistake of R. was the common mistake of despots. He presumed too much on privilege not earned by service, and on power for which he was not willing to render adequate compensation.

It is a mistake, however, to see in the disruption the shattering of a kingdom that had long been a harmonious federation from the very outset. From the sev- enfolded into two, the kingdom of the twelve tribes was imperfectly cemented. They seldom united against their common foe. No mention is made of R. in the list of tribes who fought with Deh- yan against Sisera. A claim of cities held by the Canaanites, stretching across the country from E. to W., kept the North and the South apart. Different physical characteristics produced different types of life in the two sections. Old jealousies repeatedly fanned into new flame intensified the divisions due to natural and artificial causes. David labored hard to break down the division in his reign Israel rebelled twice. North Israel had produced many of the strongest leaders of the nation, and they would have been strong for themselves against the rival ruler from the Judaean dynasty. Solomon, following David's policy of unification, divided in the midst of the days of worship at Jerusalem and through the general splendor of his reign, but he, more than any other, finally divided the nation into the North and the South, through his unjust discriminations, his heavy taxes, his fees, his devotion to general extravagance of his reign. The religion of Jeh was the only bond capable of holding the nation together. The apostasy of Solomon severed this bond. The prophets, with their profound knowledge of religious and political values, saw less danger to the true wor- ship of Jeh in a divided kingdom than in a united nation ruled over by R., who had neither political sagacity nor an adequate conception of the greatness of the religion of Jeh. Accordingly, Ahijah openly encou- raged the revolution, while Shemaiah gave it passive support.

Immediately upon his return to Jerus, R. col- lected a large army of 180,000 men (reduced to 120,000 in LXX B), for the purpose of making war against Israel. The expedition, however, was forbidden by Samuel. R., being determined to bring his expedition, however, was forbidden by Samuel. R., being determined to bring his expedition, however, was forbidden by Samuel. R., being determined to bring his expedition, however, was forbidden by Samuel. R. Forbids Shisha, the leading city of Northern Israel, to prepare the ground that they should not fight against their brethren, and that the division of the kingdom was from God. Notwith- standing the prohibition, we are informed that "there was war between Rehoboam and Jeroboam continually" (1 K 14:30; 2 Ch 12:15).

R. next occupied himself in strengthening the territory which still remained to him by fortifying a number of cities (2 Ch 11:5-12). These cities were on the roads to Egypt, or on the western hills
of the Judaeans Shephelah, and were doubtless fortified as a protection against Egypt. According to 2 Ch 11 13-17, Rehoboam's prosperity was augmented by an immigration of Shishak's time. As the city of Jericho was much used by the Philistines, it is not surprising that it became the capital. It was doubtless of considerable extent; “many of the dwellings had each its cistern, cut in the solid rock”; “once this must have been a city of not less than 12,000 or 15,000 inhabitants. Now it is a perfect field of ruins, a scene of unutterable desolation, across which the passing stranger can with difficulty find his way.” Huntington (Pal and Its Transformation, 124) describes considerable remains of a suburb population extending both to the N. and to the S. of this once important place.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN
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Rehoboth

munity returning from captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2 2; Neh 7 7 [by a copyist s error "Nehum"]; 12 3; 1 Esd 5 8, "Roimus").

(2) A Pers officer of high rank (lit. "master of judgment, taste, reason") with others wrote a poem against Jerus to King Artaxerxes (Ezr 4 8 9 17 23).

(3) Son of Bani, a Levite, one of the wall-builders under Nehemiah (Neh 3 17).

(4) One of the signers of the covenant in Neh 10 25.

(5) In Neh 12 3 (omitted in LXX) one Rehum is mentioned with those who went up with Zerub- babel. It is probable that we should read here "Harrin" (מְרִים) for מְרִים of 12 15.

W. N. STEARNS

REI, רָאֵי (rē', rē), "friendly"; "Praise, Khesek": Rei, Shimei and the Gibborim who belonged to David are listed among those who did not join Adonijah in his attempt on the throne (1 K 1 8). The name is very uncertain. Winckler (Geschichte, II, 217) identifies him with Ira, the Jairite, who was a "priest to David" (2 Sm 20 26 RVm); he tries to prove that this Ira (or Jair) was a priest of Beth- lehem (Mishna, II, 195). R. H. A. holds that Shimei and Rei were two officers of David s bodyguard. Jos (Ant. VII, xiv, 4) has דאודוב פֹלָר, ho Daoudou philos, thus making Shimei a "friend," the courier of the 2 Sm 15 37; 16 16, and omitting Rei entirely. This would call for an original reading רֶאֵי רֶאֵי, ha-melekh, or רֶאֵי רֶאֵי, ha-melekh, and is too wide a variant from the MT. Assuming that Rei belongs in the text, he is an officer of the royal guard.

HORACE J. WOLF

REIGN, rēn: The Heb word מַלְעָה (mal'āh), מַלָכָה (mal'akh), "to be king" ("to reign as king"), "to become king," "to accede to the throne," "to assume royal power publicly" and, generally speaking, "to become powerful." In the NT θρόνος, βασιλεία, βασιλέα, βασιλεῖα, "reign," "inward"; "kings" or "reign." The latter word, which is derived from Lat regnus through Off. reins, has given place in modern Eng. to the word "kings," see Skeat, Concise Etymological Dictionary of the Eng. Language, 398). RV has, however, retained the older word, at least in the m, in all passages in which it is found in AV: According to Heb psychology the reins are the seat of the deepest emotions and aspirations of man, which God alone can fully know. Thus RV has substituted "heart" for "reins" in the text of Job 19 27; Ps 7 9; 16 7; 26 2; 73 21; Prov 23 16; Jer 11 20; 12 17; 10 19; 20 12; 2 Sm 11 1 while it has substituted "inward parts" for once (Ps 139 13). In one passage AV has substituted the Heb בְּלִיָּה ("laws") with "reins" (Isa 11 5), where the RV has rightly substituted "wait" (q.v.). The Gr word nεφρός (which is etymologically allied to the Middle Eng. wer, Ger. Wer, see Skeat, ibid., 231, s.v. "Reign") is found in 1 Mac 5 24; 23 22. See KINDEYS.

H. L. E. LURINGO

REINS, rān (רָעָנִים, kîylâh; nεφρός, nεφρός, words promiscuously trd "heart," "inward parts," "kidneys" or "reins." The latter word, which is derived from Lat regnus through Off. reins, has given place in modern Eng. to the word "kings," see Skeat, Concise Etymological Dictionary of the Eng. Language, 398). RV has, however, retained the older word, at least in the m, in all passages in which it is found in AV: According to Heb psychology the reins are the seat of the deepest emotions and aspirations of man, which God alone can fully know. Thus RV has substituted "heart" for "reins" in the text of Job 19 27; Ps 7 9; 16 7; 26 2; 73 21; Prov 23 16; Jer 11 20; 12 17; 10 19; 20 12; 2 Sm 11 1 while it has substituted "inward parts" for once (Ps 139 13). In one passage AV has substituted the Heb בְּלִיָּה ("laws") with "reins" (Isa 11 5), where the RV has rightly substituted "wait" (q.v.). The Gr word nεφρός (which is etymologically allied to the Middle Eng. wer, Ger. Wer, see Skeat, ibid., 231, s.v. "Reign") is found in 1 Mac 5 24; 23 22. See KINDEYS.

H. L. E. LURINGO

REKEM, rēkem (רְקֵם, rekem, "friendship"): (1) One of the five kings of Midian slain by the Israelites under Moses (Nu 31 8; Josh 13 21; [B, פַּטְשָׂא, Ῥήκαμ], probably king of a town in Southern Judah. A town of this name is given as belonging to Benjamin (Josh 18 27).)

(2) Eponym of a Calebite family (1 Ch 2 43 [Pē'as, Ῥήκαμ]; According to the唿喊, probably a town in Southern Judah. A town of this name is given as belonging to Benjamin (Josh 18 27).)

(3) A city of Benjamin, mentioned with Irpeel and Taralah (Josh 18 27); the site is unknown. See also RAKEM.

HORACE J. WOLF


**RELATIONSHIPS, rē-lat-shēn-hips, FAMILY:***

I. **Consanguinity.** — Genealogical records were carefully kept by the ancient Hebrews (of those Gen Nu, Ch, Ez, Neh, Mt, Lk), not only because they formed the basis of a man's title to his property (Nu 27 8-11; exceptional case, 36 1-12), but also because on occasion these degrees fixed the right of the family to intermarry with the priestly caste. descent was traced through the father; a man's closest association was therefore with his father's family, and he was ordinarily referred to as the son of his father, thus the son of Abraham (Gen 25 19), Joshua the son of Nun, Caleb the son of Jephunneh (Nu 14 6). Still there are instances of men named for their mothers (Joab the son of Zeruiah), and a man's relation with his mother's family was fully recognized in the laws forbidding incest. No linear relatives were permitted to intermarry (Lev 18 7-10). The relations of ancestors and descendants were considered so close that the ordinary terms of relationship between children and parents are used constantly in relation to grandparents and remote ancestors. The wishes of a great-grandfather are respected long after his death as the wishes of a father (Jer 35 16).

The father (בָּן, 'ab; נִשּׁה, nishāh; נְבֵית, nehits) was the head of the family (mishpāhah) and household (behafrāh), which was a religious (1 S 20 6-29; Ex 12 3; Job 1 5) as well as and a social and political unit, consisting Children usually of a combination of families in the modern sense. As long as polygamy prevailed, a family would include at least the several groups of children of the wives and concubines. The Bible represents the Heb father as commanding (Gen 50 16; Jer 35 6 ff; Prov 6 20), instructing (Prov 1 4; 4 1), and rebuking (Gen 37 10; Nu 12 14); at the same time, as loving (Gen 25 28; 37 4; 44 20), pitying (Ps 103 13), and blessing his household (Gen 27 41), rejoicing over its triumphs (Prov 10 1; 15 20), or grieving over its misfortunes (Gen 37 35). The mother, too (מֵאָה, meʾēḥ; נִשָּׁה, nishāʾah), naturally displayed love and care (Gen 25 28; Prov 4 3; Isa 49 15; 66 13). To the Heb woman childlessness was considered the greatest of misfortunes (1 S 1 10 ff, of Hannah; Gen 30 23, of Rachel). Children were looked upon as a blessing from God (Ps 127 3) and the defenders of the home (vs 4, 5). In early life a child was more directly under the care of the father than of the mother; the mother was its first teacher (Prov 1 8). Thereafter the father was expected to direct the training of the son (בָּנָי, bāni; יִבְשָׂס, yibshās; רְשָׁא, reshāʾ) probably remained with the mother until her marriage (Mic 7 6). Both parents are looked upon in the Law as objects of honor (Ex 20 12; Dt 5 16 [the Fifth Commandment]; Ex 21 15; Lev 20 9; Dt 27 16; Prov 20 20; Ezk 22 7; Mic 7 6), obedience (Gen 18 17; Lev 19 14; Dt 18 15 ff), and love (1 K 19 20; Prov 28 24; 30 11). The control of parents was so great as to include the right to sell daughters in marriage, but not, without restrictions, into slavery (Ex 21 7-11; cf 22 16 f; Lev 19 14; Neh 5 5), a power which, under the Mosaic law, could not (Dt 22 28-29); they could chastise children (Dt 8 5; 21 18; Prov 13 24; Ecclus 30 1-13), and in the early days even exerted the power of life and death over them (Gen 22; Jgs 11 39; Lev 18 21; 20 2-5; 2 K 23 10; Mt 15 4). This power, at least for sacrificial purposes, was entirely removed by the Law, and changed, even for punishment, in the case of a stubborn, rebellious, gluttonous and disobedient son to a mere right of complaint to the proper authorities (Dt 21 18-21), who were to put him to death. Infanticide by exposure, such as was common among other ancient peoples, seems never to have been practised by the Hebrews. That the children were nevertheless the chattels of the parents seems to be attested from the fact that they could be seized for the debts of the father (2 K 14 6). The father could annul the vows of his daughter (Nu 30 3-5), and damages for wrongs done to her were paid to him, as in Eng. law "for loss of services" (Dt 22 22). A widow's or divorced daughter could return to her father (Gen 30 11; Lev 21 9, 10; Ruth 1 15). At his death the mother would become the actual, if not the legal, head of the household (2 K 8 1-6, the Shunammite woman; Tob 1 8, Tobit's grandmother; of the position of the head of the family of Jesus). This was esp. true of the queen mother (םְלֹה, melāh), whose name is usually given in the accounts of the kings of Judah (i K 1 11; 2 19), where a throne at the king's right hand was set for the king's mother; 11 20, 14 23; 15 2; 16 1). Usual of her was that she was the "great lady" according to Malachi (4 5 [Heb 3 23]) is one of conciliation of parents and children.

The terms "father" (亲子, 'ab; אֶלֶף, adāphō; אֶלֶפָד, adāphād) and "sister" ( الزمن, ṣimōn; אָבִית, ṣāḇīt; אֲדָלָפָה, ṣāḇīt) apply to children of the same father and mother (Gen 4 2), and also to children of one father (Gen 25 28; 37 4; 44 20), pitying (Ps 103 13), and blessing his household (Gen 27 41), rejoicing over its triumphs (Prov 10 1; 15 20), or grieving over its misfortunes (Gen 37 35). The mother, too (בָּנָי, 'ab; נִשָּׁה, nishāʾah), naturally displayed love and care (Gen 25 28; Prov 4 3; Isa 49 15; 66 13). To the Heb woman childlessness was considered the greatest of misfortunes (1 S 1 10 ff, of Hannah; Gen 30 23, of Rachel). Children were looked upon as a blessing from God (Ps 127 3) and the defenders of the home (vs 4, 5). In early life a child was more directly under the care of the father than of the mother; the mother was its first teacher (Prov 1 8). Thereafter the father was expected to direct the training of the son (בָּנָי, bāni; יִבְשָׂס, yibshās; רְשָׁא, reshāʾ) probably remained with the mother until her marriage (Mic 7 6). Both parents are looked upon in the Law as objects of honor (Ex 20 12; Dt 5 16 [the Fifth Commandment]; Ex 21 15; Lev 20 9; Dt 27 16; Prov 20 20; Ezk 22 7; Mic 7 6), obedience (Gen 18 17; Lev 19 14; Dt 18 15 ff), and love (1 K 19 20; Prov 28 24; 30 11). The control of parents was so great as to include the right to sell daughters in marriage, but not, without restrictions, into slavery (Ex 21 7-11; cf 22 16 ff; Lev 19 14; Neh 5 5), a power which, under the Mosaic law, could not (Dt 22 28-29); they could chastise children (Dt 8 5; 21 18; Prov 13 24; Ecclus 30 1-13), and in the early days even exerted the power of life and death over...
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20 12) or of one mother (Gen 43 7; Lev 18 9; 20 17). The brother as well as the father was the natural protector of the honor of his wife. Jacob speaks thus, in a later form: "The man was "taken" by her husband, or "given" by her father or, in the case of a servant, by her master or mistress (Gen 2 22; 16 3; 34 9.21), and although the contract was between the men (Gen 29; 39 16; Ex 22 16; Dt 22 29; Ruth 4 10) or the parents (Gen 21 21; 24), it is probable that the consent of the girl was usually asked (Gen 24 58). Love between the young people was given due consideration (as in the case of Samson, Shechem, Jacob and Rachel; [Gen 29 18], David and Michal [1 S 18 20]); at Abel's burial there were among married people, so that Hoesa could compare the attitude of husband toward wife to that of Jehovah toward Israel. As a matter of legal right, it is probable that throughout the Orient long before the events narrated in the Book of Est, every man did "bear rule in his own house" (Est 1 22). In fact a precedent for the Pers decree has been traced as far back as the first joint head (Gen 3 16). Nevertheless, we find many instances in which the wife seems to take the lead in the family. In the case of Samson, the parents of Samson's parents (Jgs 13 23), of the Shunammite woman (2 K 4), of Jael (Jgs 4 18 ff; 5 24 ff), of Achar's Ishai (Job 16 3; 21), Sapphira (Acts 5 1 et seq) and the woman who, at least consulted in the affairs of their several households. Abraham is even commanded by the voice of God, "In all that Sarah saith unto thee, hearken unto her voice" (Gen 21 12). That most of these women were not only permitted but almost encouraged to be consulted, is attested by the fact that at least in the earlier times the best of them had to resort to stratagem to accomplish their purposes (as in the cases of Rebekah [Gen 27 6 ff], Rachel (Gen 31 4), Leah (Gen 30 16) and Abigail (1 S 25 18 ff), and even to get information as to their husband's affairs (Sarah, Gen 18 10; Rebekah, Gen 27 5)). Perhaps their humbler sisters in later days accomplished their ends by being so contentious as to attract the notice of two proverb-collectors (Prov 21 9; 25 21). Though we have no instance of the exercise of the right of life and death over the wife by the husband, and though it is clear that the Heb husband had no power of sale (cf Ex 21 8), it is frequently asserted that the basis of child ownership, the one-sided ownership in the OT (Dt 21 14), and on the basis of analogy with other ancient laws, as well as because the wife is spoken of in conjunction with property (Ex 20 17) and because the husband exercised the right to annul the wife's vows (Nu 30 6), that the wife occupied in the ordinary Hb home a very subordinate position. It must not be forgotten, however, that the husband owed duties to the wife (Ex 21 10). It must also be borne in mind that great divergence existed at different times and places in different stations of society. Most of our OT evidence pertains to the wealthier classes. The two extremes of the women that are "at ease in Zion" (Isa 32 9-20; cf Am 4 1 ff; 6 1 ff) and the "busy "good wife" described in Prov 31 10 ff are hardly excelled in the most complex society today. The latter probably gives the fairer as well as the more wholesome picture of the functions of the wife in the home, and it is significant that her husband as well as her sons are expected to call her blessed (Prov 31 29).

It is difficult to estimate the extent to which polygamy and concubinage were practised in ancient Pal, but it is clear that the former practice was discouraged even among kings (Dt 17 17), and the latter, an outgrowth of slavery, was not held in high repute (cf Dt 21 10-14). The position of a
les-favored wife (Dt 21 15, "hated") was naturally unpleasant, and her relations with other wives of her husband decried bitterly—they were called each other's "strife, lit. "abuse." (Rev "rivals," Lev 18 18; 1 S 1 6, AV "adversary"; cf Ecclesi 37 11)—even when they were sisters (as in the case of Rachel and Leah, Gen 30 1). Hence the Law forbade the marrying of two sisters (Lev 18 18). On the other hand so strong was the desire of a Heb mother for children that the chance-wed wife welcomed the children of a maid-servant born to her husband as her own (Gen 30 1 12, etc.).

In normal Heb society, for reasons already explained, the relations of a family with the husband's parents (יִתְנָה, הֵדֶן, fem. יִתְנָה, הֵדֶנָּה, הֵדֶבֶל; יִתְנָה, -ן, -ן, -ן, -ן); Where under special conditions a man remained with his wife's tribe after marriage, as in the case of Jacob, serving out his mohar, or Moses fleeing from the wrath of the Egyptians, or the sons of Elimelek appearing in the land of Moab because of the famine in Pal, his identity with his own tribe was not destroyed, and at the first opportunity the natural impulse was to return to his own country. The bride, on the other hand, leaving her people, would become a member of her husband's tribe, with the rights and duties of a daughter (Mic 7 6). Thus Judah can order Tamar burned for violation of the obligations of a widow (Gen 38 24). No doubt the position of the daughter-in-law varied in the Heb home between the extremes of those who vexed their parents-in-law unto the death (Gen 26 35; 27 46; 28 8) and the one who said to her mother-in-law, "Jeh do so to me ... if aught but death part thee and me" (Ruth 1 17). Parents-in-law and children-in-law were considered too closely related to intermarry (Lev 18 15; 20 12 14).

A woman's brother acting in loco parentis might perform all the offices of a father-in-law and possibly be called hohem (Gen 21 30 55; 24 3. Brother- 11 ff). Naturally, brothers-in-law and in-law, etc sisters-in-law would be considered too closely related to intermarry (Lev 18 16 18; 20 2). Nevertheless the husband's brother (יִתְנָה, -ן, -ן, -ן, -ן) expected to marry the childless widow to establish the name of the deceased on his inheritance (Dt 25 5 10). This custom dated back to Canaanitic practice (Gen 38 8), and from the connection between marrying the childless widow and the restoration of land would be called part of the land of Pal (Ruth 4 1 12; cf Jer 32 6 6). In practice the Levirate was probably considered more in the nature of a moral duty than a privilege (Dt 25 7; Ruth 4 6), and devoted not only on the brother, but on other members of a deceased husband's family in the order of the nearness of their relationship to him (Ruth 3 12). In the Heb family brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law would form part of the same household. In this relation as in others we find both ideal friendship (David and Jonathan, 1 S 15 3; 2 S 1 26) and petty jealousies (in the matter of Moses' wife, Nu 12 1). Ill. Other Domestic Relations.—The Heb יִתְנָה, 'omen, fem. יִתְנָה, יִתְנָה, יִתְנָה, יִתְנָה (participle of 'aman), "nourishing, nourishment, to nourish," and "nursing, father mother" (Nu 11 12; Isa 49 23), "nurse" (Ruth 4 16; 2 S 4 4), or simply as the equivalent of "bringing up" (2 K 10 1 5; Est 2 7). In the case of Ahinoam's children, and possibly in the other instances referred to, the relation of foster-parents is suggested. The foster-

children under such conditions obeyed the words of the foster-father as the words of a father (Est 2 20). Michal is spoken of as the mother of Merab's two children (2 S 21 8) because she reared them (Sanhedrin 190). Adoption in the Rom sense was, however, hardly to be expected in a polysynonymous society where the childless father could remarry. Nevertheless, Jacob adopts Manasseh and Ephraim (Gen 48 5), and the father of the tribe of tribes. According to Jos, while Abraham was childless he adopted Lot (Ant., I, vii, 1), and the daughter of Pharaoh adopted Moses (Ant., II, ix, 7; cf Ex 2 10). In NT times the notion of adoption was so familiar that Paul uses the word figuratively of conversion (katabia, kathodeia, Rom 8 15; 9 4; Gal 4 5; Eph 1 5).

The "family" as the word is used of ancient peoples included dependents. The Heb mishpahah is connected with the word shiphahah, "maid-servant," as the Lat familia and Servants For a discussion of the various classes of servants and slaves, Heb and foreign, male and female, see Slaverty.

When Lot protested against betraying his visitors to the men of Sodom, forsooth as they had come under the shadow of his roof, and he even preferred to give his daughters to the mob rather than fail in his duties as a host (Gen 19 8), he was acting on the ancient principle of guest-friendship (cf Gr xenia), which bound host and guest by sacred ties. In the light of this principle the act of Jaal, who receives Sisera as a guest, and then betrays him, becomes startling and capable of explanation only on the basis of the spirit of hatred existing at the time, and justifiable, if at all, only on the theory that all is fair in war (Jgs 4 18 21; 5 24 27). The nomads of ancient times and even the post-exilic Hebrews, like the Arabs of today, were bound by a temporary covenant whenever there was "salt between them," that is, in the relation of host and guest (Ezr 4 14; of the expression "covenant of salt," 2 Ch 13 5; Nu 18 19). In the early Christian church breaking bread together served as a sort of brith 'ahim, or covenant of brothers. In later times, as with the king, those that ate at the table were members of the household (2 S 9 11, compared to sons; cf also 2 S 9 7 10 13; 19 28; 1 K 2 7; 4 27; 18 19). See Hospitallt.

The gër or stranger (as indicated by the expression "thy stranger") [Ex 20 10; Lev 25 6; Dt 5 14; 29 11; 31 12; cf of 1 16], Heb Stranger himself to an influential Hebrew for protection. Thus we read a "sojourner of the priest's" (Lev 22 10, tshah; of 26 6) who was in many respects a dependent, but still to be distinguished from a servant (Lev 22 11). The Mosaic Law commands that such strangers be treated with consideration (Ex 12 9 49; 20 10; 22 21 5; 23 9; Lev 19 13; 20 16; 10 18; 14 21, etc; Ps 145 9) and even with love (Dt 16 14; Lev 19 34). See Stranger.

Nathan Isaacs And Elias Davis Isaacs

Release, relés: (1) The forgiveness of a debt (מִיתָם, שְׁמִיתָם [Dt 15 1 2 9; 31 10; see Jubilee Year], with vb. shama, "to release," vs 23. (2) To exempt one from taxation (נְאַהַם, הֵדֶבֶל; יִתְנָה, הוֹדֶנָּה, יִתְנָה, יִתְנָה), "release," "rest" (Est 2 18). Some would render "granted a holiday." (3) To set a prisoner or slave at liberty (דְּשָׁנוֹת, apolous, "to let go free" [Mt 27 15 | Jn 19 10], etc.

Religious, rē-lijūn: "Religion" and "religious" in Elizabethan Eng. were used frequently to denote
the outward expression of worship. This is the force of ἰδρυσις, ἐτρακσα, τρείρ "religion" in Acts 26:5; Jas 1:26;27 (with adj. ἀρχαίον, "religious"), while the same noun in Col 2:18 is rendered "worshiping" (so in the AV). It would give the exact meaning. And in the same external sense "religion" is used by AV for λατρεία, λατρευν, "worshiping" (so RV), in 1 Mac 1:43; 2:19:22. Otherwise "Jews' religion" (or "religion of the Jews") appears in 2 Mac 8:14; 13:22; Gal 13:14 (Ἰουδαϊσμός, Ἰουδαϊστής, "Judaism"), and "an alien religion" in 2 Mac 6:24 (Ἀλλοφυλεσίας, ἀλλοφυλεσίατος, "that belonging to another tribe"). The neglect of the external force of "religion" has led to much reckless misquoting of Jas 1:26:27. Cf Acts 17:22 and see SUPERSTITION. Burton Scott Easton.

RELIGION, COMPARATIVE. See COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

RELIGION, SCIENCE OF. See COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

REMAINDER, ré-mán'dér (וָאָ֫בָּד), yáthhar, "to be left," גִּנָּ֖נָּת, sh'érith, "remnant"): In 2 S 14 7 "residue" would have been clearer (of Ps 76:10), but the changes of RV in Lev 6:16; 7:16.17 are pointless (contrast Ex 23:34).

REMALLAH, rem-a-lā' (רמאלת), r'malṭáḥ (whom Jehovah has adorned): The father of Pekah (2 K 15:25; Is 7:4 ff; 8:6). The contemptuous allusion to Pekah as "the son of Remaliah" in Is 7:4 (similarly "the son of Kish," 1 S 10:11) may be a slur on Remaliah's humble origin.

REMEMBER, ré-mem'ber, REMEMBRANCE, ré-mem-nérán: "Remember" is mostly the tr. in the OT, of[z, zahar, and in the NT of μνωμων, μνημονευ, (Mt 5:23; 26:75; Jn 2:17, etc), and of μνημονευω, μνημονευομαι (Mt 16:9; Mk 8:18; Lk 17:32, etc), and "remembrance" the tr. of derivatives of these (zeker, andminēs, etc). There are a few other words. "To remember" is used of God in remembering persons (Gen 1:8; 19:2), etc; his covenant (Gen 9:15; Ex 2:24; Ezek 66:60, etc), in answering prayer (Jgs 16:28; Neh 13:14;22; Ps 20:3, etc), and in other ways. Men are exhorted to "remember" God's dealings with them, His command (Dt 8:16:17; Josh 2:10; 10:16 12, etc), the Sabbath (Ex 20:8). A specially solemn command is that relating to the Lord's Supper in Lk 22:19; 1 Cor 11:24,25. This do in remembrance of me.

"Remembrance" (writer of chronicles) occurs in AV of 2 S 18:16; 20:24; 1 K 4:3; 1 Ch 16:15 (text "recorder," RV "chronicle"). In Isa 62:6, RV reads, "ye that are Jehovah's rememberers." RV has frequent changes on AV text, as "have marked") (1 S 15:2); "mark and mention") (Ps 30:7; 77:11; Cant 1:4); "rememberer" for "be ye mindful") (1 Ch 16:15); "memorial" for "remembrance") (Isa 57:8); in ARV, "to his holy memorial name") (Ps 30:4; 97:12, ERV "to his holy name," m Heb "memorial"); in 2 Tim 1:5, having been reminded of") for AV "call to remembrance," etc. W. L. Walker

REMETH, ré-meth, rem'eth (רֵ֖מֶת), remeth; B, ῥαμάθα, ῥαμάθας, A, ῥαμαθᾶ, ῥαμαθᾶς): A place in the territory of Issachar named with En-gannim (Josh 19:21). It is probably identical with Remath, in 1 Ch 2:35, and Jarnament of Josh 21:29. It is represented today by the village er-Ramah, situated on a hill which rises abruptly from the green plain about 11 miles S.W. of Jenin (En-gannim). While the southern boundary of Issa
ISA 40:31, it refers to the restoring of spiritual strength; (7) in the NT it invariably refers to spiritual renewal, e.g. Rom 12:2; 2 Cor 4:16; Eph 4:23; Col 3:10; Tit 3:5; He 6:6; all derivatives of σωάν, kaúna, "new."  
G. H. GERBERING

REPAIR, ré-pár (רָפָא, maḥsheh, "refuge"): In Joel 3:16, for AV "The Lord will be the hope of his people!" AV then renders "place of repair," or, "hut of refuge." RV gives "refuge." Other words are פָּתָא, הָשָּׁא, "to strengthen, "to harden," "fix" (2 K 12:5 and often; Neh 3); נָשָּׁא, rápháh, "to heal" (1 K 18:30); נְשִׁי, "to stand still" (Ezr 9:9); נָשָּׁה, הָשָּׁה, "to revive" (1 Ch 11:5); נָשָּׁב, "to close up" (1 K 11:27).

In RV Apoc for εἰσπαράτευσαι, ἐπιστρέφοντας, "to patch up" (Sir 50:11); וַהֲשָׁא, episkeuázontas, "to get ready" (1 Mac 12:37). In 1 Mac 14:34 occurs "reparation" (modern Eng. "repairs") for εἰσπαράτευσαι, επιστρέφοντας, "strengthening up."  
M. O. EVANS

REPRESENTATION, re-pent-t'ans:  
I. O.T. TERMS
1. To Repent—"to Pant," "to Sigh."  
2. To Repent—"to Turn," or "to Turn Over."  
II. NT TERMS
1. To Repent—"to Care," "Be Concerned."  
2. To Repent—"to Change the Mind."  
3. To Repent—"to Turn Over" or "Unto."  
III. THE PSYCHOLOGICAL ELEMENTS
1. The Intellectual Element  
2. The Emotional Element  
3. The Violitional Element

LITERATURE
To get an accurate idea of the precise NT meaning of this highly important word it is necessary to consider its approximate synonyms in the original Heb and Gr. The psychological elements of repentance should be considered in the light of the general teaching of Scripture.

The Heb word רָפָא, nāḥam, is an onomatopoetic term which implies difficulty in breathing, hence "to pant," "to sigh,"  
1. Repent, "to groan." Naturally it came to "to Pant," to signify "to lament" or "to grieve," "to Sigh" and when the emotion was produced by the desire of good for others, it merged into compassion and sympathy, and when incited by a consideration of one's own character and deeds it means "to rue," "to repent." To adduce as our understanding, God is represented as repenting when averted penalties are at last to be inflicted, or when threatened evils have been averted by genuine reformation (Gen 6:6; Jon 3:10). This word is τρέπω repet" about 40 times in the O.T., and in nearly all cases it refers to God. The principal idea is not personal relation to sin, either in its experience of grief or in turning from an evil course. Yet the results of sin are manifest in its use. God's heart is grieved at man's iniquity, and in love He bestows His grace, or in justice He terminate...His mercy. It indicates the aroused emotions of God which prompt Him to a different course of dealing with the people. Similarly when used with reference to man, only in this case the consciousness of personal transgression is evident. This distinction in the application of the word is intended by such declarations as God "is not a man, that he should repent" (1 S 15:29; Job 42:6; Jer 8:6). The term נחָש, shabb, is most generally employed to express the Scriptural idea of genuine repentance. It is used extensively by the prophets, and makes prominent the idea of God as a father to man and to enter into fellowship with God. It is employed extensively with reference to man's turning away from sin to righteousness (Dt 4:30; Neh 1:9; Ps 7:12; Jer 3:14). It quite often refers to God in His relation to man (Ex 32:12; Josh 7:26). It is employed to indicate the thorough spiritual change which God alone can effect (Zech 12:8). When God employs the term "return" it has reference either to man, to God, or to God and man (Isa 1:26; Ps 50:13 [both terms, nāḥam and shabb); Isa 21:12; 55:7). Both terms are also sometime employed when the twofold idea of grief and altered relations is expressed, the one is tsōb by "repent" and "return" (Ezk 14:6; Hos 12:6; Jon 3:8).  

II. NT TERMS
The term παραλλάσσω, meta-méllomai, literally signifies to have a feeling or care, concern or regret; like nāḥam,  
1. Repent, it expresses the emotional aspect of "to Be repentance. The feeling indicated by Careful" or the word may issue in genuine repentance. "Concerned ance, or it may degenerate into mere With" remorse (Mt 21:32, 27). Judas repented only in the sense of regret, remorse, and not in the sense of the abandonment of sin. The word is used with reference to Paul's feeling concerning a certain course of conduct, and with reference to God in His purposes of grace (2 Cor 7:8 AV; He 7:21). The word περαλοβεί, meta-bolébs, expresses the true NT idea of the spiritual change implied in a sinner's return to God. The term signifies to have another mind; to change the opinion or purpose with regard to the mind. It is equivalent to the OT word "turn." Thus it is employed by John the Baptist, Jesus, and the apostles (Mt 3:2; Mk 1:15; Acts 3:18). The idea expressed by the word is intimately associated with different aspects of spiritual transformation and of Christian life, with the process in which the agency of man is prominent, as faith (Acts 20:21), and as conversion (Acts 19:3), and with those experiences and blessings of which God alone is the author, as remission and forgiveness of sin (Lk 24:47; Acts 5:31). It is sometimes conjoined with baptism, which as an overt public act proclaims a changed relation to God and God (Mt 3:14; Lk 3:3; Acts 13:24, 19:4). As a vital experience, repentance is to manifest its reality by producing good fruits appropriate to the new spiritual life (Mt 3:8).

The word ἐπιστρέφω, epistárephō, is used to bring out more clearly the distinct change wrought in repentance. It is employed quite frequently in Acts to express the positive side of a change involved in NT repentance, or to indicate the return to God of which the turning from sin is the negative aspect. The two conceptions are inseparable and complementary. The word is used to express the spiritual transition from sin to God (Acts 9:53; 1 Thess 1:9); to strengthen the idea of faith (Acts 11:21); and to complete and emphasize the change required by NT repentance (Acts 26:20).

There is great difficulty in expressing the true idea of a change of thought with reference to sin when we translate the NT "repentance" into other languages. The Lat version renders it "exercise penitence (poenitentiam agere). But "penitence" etymologically signifies pain, grief, distress, rather than a change of thought and purpose. Thus Lat Christianity has been corrupted by the pernicious error of proscribing grief over sin's state and abandonment of sin as the primary idea of NT repentance. It was easy to make the transition from penitence to penance, consequently the Romanists represent Jesus and the apostles as urging people to do penance (poenitentiam agere). The Eng.
word "repent" is derived from the Lat. repentire, and inherits the fault of the Lat, making grief the principal idea and keeping in the background, if not altogether out of sight, the fundamental NT conception of a change of mind with reference to sin. But the exhortations of the ancient prophets, of Jesus, and of the apostles show that the change of mind is the dominant idea of the words employed, while the accompanying grief and consequent reformation enter into one's experience from the very nature of the case.

1. The Psychological Elements.—Repentence is that change of a sinner's mind which leads him to turn from his evil ways and live.

The change wrought in repentance is so deep and radical as to affect the whole spiritual nature and to involve the entire personality. The intellect must function, the emotions must be aroused, and the will must act. Psychology shows repentance to be profound, personal and all-pervasive. The intellectual element is manifest from the nature of man as an intelligent being, and from the demands of God who desires only rational service. Man must apprehend sin as unutterably heinous, the Divine law as perfect and inexorable, and himself as a sinner and falling below the requirements of a holy God (Job 42:5; Ps 51:3; Rom 3:20).

There may be a knowledge of sin without turning from it as an awful thing which dishonors God and ruins man. The change of view may lead on man merely to a desire of punishment and not to the hatred and abandonment of sin (Ex 9:27; Nu 22:34; Josh 7:20; 1 S 16:24; Mt 27:4).

An emotional element is necessarily involved in repentance. While feeling is not the equivalent of repentance, it nevertheless may be a powerful impulse to a genuine turning from sin. A penitent cannot from the nature of the case be stolid and indifferent. The emotional attitude must be altered if NT repentance be experienced. There is a type of grief that issues in repentance and another which plunges into remorse. There is a godly sorrow and also a sorrow of the world. The former brings life; the latter, death (Mt 27:3; Lk 18:23; 2 Cor 7:9-10).

There must be a conscious sense of sin in the individual's relation to God before there can be a hearty turning away from unrighteousness. The feeling naturally accompanying repentance implies a conviction of personal sin and sinfulness and an earnest appeal to God to forgive according to Lk 11:2(10-14).

The most prominent element in the psychology of repentance is the voluntary, or volitional. This aspect of the penitent's experience is expressed in the OT by "turn," or "return," and in the NT by repent," or "turn." The words employed in the Heb and Gr place chief emphasis on the will, the change of mind, or of purpose, because a complete and sincere turning to God involves both the apprehension of the nature of sin and the consciousness of personal guilt (Jer 25:5; Mt 1:15; Acts 2:38; 2 Cor 7:9-10). The demand for repentance implies free will and individual responsibility. That men are called upon to repent there can be no doubt, and that God is represented as taking the initiative in repentance is equally clear. The solution of the problem belongs to the spiritual sphere. The psychical phenomena have their origin in the mysterious relations of the human and the Divine personalities. There can be no extension on the natural plane. Sackcloth for the body and remorse for the soul are not to be confused with a determined abandonment of sin and return to God. Not material sacrifice, but a spiritual change, is the inexorable demand of God in both dispensations (Ps 51:17; Isa 1:11; Jer 6:20; Hos 6:6).

Repentence is only a condition of salvation and not its meritorious ground. The motives for repentance are chiefly found in the goodness of God, in the Divine love, in the pathetic desire to have sinners saved, in the inevitable consequences of sin, in the universal demands of the gospel, and in the hope of spiritual life and membership in the kingdom of heaven (Ezk 33:11; Mk 1:15; Lk 13:1-3; Jn 18:11; Acts 2:20; Rom 2:4; 1 Tim 2:4). The first four beatitudes (Mt 5:3-6) form a heavenly ladder by which penitent souls pass from the dominion of Satan into the Kingdom of God. A consciousness of spiritual poverty doth refining, a sense of personal unworthiness producing grief, a willingness to surrender to God in genuine humility, and a strong spiritual desire developing into hunger and thirst, enter into the experience of one who wholly abandons sin and heartily turns to Him who grants repentance unto life.

LITERATURE:

BYRON H. DEMENT

REPETIONS, rep-i-tish'yun: In Mt 6:7 only, "Use not therefore the repetition of words, but let your speech be always seasoned with graciousness,..." Repetitions of a family of gatekeepers (1 Ch 26:7). The name occurs in Tob and En ("Raphel"); it probably belongs to a group of late formations. See Gray, HPN, 225, 311.

REPHAIM, re-fa'el, re-fa-el (Ne'f, r'ph'ay'ah, "God has healed"); Pa'af, Raphel): The eponym of a family of gatekeepers (1 Ch 26:7). The name occurs in Tob and En ("Raphel"); it probably belongs to a group of late formations. See Gray, HPN, 225, 311.

REPHAH, re-fa'ay, re-fa'ya (Ne'f, r'ph'ay'ah, probably "Jeh is healing"); LXX Pa'af, Riph, Ra'phad (a): (1) In David's family, LXX also Raphah (1 Ch 3:21).

(2) A captain of Simeon (1 Ch 4:42).

(3) A grandson of Iseaar, LXX also Rapharad (1 Ch 7:2).

(4) A descendant of Saul (1 Ch 9:43; in 8:37 called "Raphah" ([Ne'f]); LXX also Raphah).

One of the repairers of the wall under Nehemiah (Neh 3:9).

REPHAIM, re-fa'im, re-fa'aim (Ne'f, r'ph'aim, "a terrible one," hence 'giant," as in 1Ch 20:4, Ne'f, r'ph'aim, y'Efleh hā-r'ph'aim, "sons of the giant"); AV Rephaim): A race of aboriginal or early inhabitants E of the Jordan in Asheroth-karnaim (Gen 14:5) and in the vale of Rephaim S.W. of Jerusalem (Josh 10:8). They associated with...
other giant races, as the Emim and Anakim (Dt 2:10.11) and the Zuzummum (ver 20). It is probable that they were all of the same stock, being given different names by the different tribes who came in contact with them. The same Heb word is rendered "the dead," or "the shades" in various passages (Job 36:5; Ps 68:10; Prov 2:18; 9:15; 21:16; Is 14:9; 26:14.19 m). In these instances the word is derived from רפָּחַה, rāphēh, "weak," "powerless," "a shadow" or "shade.

H. Porter

REPHAIM, VALE OF (עֵדֶּר חָמָן; 1 Mc 19:27; "emek r'phānim; פִּלְגָּתָה, Pīlāqāt Rāphāhem, פִּלְגָּתָה תָּבָא, Pīlāqāt Ṭāḇāyān;): This was a fertile vale (Isa 17:5), to the S.W. of Jerusalem (Josh 15:8; 18:16; AV "Valley of the Giants"), on the border between Judah and Benjamin. Here David repeatedly defeated the invading Philistines (2 S 5:18; 22:13; 1 Ch 11:15; 14:9). It is located by Jos between Jerusalem and Bethlem (Ant, VII, iv, i; xii, 4). It corresponds to the modern el-Bīko, which falls away to the S.W. from the lip of the valley of Hinnom. The name in ancient times may perhaps have referred to a larger area, including practically all the land between Jerusalem and Bethlem, where the headwaters of Nahar Rūṭān are collected.

W. EWING

REPHAN, רָפָן: A name for Chion, the planet Saturn. See Astrology, 7; CREMN.

REPHIDIM, רֵפִּידִים (בֵּית אי, רפִדִים, "rests"); פִּדים, Rāphidiym): A station in the Wanderings, between the wilderness of Sin and the wilderness of Sinai (Ex 17:18; 19:2; Nu 33:14). The host expected to find water here; to their distress the streams were dry, and water was miraculously provided. Palmer (Desert of the Exodus, 158 ff) states cogent reasons for identifying Rephidim with Wady Feiran. It is the most fertile part of the peninsula, well watered, with a palm grove stretching for miles along the valley. Palmer speaks of passing through the palm grove as a "most delightful" walk; "the tall, graceful trees afforded a delicious shade, fresh water ran at our feet, and, above all, bulbous fritillaries from branch to branch cast a carpet of sweet notes." Our camp was pitched at the "mouth of Wady 'Aleidy, a large open space completely surrounded by steep, shelving mountains of gneiss, the fantastic cleavage of which added greatly to the beauty of the scene. Palms and tamarisks were dotted all around, and on every knoll and mountain slope were ruined houses, churches, and walls, the relics of the ancient mo-nastic city of Paran. Behind our tents rose the majestic mass of Serbal, and beneath the rocky wall opposite ran a purling brook, only a few inches in depth, but still sufficiently cool, clear, and refreshing."

Such a place as this the Amalekites would naturally wish to preserve for themselves against an impending attack. For these desert dwellers, indeed, the possession of this watered vale may well have been a matter of life and death.

If this identification is correct, then Jebel Tahuneh, "Mount of the mill," a height that rises on the N. of the valley, may have been the hill from which Moses, with Aaron and Hur, viewed the battle.

W. EWING

REPROBATE, rep'rō-bāt: This word occurs in the Eng. Bible in the following passages: Jer 6:30 (RV "refuse"); Rom 1:25; 2 Cor 13:5.6.7; 2 Tim 3:8; Tit 1:16. In all the cases above, the word is "adokimos, unacknowledged." The same Gr word, however, is found with other renderings in Is 1:22 ("dross"); Prov 25:4 ("dross"); 1 Cor 9:27 ("castaway," "rejected"). The primary meaning of adokimos is "not-received," "not-acknowledged." This is applied to precious metals or money, in the sense of "not-current," to which, however, the connotation "not-genuine" easily attaches itself. It is also applied to persons who do not or ought not to receive honor or recognition. This purely negative connotation frequently passes over into the positive one of that which is or ought to be rejected, either by God or men. Of the above passages 1 Cor 9:27 uses the word in this meaning. Probably Rom 1:25, "God gave them up unto a reprobrate mind," must be understood on this principle: the nois of the idolatrous heathen is permitted by God to fall into such extreme forms of evil as to meet with the universal rejection and repudiation of men. Wettstein's interpretation, "an unfit mind," i.e. incapable of properly performing its function of moral discrimination, has no linguistic warrant, and obliterates the word-play between "they refused to have God in their knowledge [ook adokimason]," and "God gave them up to a reprobate [unacknowledged, adokimoas] mind." Even Tit 1:16, "unto every good work reprobate," affords no instance of the meaning "unfit," but belongs to the following rubric.

The close phonetic resemblance and etymological affinity of dokimos to the vb. dokimazo, "to try," "test," "has led the notion that the word is "tried," "tried," and its opposite of "being found wanting in the test" to associate itself more or less distinctly with the adj. dokimos and adokimos. Thus the more complex meaning results of that which is not acknowledged, not rejected, but it has not been found or not approved itself in testing. This connotation is present in 2 Cor 13:5.6.7; 2 Tim 3:8; Tit 1:16; He 6:8. In the first two of these passages the word is used of Christians who ostensibly were in the true faith, but either hypothetically are represented as having failed to meet the test. "Reprobate unto every good work" (Tit 1:16) are they who by their life have disappointed the expectation of good works. The "reprobate [rejected] land" of He 6:8 is land that by bearing thorns and thistles has failed to meet the test of the husbandman. It should be noticed, however, that adokimos, even in these cases, always retains the meaning of rejection because of failure in trial; of the last-named passage: "rejected and nigh unto cursing."

Literature.—Cremers, Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der neuestestamentlichen Göttercräte, 356-57.

REPROOF, rep'rō-ref; REPROVE, rep'rō-vāv: "Reprove" in Elizabethan Eng. had a variety of meanings ("reject," "disprove," "convince," "rebuke"), with "put to the proof" (see 2 Tim 4:2 RVm) as the force common to all, although in modern Eng. the word means only "rebuke" (with a connotation of deliberateness). AV uses the word chiefly (and RV exclusively, except in 2 Esd 12:32; 14:13; 2 Macc 4:33) for ἀδοκιμος, ἀδοκίμως, and ἄνωθεν, eléchō, words that have very much the same ambiguities of meaning. Hence a fairly easy rendering into Eng. was possible, but the result included all the ambiguities of the original, and to modern readers such a passage as "But your reproof, what doth it reprove? Do ye think to reprove words?" (Job 6:23-24 ARV) is virtually incomprehensible. The meaning is, approximately: "What do your rebukes prove? Are you quibbling about words?" In Jn 16:18 no single word in modern Eng. will translate eléchō, and "reprove" (AV) "converse with the Gr. eléchō (a word)" are both unsatisfactory. The sense is: "The Spirit will teach men the true meaning of these three words: sin, righteousness, judgment."

Burton Scott Easton
The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia
Rephaim, Vale of Restoration

Reptile, rep’til, -tl: Vulg in Mic 7 17 has reptilia for zôdâh, "crawling things," ARV "worms of the earth," AVm "creeping things." See Lëvi-tân; Lízar, Serpent; Tortoise.

Reputation, rep’-û-tá’-shun: AV uses "reputation" where modern Eng. would use "repute," as connecting prominence rather than moral character. Hence RV’s change to "repute" in Gal 2 2 (for dokeô, dokein, "seem," perhaps with a slightly sarcastic touch). RV’s alteration of "reputation," into "have in honor" (Acts 5 34; Phil 2 29) is to secure uniformity of tr for the derivatives of ῥῆξις, ῥῆξ, "honor," but RV retains "reputation in Scripture." AV’s "made himself of no reputation" in Phil 2 7 is a gloss. See Koine. On Eccl 10 1 see the commentaries.

Require, rē-krî’-vâ: "Require" meant originally "seek after," whence "ask," and so (as in modern Eng.) "demand." All meanings are common in AV (e.g. 1 S 21 8; Eccl 3 15; Ex 8 22; 1 Cor 4 2), and RV has made little change.

Rereward, rer’-ward. See Rearward.

Resaias, ré-sâ’-yâs, ré-sâ’-ás (Pyraías; Rhésaias; AV Reesaias): One of the "leaders" with Zerubbabel in the return (1 Ex 5 8) "Reelaiah" in Ex 2 2; "Rezamiah" in Neh 7 7. The name is apparently duplicated in 1 Ex 6 5 in the form "Reelaisa.

Resen, rē-së’-n (רֶשֶׁן, resen; LXX Áãor, Dássen, Δάρις, Νιμροῦ): The Gr forms show that the LXX translators had "rē-sēn, for rē-sēn, rē-sēh, but the reading of the MT is to be preferred. Name and Resen—the last of the four cities Its native mentioned in Gen 10 11.12 as having Equivalent been founded by Nimrod (AV by Assur)—probably represents the Assyrian pronunciation of the place-name Rēsh-en, "fountain-head." The only town so named in the inscriptions is one of 18 mentioned by Sennacherib in the Bavian inscription as places from which he dug canals connecting with the Tigris. Nineveh was one of the sources of Nineveh’s water supply. It probably lay too far N., however, to be the city here intended. Naturally the name "Resen" could exist in any place where there was a spring.

As the Black Sea, the so called lying between Nineveh and Calah (Kουγυσικ and Nimroud), it is generally thought to be represented

2. Possibly by the ruins at Selamiyeh, about 3 miles N. of the latter city. It is noted Selamiyeh worthy that Xenophon (Anab. iii.4) mentions a "great" city called Lariass as occupying this position, and Bochart has suggested is that it is the same. He supposed that when the inhabitants were asked to what city the ruins belonged, they answered "la Resen," "to Resen," which was revised by the later Chaldeans as Lariass. Xenophon describes its walls as being 25 ft. wide, 100 ft. high, and 2 parasangs in circuit. Except for the stone plinth 20 ft. high, they were of brick. He speaks of a stone-built pyramid near the city—possibly the temple-tower at Nimroud. See Calah; Nineveh, 10.

T. G. Pinches

Reservoir, rē’-zë-vôr, -vôr (תֵּבר, mîkâvâh; AV ditch [Isa 22 11]). See Ditch; Cistern; Pool.

Resh, rēsh (רעש): The 20th letter of the Heb alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopaedia as r. It came also to be used for the number 200. For name, etc., see Alphabet.

Reseph, re’-sef (רְסֵף), reseph, "flame" or "fire-hole"): Personal name found in Phoen as a divine name. In the OT the name of a descendant of Ephraim, the eponym of an Ephraimitic family or clan (1 Ch 7 25).

Residue, rez’-i-dû. See Remnant.

Respect, rē-spekt’, OF PERSONS: The phrase צֶּרֶס הָנִּיצָר (nāṣā rēsāh, means lit. "lift up the face," and, among other tr, is rendered indifferently "accept" or "respect the person" in AV (contrast Prov 18 1, etc.). As applied to a (prostrate) suppliant, the phrase means "receive him with favor," and is so used in 1 S 26 35; Mal 1 8.9 (cf Gen 19 21, etc). By a shift in force the phrase came to mean "accept the person instead of the cause" or "show partiality" (Job 13 8.10 ARV), and is so used commonly. A literal tr into Gr gave ρέσηφων, ῥησάρθρων (Sir 35 13 [32 16]; Lk 20 21; Gal 2 6), with the noun ρησαλαμαία, ρησολαμαία, "face-taking" (Rom 2 11; Eph 4 1, etc.). AV rendered uniformly "respect of persons" in RV. A noun ρησαλαμαία, ρησολαμαία, are found Acts 10 34; Jas 2 2. God’s judgment rests solely on the character of the man and will be influenced by no worldly (Eph 6 9) or national (Rom 2 11) considerations. See also Accept.

Burton Scott Easton

Rest (רֶס, reš, רְסָה, רְסָה; mînâḥâh, "cessation from motion," "peace," "quiet, etc.; פָּנַי, פָּנַי, פָּנַי, פָּנַי; פָּנַי, פָּנַי, פָּנַי; פָּנַי, פָּנַי): The geographical situation above sense is of frequent occurrence, and is the tr of several words with various applications and shades of meaning, chiefly of the words given above. It is applied to God as ceasing from the work of creating on the 7th day (Gen 2 2); as having His place of rest in the midst of His people in the temple (1 Ch 25 2; Ps 132 8.14); as resting in His love among His people (Zeph 3 17; RVm "Heb," "be silent"). The 7th day was to be one of rest (Ex 16 23; 31 15; see Sabbath); the land also was to have its rest in the 7th year (Lev 25 4). Jehovah promised His people rest in the land He should give them; this they looked forward to and enjoyed (Dt 11 9; Jos 11 29). "To rest" often means to come under the shadow of the Spirit of Jeh (Nu 11 25 f; Isa 11 2), of wisdom (Prov 14 33), of anger (Eccl 7 9). There is again the "rest" of the grave (Job 3 13;17;18; Isa 67 2; Dan 12 13). Rest is sometimes equivalent to trust, reliance (2 Ch 14 11, RV "rely"); hence rest in Jeh (Ps 37 7, etc); "rest" in the spiritual sense is not, however, prominent in the OT. In the NT Christ’s great offer is rest to the soul (Mt 11 28). In He 4 1ff, it is argued from God’s having promised His people a "rest"—a promise not fulfilled in the Canaan (ver 8)—that there remains for the people of God a "Sabbath rest" (sabbatianmos, ver 9). For "rest." RV has "solemn rest" (Ex 16 23; 31 15, etc), "resting-place" (Ps 132 8.14; Isa 11 10), "peace" (Acts 9 51), "relief" (2 Cor 2 13; 7 5), etc. See also Remnant.

W. L. Walker

Restitution, res-ti-tû’-shun, Restoration. See PUNISHMENTS.

Restoration, res-tô’-râ’-shun: The idea of a restoration of the world had its origin in the preaching of the OT prophets. Their faith in the unique position and mission of Israel as the chosen people of God inspired in them the conviction that the destruction of the nation would eventually be fol-
loved by a restoration under conditions that would insure the realization of the original Divine purpose. When the restoration came and passed without fulfilment of this hope, the Messianic era was projected into the future. By the time of Jesus the concept of the more or less spiritualized, and the anticipation of a new order in which the consequences of sin would no longer appear was a prominent feature of the Messianic conception. In the teaching of Jesus and the apostles such a restoration was assumed as a matter of course.

In Mt 17 11 (cf Mk 9 12), the moral and spiritual regeneration preached by John the Baptist is described as a restoration and viewed as a fulfilment of Mal 4 6. It is to be observed, however, that the work of John could be characterized as a restoration only in the sense of an inception of the regeneration that was to be completed by Jesus. In Mt 19 28 Jesus speaks of a regeneration (σωματικὴν ἀνεκούσιαν) of the whole in terms that ascribe to the saints a state of special felicity. Perhaps the most pointed expression of the idea of a restoration as a special event or crisis is found in the address of Peter (Acts 3 21), where the restoration is described as an ἀνακάθαρσις πνεύμων, apokatâstasis pàndòn, and is viewed as a fulfilment of prophecy.

In all the passages cited the restoration is assumed as a matter with which the hearers are familiar, and consequently its nature is not unfolded. The evidence is, therefore, too limited to justify any attempt to outline its special features. Undoubtedly circumstances there is grave danger of reading into the language of the Scriptures one's own conception of what the restoration is to be. We are probably expressing the full warrant of the Scripture when we reconstruct the regeneration mentioned in these passages contemplates the restoration of man, under the reign of Christ, to a life in which the consequences of sin are no longer present, and that this reconstruction is to include in some measure a regeneration of both the physical and the spiritual world.

Whether the benefits of the restoration are to accrue to all men is also left undefined in the Scriptures. In the passages already cited only the disciples of Christ appear in the field of vision. Certainly other readings are sometimes regarded as favorable to the more inclusive view. In Jn 12 32 Jesus speaks of drawing all men to Himself, but here, as in Jn 3 14-15, it is to be observed that while Christ's sacrifice includes all men in its scope, its benefits will doubtless accrue to those only who respond willingly to His drawing power. The saying of Caiphas (Jn 11 52) is irrelevant, for the phrase, "the children of God that are scattered abroad," probably refers only to the worthy Jews of the dispersion. Neither can the statements of Paul (Rom 11 32; 1 Cor 16 22; Eph 1 9-10; Col 1 20; 1 Tim 2 4; 4 10; Tit 2 11) be pressed in favor of the restorationist view. They affirm only that God's plan makes provision for the redemption of all, and that His saving will is universal. But men have wills of their own, and whether they share in the benefits of the salvation provided depends on their availing themselves of its privileges. The doctrine of the restoration of all can hardly be deduced from the NT. See also Punishment, Everlasting.

RESURRECTION, res-u-rek'shun (in the NT ἀνάστασις, anástasis, with vbs. ἀνάστημι, anastēmi, "stand up," and ἐπιθίνω, epithinō, "raise.") There is no technical term for granted in the OT, but in Isa 26 19 are found the vbs. ἀνάστημι, ἐπιθίνω, "live," ἀνάπλασις, "rise," ἐρχομαι, kîp, "awake").

1. ISRAEL AND IMMORTALITY.
1. Nationalism.
2. Speculation.
4. Ethical Immortality.
5. Resurrection.

II. SPECULATION IN THE OT AND INTERMEDIATE LITERATURE.
1. The Prophets.
2. The Righteous.
3. The Unrighteous.

III. THE TEACHING OF CHRIST.
1. Mk 10 25,
2. In General.

IV. THE APOSTOLIC DOCTRINE.
1. Reformation.
2. Pauline Doctrine.
3. Continuity.
4. 2 Cor 5.

V. SUMMARY.
1. NT Data.
2. Interpretation.

LITERATURE.
1. Nationalism.
2. Speculation.
4. Ethical Immortality.
5. Resurrection.

1. Israel and Immortality.—It is very remarkable that a doctrine of life after death as an essential part of religion was of very late development in Israel, although this doctrine, often highly elaborated, was commonly held among the surrounding nations. The chief cause of this lateness was that Israel's religion centered predominantly in the ideal of a holy nation. Consequently the individual was a secondary object of consideration, and the future of the men who died before the national promises were fulfilled either was merged in the future of his descendants or else was disregarded altogether.

Much speculation about life after death evidently existed, but it was not in direct connection with the nation's religion. Therefore the OT data are scanty and point, as might be expected, to non-homogeneous concepts. Still, certain ideas are clear. The living individual was composed of 'flesh' and nephesh, or a trichotomy appears to be post-Bib., despite 1 Thess 5 23; see Psychology). In the individual nephesh and râ$h seem to be fairly synonymous words, meaning primarily "breath," as the animating principle of the flesh (so for the lower animals in Ps 104 20; see also Job 38 17; Job 33 18, etc), and nearly all of such passages seem quite late. Indeed, in some 13 cases the nephesh of a dead man is unmistakably his corpse (Lev 19 25; Nu 5 2; Hag 2 13, etc). It seems the question of what survives death was hardly raised; whatever existed then was thought of as something quite new. On the one hand the dead man could be called a "god" (1 S 28 13), a term perhaps related to ancestor-worship. But more commonly the dead are thought of as "shades," râ'phâ\'im (Job 26 5 m, etc), weak copies of the original man in all regards (Ezk 32 25). But, whatever existence such "shades" might have, they had passed out of relation to Jeh, whom the "dead praise not" (Ps 150 5; Isa 38 18-19), and there was no religious interest in them.

Indeed, any interest taken in them was likely to be anti-religious, as connected with necromancy, etc (Dt 14 1; 26 14; Isa 8 19; Ps 146 6; etc; see Sorcery), or connected with foreign religions. Here, probably, the very fact that the surrounding nations taught immortality was a strong reason for Israel's refusing to consider it. That Egypt held an elaborate doctrine of individual judgment at death, or that Persia taught the resur-
rection of the body, would actually tend to render these doctrines suspicious, and it was not until the danger of syncretism was removed that such beliefs could be considered on their own merits. Hence it is not surprising that the prophets virtually disregard the idea or that Ezech denies any immortality doctrine categorically.

None the less, with a fuller knowledge of God, wider experience, and deeper reflection, the doctrine was bound to come. But it came slowly. Individualism reaches ex-

Immortality plied statement in Ezk 14, 18, 33 (cf. 24 16; Jer 31 29-30), but the national point of view still made the rewards and punishments of the individual matters of this world only (Ezk 14 14; Ps 37, etc.), a doctrine that had surprising vitality and that is found as late as SIR 11 13 26. But as this does not square with the facts of life (Job), a doctrine of immortality, already hinted at (11, 1, below), was inevitable. It appears in full force in the post-Macca-

bean period, but why just then is hard to say; perhaps because it was then that there had been witnessed the spectacle of martyrs on a large scale (1 Mace 1 60-64).

Resurrection of the body was the form immor-

tality took, in accord with the religious premises.

As the saint was to find his happiness in the nation or the nation to be restored to the nation; and the older views did not point toward pure soul-immortality. The "shades" led a wretched existence at the best; and S. Paul himself shuddered at the thought of "death and judgment" (1 Cor 15 25 26).

As was the case with Ps 23 and Ps 25, the New Testament was uncertain about the immortality of the soul, and still more were the terms of expression. Even the NT has no consistent terminology for the immortal part of man ("soul," Rev 6 9; 20 4; "spirit," He 12 23; 1 Pet 3 19; St. Paul avoids any term in I Cor 15; and we know that "soul" and "spirit" were uncertain quantities, and even the NT has not a common view is that the old bodies will receive new souls (Ber. R. 2 7; 6 7; Vagg. R. 12 2; 15 1, etc.; cf. Sib Or 4 187).

Where direct Gr influence is clear, however, it can be predicated, pure soul-immortality is found (cf. Wis 8 19 20; 9 15 [but Wisd's true teaching is very uncertain]; En 102 Concepts 4-105; 108; Slav En; 4 Macc; Jos, and esp. Philo). According to Jos (BJ, 11, viii, 6), the Erez is to be restored to the Erez, but as Jos graces the Pharisaic resurrection into metaphorical soul-transition (II, viii, 14; contrast Ant, XVIII, i, 3), his evidence is doubtful. Note, moreover, how Lk 6 9; 9 25; 12 45 has reworded Mk 3 4; 8 20 and Lk 15 21 (the Talm in a vaguer way even Palestinian Judaism had something of the same concepts (2 Esd 7 88; 2 Cor 4 16; 12 2), while it is commonly held that the souls in the intermediate state can enjoy happiness, a statement first appearing in En 22 (Jub 33 21 is hardly serious).

II. Resurrection in the OT and Intermediate Literature. — For the reasons given above, references in the OT to the resurrection doctrine are few. Probably it is to be found in Ps 17 15; 16 11; 49 15; 73 24, and in each case with increased probability, but for exact discussions the student must consult the comm. Of course no exact dating of these Ps passages is possible. With still higher probability (see below) should be Job 14 13-15; 19 25-29, but again alternative explanations are just possible, and, again, Job is a notoriously hard book to date (see Jos, Book or). The two certain passages are Isa 26 19 m and Dan 12 2. In the former (to be dated about 330 b.c.) it is implied that the "dead" shall rise from the earth and so the (righteous) dead shall revive. But this resurrection is confined to Pal and does not include the unright-

eous. For Dnl 12 2 see below.

Indeed, restriction for the righteous only was thought of much more naturally than a general resurrection. And still more naturally

2. The a resurrection of martyrs was thought

Righteous of, such simply receiving back what they had given up for God (Sib 90 33 (prior to 107 BC) and 2 Macc 7 9 11. 23; 14 46 (only martyrs are mentioned in 2 Macc); cf. Rev 20 4. But of course the idea once given could not be restricted to martyrs only, and the intermediate lit. contains so many references to the resurrection of the righteous that this is not very common, and XII P. Test. Judah 25 4 (before 107). A very curious passage is En 25 6, where the risen saints merely live longer than did their fathers, i.e. resurrection does not imply immortality. This pas-

sage seems to be unique.

For a resurrection of unrighteous men (Dnl 12 2; En 22 11; XII P. Test. Benj. 10 7 8, Armenian text — in none of these cases a general resurrec-

3. The Uni- tion), a motive for the "second death" is

Righteous 13: for such men the mere condition of Sheol is not punishment enough.

For a general resurrection the motive is always the final judgment, so that all human history may be summed up in the resurrection. The NT, however, is not very common, and XII P. Test. Benj. 10 7 8 (Gr text) — Bar 50 2; En 51 1; Sib Or 4 178-90; Life of Adam (Gr) 10, and 2 Esd 6 45; 7 32; 14 35 about account for all the unequivocal pas-

sages. It is a doctrine of resurrection and its teachings were confined to the Talm. XII P. Test. Benj. 10 7 8 (Gr) has two resurrections.

Finally, much of the lit. knows no immortality at all. Ezech, Sir and 1 Mace are the most familiar examples, but there are many others.

4. Complete It is esp. interesting that the very

Denial spiritual author of 2 Esd did not think it worth while to modify the categoric-

al denial in the source used in 13 20. Of course, the Jewish party that persisted most in a denial of any resurrection was the Sadducees (Mt 22 23 and 24; Acts 23 8), with an extreme conservatism often found among aristocrats.

III. Teaching of Christ. — The question is dis-

cussed explicitly in the following passages: Mk 12 18-27; Mt 22 23-33; Lk 20 27-38.

1. Mk 12: The Sadducees assumed that resurrec-

tion implies simply a resuscitation to a

2. The resurrection of the soul only was con-

restricted to the" soul," with a vague idea of God. For the Scriptures teach a God whose ability and willingness to care for His creatures are so unlimited that the destiny He has prepared for them is caricatured if conceived in any terms but the absolutely highest. Hence there follows not only the truth of the resurrec-

tion, but a resurrection to a state as far above the sexual sphere as that of the angels. (The possibility of mutual recognition by husband and wife is irrelevant, nor is it even said that the resurrection bodies are sexual.) Lk 20 36 adds the explana-

tion that, as there are to be no deaths, marriage (in its relation to births) will not exist. It may be thought that Christ's argument would support equally well the immortality of the soul only, and, as a matter of fact, the same argument is used for the latter doctrine in 4 Macc 7 18 19; 16 25. But in Jesus and under the given circumstances this is quite impossible. And, moreover, it would seem that any such dualism would be a violation of Christ's teaching that the resurrection is literal.

However, the argument seems to touch only the resurrection of the righteous, esp. in the form given
in Lk (cf Lk 14:14). But that Luke thought of so limiting the resurrection is disproved by Acts 24:15. Similarly in Mt 6:11 | Lk 13:30 | Mt 24:31. But, as a general feature in the Judgment, the resurrection of all men is taught. Then the sordom, Tyre, Nineveh appear (Mt 11:22,24; 12:41.42 | Lk 10:11 | 11:32), and those cast into Gehenna, are represented as having a body (Mt 9:43-47; Mt 29:30; 10:28; 18:8,9). And at the great final assize (Mt 25:31-46) all men appear. In the Fourth Gospel a similar distinction is made (6:39.40.44.54; 11:25), the resurrection of the righteous, based on their union with God through Christ and their present possession of this union, and (in 5:28:29) the general resurrection to judgment. Whether these passages imply two resurrections or emphasize only the extreme difference in conditions at the one cannot be determined.

The passages in 4 Mac referred to above read: "they who care for piously with their whole heart, they alone are able to conquer the impulses of the flesh, being patriarchy with firmness. (Rom. 6:19) And they do not die to God but live to God" (7:18-19); and "They knew that dying for God they would live with God forever and Isaac and Jacob and the patriarchs" (16:25). It is distinctly possible that Oral traditions recorded have been known to the author of 4 Mac, although the possibility that Christ approved and broadened the tenets of some spiritually-minded few is not to be overlooked, and possibly even helped, for 4 Mac influenced Luke's Gr pharoeology. See Macr. Book of IV.

IV. The Apostolic Doctrine.—For the apostles, Christ's victory over death took the resurrection doctrine out of the realm of speculative eschatology. Henceforth it is a fact of experience, basic for Christianly. Direct references in the NT are found in Acts 2:17; 18:32; 23:6; 24:15,21; Rom 4:17; 5:17; 6:5,8; 8:11; 11:15; 1 Cor 6:14; 15; 2 Cor 1:9; 4:14; 5:1-10; Phil 3:10; 11,21; Col 1:18; 1 Thess 4:13-18; 2 Tim 2:18; Heb 6:2; 11:19.35; Rev 20:4 (martyrs only); 20:12,13. Of these only Acts 24:15; Rev 20:12,13, refer to a general resurrection with absolute unambiguity, but the doctrine is certainly contained in others and in 2 Tim 4:1 besides.

A theology of the resurrection is given fully by St. Paul. Basic is the conception of the union of Christ with God in heaven, so that every believer anticipates it (Phil 3:10). Godiff 4:11). Every deliverance from danger is a foretaste of the resurrection (2 Cor 4:10,11). Indeed so certain is it, that it may be spoken of as accomplished (Eph 2:6). From another standpoint, the resurrection is simply part of God's general redemption of Nature at the consummation (Rom 8:11,18-25). As the believer then passes into a condition of glory, his body must be altered for the new conditions (1 Cor 15:50; Phil 3:21); it becomes a "spiritual" body, belonging to the realm of the spirit (not "spiritual" in opposition to "material"). Nature shows us how different "bodies" can be— from the "body" of the sun to the bodies of the lowest animals the kind depends merely on the creative will of God (1 Cor 15:36-41). Nor is the idea of a change in the body of the same thing unfamiliar: look at the difference in the "body" of a grain of wheat, its sowing and after it is grown (Mt 13:31). Just so, I am "grown" or "changed" in the image of Christ (Rom 12:2).

Of a resurrection of the wicked, St. Paul has little to say. The doctrine seems clearly stated in 2 Cor 5:10 (and in 2 Tim 4:1, unless the Pauline authorship of 2 Tim is denied). But St. Paul is willing to treat the fate of the unrighteous with silence.

V. Summary.—The points in the NT doctrine of the resurrection of the righteous, then, seem to be these: The personality of the believer survives death and is with Christ.

1. NT Data

But it is lacking in something that will be accomplished by the general resurrection when a body will be given in which there is nothing to hinder perfect intercourse with God. The connection of this body with the present body is not discussed, except for saying that some connection exists, with the necessity of a transformation for those alive at the end. In this state nothing remains
that is inconsistent with the height to which man is raised, and in particular sexual relations (Mt 12:28) and the results of nutrition (1 Cor 6:9). For this end the whole power of God is available. And it is insured by the perfect trust the believer may put in God and by the resurrection of Christ, with whom the believer has become intimately united. The urgetiousness for the final vindication of God's name and glory in history. These resurrections are found in Rev 20:5.13 and quite possibly in 1 Thess 4:16; 1 Cor 15:23.24. Hence the phrase first resurrection; see Last Judgment.

Into the “blanks” of this scheme the believer is naturally entitled to insert such matter as may seem to him best compatible with his other concepts of Christianity and of philosophy. As in the Bible, the student marvels at the way the sacred writers were restrained from committing Christianity to metaphysical schemes that growth in human knowledge might afterward show to be inadequate to the task of discerning God's design to distinguish between the revealed facts and the interpretation given them in any system that he constructs to make the doctrine fit the connected concepts of his own time or circle, distinction too often forgotten in the past and sometimes today. The desire to reconcile such a phrase as “a purely spiritual immortality” rests on a metaphysical dualism that is today obsolete, and its truth is hardly discoverable. The expectation that the resurrection body will contain knowledge of the spiritual body. We are still quite in the dark as to the relations of what we call “soul” and “body,” and so, naturally, it is quite impossible for A. Meyer in 1 COR 15:40 (‘Hanser-Buchstab. dogmatisch’) has some interesting suggestions. In metaphysics, soul, and spirit, there are only two forms of God's thought, the resurrection offers no difficulties. If the body be regarded as the web of forces which was the essence of the resurrection, this web would take the form of the return of those forces to their original conditions. It becomes, therefore, to embrace the totality of effects that proceed from the individual man. According to the final and individual units. Or resurrection may be considered as the end of evolution—the reunion in God of all that has been done and developed to a natural, but may be found to lead to results of great value.

In recent years the attention of scholars has been directed to the problem of how far the teachings of other religions assisted the Jews in attaining a resurrection doctrine. Practically only the Pers system comes into question, and here the facts seem to be these: A belief among the Persians in the resurrection of the body is attested for the pre-Christian period by the fragments of the so-called Book of Life, BC, preserved by Diodorus, Laertius and Aeneas of Gaza. That this doctrine was taken up by the followers of Zoroaster, known by Paper, but is probable. But on the precise details we are in great uncertainly. In the Avesta the doctrine is not found at first (the oldest document is the Gathas, written in the 19th cent.). A document that has certainly undergone post-Christian redaction of an unknown date is the Bundahesh. The fullest Pers sources is the Bundahesh (30), written in the 9th century. It contains much very ancient matter, but the age of any given passage is in it always a problem. Consequently the sources must be used with great caution. It may be noted that late Judaism certainly was affected to some degree by the Pers religion (see Tob., esp.), but there are so many native Jewish elements that were leading to a resurrection doctrine that familiarity with the Pers beliefs could have been an assistance. Esp. is it to be noted that the great acceptance of the doctrine lies in the post-Maccabean period, when direct Pers influence is not apparent. See Zoroastrianism.

LITERATURE.—The older works suffer from a defective understanding of the presuppositions, but Salmond, Corn. F. is invaluable, but must be used critically by the thorough student, for the opinions and theories of other authors have not always been worth the price of the book. “Resurrection” in DCG is good; Bernard's in HDD is not so good. On 1 Cor. Findlay on 1 Cor. C. Eichhorn on 1 Cor. W. J. is an excellent introduction to the NT Theologies of Weiss, Holtzmann, Peine; Schäfer's “Anleitung” is PEB. On Weiss see J. Weiss in PEB (see 9); on 2 Cor. Bachmann in the Zahn series. On both Cor. See Bouquet in the Schriften des NT of J. Weiss (the works of an eminent ecclesiologist, Lichtenstein, his Handbuch. See BODY: Erschätzung (OT and NT); Fleisch, T. Bible.
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challenged. The theory of a swoon and a recovery in the tomb is impossible, and to it Strauss "practically gives its deathblow" (Orr, op. cit., 223).  

**2. Second At Christ's burial a stone was rolled before the tomb, the tomb was empty.** Proof: The tomb was rolled before the tomb, the tomb was empty. Yet on the third morning the body had disappeared, and the tomb was empty. There are only two alternatives. His body must have been taken out of the grave by human hands or else by superhuman power. If the hands were human, they must have been those of His friends or of His foes. If His friends had wished to take out His body, the question at once arises whether they could have done so in the face of the stone, the seal and the guard. If His foes had contemplated this action, the question arises whether they would seriously have considered it. It is extremely improbable that any effort should have been made to remove the body out of the reach of the disciples. Why should His enemies do the very thing that would be most likely to spread the report of His resurrection? As Chrysostom said, "If the body had been stolen, they could not have stolen it naked, because they could not find a garment of the buried clothes and the trouble caused by the drugs adhering to it." (quoted in Day, *Evidence for the Resurrection*, 35). Besides, the position of the grave-clothes proves the impossibility of the theft of the body (Gospel of St. Peter, 17; Tertullian, *De Corona*, 11; T. T. Waterlow, *Man and Humanity*, 69, 70; Latham, *The Risen Master; Expos T*, XIII, 293 f.; XIV, 510). How, too, is it possible to account for the failure of the Jews to disprove the resurrection? Not more than seven weeks afterward Peter preached in that city the fact that Jesus was not "dead". It is more difficult to believe that they could have been deceived or that they would have produced the dead body and silenced Peter forever. "The silence of the Jews is as significant as the speech of the Christians" (Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, 357).

The fact of the empty tomb with the disappearance of the body remains a problem to be faced. It is now admitted that the evidence for the empty tomb is adequate, and that it was part of the primitive belief (Pannafraction, 134, 154). It is important to realize the force of this admission, because it is a testimony to St. Paul's use of the term "third day" (see below) and to the Christian observance of the first day of the week. And yet in spite of this were we not to be accommodated somehow? By some writers the idea of resurrection is interpreted to mean the revival of Christ's spiritual influence on the disciples, which had been brought to a close by His death. It is thought that the essential idea and value of Christ's resurrection can be conserved, even while the belief in His bodily rising from the grave is surrendered (Orr, *The Resurrection of Jesus*, 23). But how can we believe in the resurrection while we regard the basis of the primitive belief in it as a mistake, not to say a fraud? The disciples found the tomb empty, and on the strength of this they believed He had risen. How can the belief be true if the foundation be false? Besides, the various forms of the vision- theory are now gradually but surely being regarded as inadequate and impossible. They involve the change of almost every fact in the Gospel history, and the invention of new scenes and conditions of which the Gospels know nothing (Orr, op. cit., 223). It has never been satisfactorily shown why the disciples had such a consistent experience of visions; nor why they should have had it so soon after the death of Christ and within a strictly limited period; nor why it suddenly ceased. The disciples were familiar with the apparition of a spirit, like Samuel's, and with the resurrection of a body, like Lazarus', but what they had not experienced or imagined was the fact of a spiritual body, the combination of body and spirit in an entirely novel way. So the old theory of a vision is now virtually set aside, and the disciples were called to the duty of a real spiritual manifestation of the risen Christ. The question at once arises whether this is not prompted by an unconscious but real desire to get rid of anything like a physical resurrection. Whatever may be true of unbelievers, this is an impossible position for those who believe Christ is alive.

Even though we may be ready to admit the reality of telepathic communication, it is impossible to argue that this is equivalent to the idea of resurrection. Psychical research has not proceeded far enough as yet to warrant arguments being built on it, though in any case it is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain material from this quarter which will answer to the conditions of the physical resurrection recorded in the NT. "The survival of the soul is not resurrection." "Whoever heard of a spirit being buried?" (Orr, *The Resurrection of Jesus*, 229).

In view of the records of the Gospels and the general testimony of the NT, it is impossible to be "agnostic" about facts that are so large on the face of the records. When once the evidence for the empty tomb is allowed to be adequate, the impossibility of any other explanation than that indicated in the NT is at once seen. The evidence for the resurrection of Christ is the dead body, which is to be exercised in the exalted Lord, and that belief in a resuscitation of the human body is no vital part of it. It is no doubt true that faith today is to be exercised solely in the exalted and glorified Lord, but faith must ultimately rest on fact, and it would be "agnostic" about facts that are so large on the face of the records. When once the evidence for the empty tomb is allowed to be adequate, the impossibility of any other explanation than that indicated in the NT is at once seen. The evidence for the resurrection of Christ is the dead body, which is to be exercised in the exalted Lord, and that belief in a resuscitation of the human body is no vital part of it. It is no doubt true that faith today is to be exercised solely in the exalted and glorified Lord, but faith must ultimately rest on fact, and it would be "agnostic" about facts that are so large on the face of the records. When once the evidence for the empty tomb is allowed to be adequate, the impossibility of any other explanation than that indicated in the NT is at once seen. The evidence for the resurrection of Christ is the dead body, which is to be exercised in the exalted Lord, and that belief in a resuscitation of the human body is no vital part of it. It is no doubt true that faith today is to be exercised solely in the exalted and glorified Lord, but faith must ultimately rest on fact, and it would be "agnostic" about facts that are so large on the face of the records. When once the evidence for the empty tomb is allowed to be adequate, the impossibility of any other explanation than that indicated in the NT is at once seen. The evidence for the resurrection of Christ is the dead body, which is to be exercised in the exalted Lord, and that belief in a resuscitation of the human body is no vital part of it. It is no doubt true that faith today is to be exercised solely in the exalted and glorified Lord, but faith must ultimately rest on fact, and it would be "agnostic" about facts that are so large on the face of the records. When once the evidence for the empty tomb is allowed to be adequate, the impossibility of any other explanation than that indicated in the NT is at once seen. The evidence for the resurrection of Christ is the dead body, which is to be exercised in the exalted Lord, and that belief in a resuscitation of the human body is no vital part of it. It is no doubt true that faith today is to be exercised solely in the exalted and glorified Lord, but faith must ultimately rest on fact, and it would be "agnostic" about facts that are so large on the face of the records.
not a physical resurrection" (C. H. Robinson, Studies in the Resurrection of Christ, 12). But the difficulty here is as to the meaning of the term "resurrection." If it means a return from the dead, a rising again (re-), must there not have been some identification of appearance with body in the tradition and the "objective reality" which appeared to the disciples? Wherein lies the essential difference between an objective vision and an objective appearance? If we believe the apostolic testimony to the empty tomb, why may we not accept their recognition of the resurrection? They evidently recognized their Master, and this recognition must have been due to some familiarity with His bodily appearance. No difficulty of conceiving the resurrection of mankind hereafter must be allowed to set aside the plain facts of the record about Christ. It is, of course, quite clear that the resurrection body of Jesus was not exactly the same as it was when it was put in the tomb, but it is equally clear that there was definite identity as well as definite dissimilarity, and both elements must be faced and accounted for. There need be no insuperable difficulty if we believe that in the very nature of things Christ's resurrection must be unique, and, since the life and work of Jesus Christ transcended all our experience (as they could do), we must not expect to bring them within the limitations of natural law and human history. How the resurrection body was sustained is a problem quite outside our ken, though the reference to "flesh and bones," as opposed to "spirit," the words about "flesh and blood" not being able to enter the kingdom of God, may suggest that while the resurrection body was not constituted upon a natural basis through blood, yet that it possessed "all things pertaining to the change of nature" (Church of England Article IV). We may not be able to solve the problem, but we must hold fast to all the facts, and these may be summed up by saying that the body was the same though different, different though the same. The true description of the resurrection seems to be that "it was an objective reality, but that it was not merely a physical resuscitation." We are therefore brought back to a consideration of the facts recorded in the Gospels as to the empty tomb and the return of appearances of our Lord in three days' time as an explanation which will take into consideration all the facts recorded, and will do no violence to any part of the evidence. To predicate a new resurrection body in which Christ appeared to His disciples and which was the body which had been placed in the tomb was done away with. Does not this theory demand a new miracle of its own (Kenny, Interpreter, V, 271)?

3. Third Proof: Transformation of the Disciples caused by the resurrection. They had seen their Master die, and through that death they lost all hope. Yet hope returned three days after. On the day of the crucifixion they were filled with sadness on the first day of the week with gladness. At the crucifixion they were hopeless; on the first day of the week their hearts glowed with certainty. When the message of the resurrection first came they were overcome and astonished, but when once they became assured they never doubted again. What could account for the astonishing change in these men in so short a time? The mere removal of the body from the grave could never have transformed their passions and characters. Three days and nights for a legend to spring up which should so affect them. Time is needed for a process of legendary growth. There is nothing more striking in the history of primitive Christianity than this marvelous change wrought in the disciples by a belief in the resurrection of their Master. It is a psychological fact that demands a full explanation. The disciples were prepared to believe in the resurrection when they had seen it in the tomb and the possibility of a resurrection (see Mk 16:11). Men do not imagine what they do not believe, and the women's intention to embalm a corpse shows they did not expect His resurrection. Besides, a hallucination involving five hundred people at once, and repeated several times during forty days, is unthinkable.

From this fact of the transformation of personal life in so incredibly short a space of time, we proceed to the next line of proof, the existence of the primitive church.


The apostles believed in the resurrection of the Lord (Burkitt, The Gospel Church, 74). Yet multi-

titudes of Jews were led to worship Him (Acts 2:41), and a great company of priests to obey Him (Acts 6:7). The only explanation of these facts is God's act of resurrection (Acts 2:20), for nothing short of it could have any Jewish sect come to acknowledge Christ as their Messiah. The apostolic church is thus a result of a belief in the resurrection of Jesus Christ. The early chapters of Acts bear the marks of primitive documents, and their evidence is unmistakable. It is impossible to allege that the early church did not know its own history, that myths and legends quickly grew up and were eagerly received, and that the writers of the Gospels had no conscience for principle, but manipulated their material at will, for we should give no account of its history for the past fifty years or more (Orr, The Resurrection of Jesus, 144). And it is simply absurd to think that the earliest church had no such capability. In reality there was nothing vague or unreal in the testimony borne by the apostles and other members of the church. "As the church is too holy for a foundation of rottenness, so she is too real for a foundation of mist" (Archbishop Alexander, The Great Question, 10).


The conversion and work of Saul of Tarsus is one next line of proof. It is first called to the evidence of his life and writ-
gings. Some years ago an article appeared (E. W. Medley, Expositor, V, 359), inquiring as to the conception of resurrection which would be suggested to a heathen inquirer by a perusal of Paul's writings. The extent of the time at least would stand out clearly—that Jesus Christ was killed (2:15; 4:14) and was raised from the dead (4:14). As this Ep. is usually dated about 61 AD—that is, only about 22 years after the resurrection—and as the same Ep. plainly attributes the conception of God in relation to man (1:15, 2:12; 3:11), we can readily see the force of this testimony to the resurrection. Then a few years later, in another place (1 Corinthians 15:21), he speaks as one of St. Paul's, we have a much fuller refer-
ence to the event. In the well-known passage (1 Corinthians 15:12, where he is considered to prove (not Christ's resurrection, but) the resurrection of Christians, he naturally adduces Christ's resurrection as his own model. If we make a list of the various appearances of Christ, ending with one to himself, which he puts on an exact level with the others:
"Last of all he was seen of me also." Now it is essential to give special attention to the nature and particularity of this testimony. It is delineated unto you first of all that which I received, that Christ said for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried; and that the records of the resurrection of the dead, according to the scriptures" (I Cor 15:3 f.). This, as it has often been pointed out, is our earliest authority for the appearance of the resurrection. ... An ancient chronologist has left us a few years of the year itself. ... But there is much more than this. If we address that which 25 years or the crucifixion of Jesus he was taught that 'Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was made alive again on the third day according to the Scriptures' (Kennett, Interpretor, V. 267). And it therefore follows that we, if we could give the same testimony as the view, and their, and the amplitude and weight of their testimony should be carefully estimated. While we are precluded by our space from examining each appearance minutely, and indeed it is unnecessary for our purpose to do so, it is impossible to avoid calling attention to two of them. No one can read the story of the walk to Emmaus (Lk 24), or of the visit of Peter and John to the tomb (Jn 20), without observing the striking marks of reality and personal testimony in the accounts. As to the former, because it carries with it, as great literary critics have pointed out, the deepest inward evidences of its own literal truthfulness. For it so narrates the intercourse of a 'risen God' with commonplace men as to set natural and supernatural sides by side. ...We have adduced this in the previous chapter (p. 212), and now we shall attempt a further demonstration, and bear the same testimony to the impression of truth and reality made upon them by the Emmanuel narrative (A. Meyer and K. Lake, quoted in Orr, The Resurrection of Jesus, 176 f.). It is well known that there are difficulties connected with the number and order of these appearances, but they are probably due largely to the summary character of the story, and certainly are not sufficient to invalidate the utter reliability of the accounts. The two facts: (1) the empty grave, (2) the appearances of Christ on the third day. These are the main facts of the combined witness (Orr, op. cit., 212). The very difficulties which have been observed in the Gospels for nearly nineteen centuries are a testimony to a conviction of the truth of the narratives on the part of the whole Christian church. The church has not been afraid to leave these records as they are because of the facts that they embody and express. If there had been no difficulties men might have said that everything had been artificially arranged, whereas the differences bear testimony to the reality of the event recorded. The fact that we possess these two sets of appearances—one in Jerusalem and one in Galilee—is really an argument in favor of their credibility, for if it had been recorded that Christ appeared in Galilee only, or Jerusalem only, it is not unlikely that the account might have been rejected for lack of support. It is well known that the results of eyewittiness are often very exact in details, while there is no question as to the events themselves. The various books recording the story of the Indian mutiny, or the surrender of Napoleon III at Sedan are cases in point, and Sir William Ramsay is there, as elsewhere, a liberal and enlightened critic. And the main fact with great uncertainty as to precise details (Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller, 29). We believe, therefore, that a careful examination of these
appearances will afford evidence of a chain of circumstances extending from the empty grave to the day of the ascension.

Now, let us carefully all these converging lines of evidence and endeavor to give weight to all the facts of the case, it seems impossible

7. Summary to escape from the problem of a physical and miracle. That the prima facie view of the evidence afforded by the resurrection of Christ and that the apostles really believed in a true physical resurrection are surely beyond all question. And yet very much of present-day thought refuses to accept the miraculous. The scientific doctrine of the uniformity and continuity of Nature bars the way, so that from the outset it is concluded that miracles are impossible. We are either not allowed to believe (see Orr, The Resurrection of Jesus, 44), or else we are told that we are not required to believe (C. H. Robinson, Studies in the Resurrection of Christ, ch ii), in the reanimation of a dead body. If we take this view, "there is no need, really, for investigation of evidence: the question is decided before the evidence is looked at" (Orr, op. cit., 46).

A challenge to this position. It proves too much. We are not at all concerned by the charge of believing in the abnormal or unusual. New things have happened from the beginning of the present natural order, and the Christian faith teaches that Christ Himself was a new thing, and that His own resurrection as "God manifest in the flesh" was something absolutely unique. If we are not allowed to believe in any Divine intervention which we may call supernatural or miraculous, it is impossible to account for the Person of Christ at all. "Assuming Personality would be a miracle in time." Arising out of this, Christianity itself was unique, inaugurating a new era in human affairs. No Christ, therefore, can have any difficulty in accepting the abnormal, the unusual, the miraculous. If it be said that no amount of evidence can establish a fact which is miraculous, we have still to account for the moral miracles which are really involved and associated with the resurrection, esp. the deception of the disciples, who could have found out the truth of the case; a deception, too, that has proved so great a blessing to the world. Surely to those who hold a true theistic view of the world this prior view is impossible. Are we to refuse to allow to God at least as much liberty as we possess ourselves to the spontaneity of action on the other hand? We may like or dislike, give or withhold, will or not will, but the course of Nature must flow on unbrokenly. Surely God cannot be conceived of as having given such a constitution to the universe as limits His power to intervene if necessary and for sufficient purpose with the work of His own hands. Not only are all things of Him, but all things are through Him, and to Him. The resurrection means the presence of miracle, and "there is no evading the issue with which this confronts us" (Orr, The Resurrection of Jesus, 53). Unless, therefore, we are prepared to accept the possibility of the miraculous, all explanation of the NT evidence is a pure waste of time.

Of recent years attempts have been made to account for the resurrection in terms of ideas derived from Bab and other Eastern sources. It is argued that mythology provides the key to the problem, that not only analogy but derivation have been found. But apart from the remarkable variety of conclusions of Bab archaeologists there is nothing to show any historical proof worthy of the name. The whole idea is arbitrary and baseless, and prejudiced by the attitude to the supernatural. There is no connection between these oriental cults and the Jewish and Christian beliefs in the resurrection.

And so we return to a consideration of the various lines of proof. Taking them singly, they must be admitted to be strong, but taking them altogether, the argument is cumulative and sufficient. Every effect must have its adequate cause, and the only proper explanation of Christianity today is the resurrection of Christ. The doctrine of the post-Resurrection miracles of Ruggles, however, no mean judge of historical evidence, said that the resurrection was the "best-attested fact in human history." Christianity welcomes all possible sifting, testing, and use by those who honestly desire to arrive at the truth, and if they will give proper attention to all the facts and factors involved, we believe they will come to the conclusion expressed years ago by the Archbishop of Armagh, that the resurrection is the rock from which all the hammers of criticism have vainly chipped a single fragment (The Great Question, 24).

The theology of the resurrection is very important and calls for special attention. Indeed, the prominence given to it in the NT 8. Theology affords a strong confirmation of the fact itself, for it seems incredible that the resurrection—such varied and important truths—should not rest on historic fact. The doctrine may briefly be summarized: (1) evidentiary: the challenge of the resurrection promises the atoning character of the death of Christ, and of His Deity and Divine exaltation (Rom 1:4); (2) evangeline: the primitive gospel included testimony to the resurrection as one of its characteristic features, thereby proving to the hearer the assurance of the Divine redemption (1 Cor 15:1-4; Rom 4:25); (3) spiritual: the resurrection is regarded as the source and standard of the holiness of the believer. Every aspect of the Christian life confronts the believer from the beginning to the end (Rom 10:13-17); (4) eschatological: the resurrection is the guaranty and model of the believer's resurrection (1 Cor 15). As the bodies of the saints arose (Mt 27:52), so ours are to be quickened (Rom 8:11), and made like Christ's glorified body (Phil 3:21), thereby becoming spiritual bodies (1 Cor 15:44), that is, bodies ruled by their spirits and yet bodies. These points offer only the barest outline of the fullness of NT teaching concerning the doctrine of the resurrection of Christ.


W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS

RETAIL, re-tal'v. Several Heb words are thus transliterated: נְּחָשַׁנָּה, nēḥaseh, "to hold fast" (Jgs 7:8; 19:4; Job 2:9 AV [RV "hold fast"]; Mic 7:18; נְגָר, nger, "to shut up" [only in Dn 10:8; 11:6]; נְּפָדֵּנָה, naphadenah, "to hold" (Prov 3:18; 4:27; 11:16 AV [RV "obtain"]; in one case כָלָּה, kalah [Eccl 8:8]. In the NT καταλήψις, katalepsis, is used in Jn 20:23 of the "retaining of" sins by the apostles (see Retention of Sins); in Rom 1:28, RV has "refused to have," m כָלָה, "did not approve."' For AV "did not like to retain" (echo); and in Philm ver 13, substitutes "fain have kept" for "retained" (katechō). Sir 41:16 has "retain" for dialphounteō, "keep.""

RETAILATION, re-tal-i-ā'shun, re-. See Law in the NT; PUNISHMENTS; RETRIBUTION.

RETENTION, re-ten'shun, OF SINS (καταλήψις, katalepsis, "to lay fast hold of" [Jn 20:23]): The opposite of "the remission of sins." Where there was no evidence of repentance and faith, the community of believers were unauthorized to give assurance of forgiveness, and, therefore, could only warn that the guilt of sin was retained, and
that the sinner remained beneath God's judgment.

While such retention has its place in connection with all preaching of the gospel, since the offers of grace are conditional, but not the law of God. All personal dealing of a pastor with a communicant, preparatory to the reception of the Lord's Supper. As the retention is supposed to be by an individual assurance, so the retention is an assurance of individual merit. With the retention is exercised by the ministry, not as an order, but as the representatives of the congregation of believers, to whom Christ gave power. It is well known by Alford in Test. on above passage, See also Malachi. Appendix to the "Schmalkald Articles."

H. E. Jacobs

RETRODUCTION, ret-i-bi'-shun:

1. NT Terms
2. A Revelation of Wrath as Well as Grace
3. Witness of Natural Theology
4. Retribution the Natural Consequence of Sin
5. Also the Positive Infliction of Divine Wrath
6. Instances of Use of ergo and thumos
7. Instances of Use of Greek Words for "Vengeance"
8. Words Meaning "Chastisement" Not Used of the Impenitent
9. Judgment Implies Retribution
10. Moral Sense Demands Vindication of God's Righteousness
11. Scripture Indicates Certainty of Vindication

The word as applied to the Divine administration is not used in Scripture, but undoubtedly the idea is commonly enough expressed. The words which come nearest to it are:

1. NT Terms ergo, thumos, wrath attributed to God; ενόχα, εκκλησία, κοινωνία, εἱκάζειν, εἰκάζεσθαι, εἰκάζω, δική, δίκαιος, δίκαιος, kóllasí, and τυμβία, τιμβία, "punishment"; besides σοφία, krtmá, and its derivatives, words expressive of judgment.

Rom 2 is full of the thought of retribution. The apostle, in vs 5, 6, comes very near to using the word itself, and gives indeed a good description of the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment as of God, "who will render to every man according to his works." It is well in approaching the subject to remind ourselves that there is undoubtedly, as the apostle says, a Revelation of wrath. We are so accustomed to think of the gracious revelation which the gospel brings us, and to approach the subject of the doom of the impenitent under the influence of the kindly sentiments engendered thereby, and with a view of God's gracious character as revealed in salvation, that we are apt to overlook somewhat the sterner facts of sin, and to misconceive the Divine attitude toward the impenitent sinner. It is certainly well that we should let the grace of the gospel have full influence upon all our thinking, but we must beware of being too fully engrossed with one phase of the Divine character. It is an infamy of human nature that we find it difficult to let two seemingly conflicting conceptions find a place in our thought. We are apt to surrender ourselves to the sway of one or the other of them according to the pressure of the moment.

Putting ourselves back into the position of those who have only the light of natural theology, we find that all deductions from the perfections of God, as revealed in His works, combined with a consideration of man's sin and want of harmony with God, lead us to the conclusion announced by the apostle: "The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men" (Rom 1:18). Wrath implies punishment, punishment is decreed, punishment is denounced. The word of God but confirms the verdict which conscience forecasts, Nature teaches that punishment, retribution, must follow sin. Within the sphere of physical law this is clearly exemplified. No breach of the so-called laws of Nature is tolerated. Strictly speaking, the laws of Nature are not laws, but by man's will to keep in harmony with them, and the natural consequences will be trouble, punishment, retribution. Harmony with law is blessing; collision with law is loss. Thus law in Nature "worketh wrath" to the neglecters of it. Punishment necessarily results. So we may well expect that in the higher sphere, God's moral laws cannot be neglected or violated with impunity, and Scripture fully justifies the expectation and shows that sin must be punished. All things considered, the fact of punishment for sinners need not surprise; the fact of pardon is the surprising thing. The surprise of pardon has ceased to surprise us because we are so familiar with the thought. We know the "how" of it because of the revelation of God's grace, however, saves on certain conditions, and there is no such thing known in Scripture as indiscriminate, necessary, universal grace. It is only from the Bible that we know of the salvation by grace. That same revelation shows that the grand design does not come to all, in the wise of saving all; though, of course, it may be considered as presented to all. Those who are not touched and saved by grace remain shut up in their sins. They are, and must be, in the nature of the case, left to their sins, with the added guilt of rejecting the offered grace. "Except ye believe that I am he," says Incarnate Grace, "ye shall die in your sins" (Jn 8:24).

Another conclusion we may draw from the general Scriptural representation is that the future retribution is one aspect of the natural consequence of sin, yet it is also in another aspect the positive infliction of Divine wrath. It is shown to be the natural outcome of sin in such passages as "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap" (Gal 6:7); "He that soweth unto his own flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption" (Gal 6:8). It is not without suggestiveness that in Heb word 'đwōn means both iniquity and punishment, and when Cain said "My punishment is greater than I can bear" (Gen 4:13), he really said "My iniquity is greater than I can bear"; his iniquity became his punishment. Of course, due consideration to the iniquity goes a long way toward meeting many of the objections brought against the doctrine of future punishment.

The other statement, however, remains true and must be emphasized, that there is an actual infliction of Divine wrath. All the great statements about the Divine judgment imply this, and while it is wrong not to take account of the natural working out of sin in its terrible consequences, it is equally wrong, perhaps more so, to refuse to recognize this positive Divine infliction of punishment. This, indeed, is the outstanding feature of retribution as it assumes form in Scripture. Even the natural consequences of sin, rightly viewed, are part of the Divine infliction, since God, in the nature of things, has conjoined sin and its consequences, and part of the positive infliction is the judicial shutting up of sin, "wrath to the neglection of it." With the case of Cain, his iniquity became his punishment, inasmuch as God sentenced him to bear the consequences of that iniquity. On the other hand, we might say that even the terribly positive outpourings of God's wrath upon the sinner are the natural consequences of sin, since sin in its very
nature calls down the Divine displeasure. Indeed, these two phases of future punishment are so very closely connected that a right view of the matter compels us to keep both before us, and no full explanation of the punishment is possible when either phase is ignored.

The term Scripture applied to the doom of sinners all imply Divine displeasure, punitive action, retribution. The two outstanding Gr words for "wrath," ἀγέρ and θανάσιος, are both freely applied to God. ἀγέρ indicates settled displeasure, whereas θανάσιος is rather the tearing out of the flesh anger. The former is, as we should expect, more frequently applied to God, and, of course, all that is capricious and reprehensible in human wrath must be eliminated from the word as used of God. It indicates the settled opposition of His holy nature against sin. It was an affection found in the sinless Saviour Himself, for "he looked round about on them with anger" (Mk 3 5).

In the Baptist's warning "to flee from the wrath to come" (Mt 3 7), it is unquestionably the wrath of God that is meant, the manifestation of that being further described as the burning of the chalk with unquenchable fire (Mt 3 12). In Jn 3 36 it is said of the unbeliever that "the wrath of God is revealed from heaven to light of men" (Rom 1 18), the great passage we have already quoted about "the wrath of God revealed from heaven." The connection is a suggestive one and is often overlooked. In that passage Paul has quite a change of terms; he is ready to preach the gospel at Rome for he is not ashamed of the gospel; he is not ashamed of the gospel for it is the power of God unto salvation; it is the 'power of God' for therein is revealed the righteousness of God by faith; and his salvation by faith is a necessity "for the wrath of God is revealed," etc. Thus the Divine wrath on account of sin is the dark background of the gospel message. Had there been no such just wrath upon men, there had been no need for the Divine salvation. The despising of God's goodness by the impenitent means a treasuring up of "the wrath of God in the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God" (Rom 2 3-5). God "visithet with wrath" (1 5).

In Rom 4 15 the apostle states that "the law worketh wrath" (i.e. brings down the Divine displeasure), while in 5 9 he shows that believers are saved from wrath—undoubted wrath of God. The other two instances are in 2 20 where "are the children of wrath" (Eph 2 3); surely not "wrathful children," but liable to the wrath of God, and because of evil deeds come "the wrath of God upon the sons of disobedience" (Eph 5 6; Col 3 6). Christ "delivereth us from the wrath to come" (1 Thess 5 9); wrath has come upon the opposing Jews (2 16); but believers are not appointed unto wrath (5 9). With all these specific passages in view, to say nothing of the general teaching of the apostle on the question of coming judgment and punishment, it is utterly impossible to eliminate the idea of the Divine displeasure against sinners, and His consequent retributive action toward them. Even Ritschl, who absolutely denies the great principle of retribution, of positive displeasure, admits that "the only way for him out of the difficulty is to reject Paul's teaching as unauthorized." Other references to the "wrath of God" are in He 3 11; 4 3; and 6 passages in the Apocalypse—Rev 6 16 f; 11 18; 14 10 16 19 19 15. Two of the most terrible phrases in the whole of the NT. θανάσιος is only used in the Apocalypse concerning God (Rev 14 10-19; 15 1-7; 16 1-19; 19 15). In each case it refers to the same punishment, the blasing forth of the wrath; in the last two passages it is in passages in combination with ἀγέρ, and is rendered "fiercefulness" the fierceness of His wrath.

Εὐθύθεν, which means to avounce, is twice used of God (Rev 6 10; 19 2), and chatharos, "vengeance," 6 times (Lk 18 7 f; Rom 13 19; 2 Thess 1 8; He 10 30). In the first two instances it is used by Jesus, concerning the Divine action: εὐθύθεν, "judgment," or "vengence" is twice applied to God (2 Thess 1 9; Jude ver 7). Use of these terms shows that the punishment inflicted on evil men is strictly punishment of the vindictive sort, the vindication of outraged justice, the infliction of deserved penalty. Very significant is the passage in 2 Thess 1 6, "It is a righteous thing with God to recompense affilection to them that afflict you." There is no question of bettering the offender.

It is very remarkable that the terms in Gr which would carry the meaning of punishment for the good of the offender are never used in the NT of the infliction which comes upon the impenitent; these are παντελής and παντελεδές, and they are frequently used of the "chastisement of believers, but not of the impenitent. It is often claimed that the word κατάδικος used in Mt 25 46 carries the same idea of chastisement of the chaste unrepentant offender, but although Aristotle comparing God, in comparing Him to the judge of the living and the dead claims to mean that it is for the benefit of the offender (what he really says is that it is a god θανάσιος Macedonia, "one not mons and judging," "has the punished one in view," whereas θανάσιος in τον ολόκληρον εὐθυθέν, "of every one who haimg," "he may be satisfied"), the usage even in classical Gr is predominantly against making the supposed distinction. Reasons for this are given by the leading classical authors, including Aristotle himself, and it is certain that to those not thought of betterment can be in question, while all admit that in Hellenistic Gr the distinction is not maintained, and in any case chrestheria is also used of the punishment of the sinner (He 10 29).

All the representations of the coming day of judgment tell of the fact of retribution, and Christ Himself distinctly asserts it. Apart from His great eschatological discourses, concerning which criticism still hesitates and stammers, we have the solemn close of the Sermon on the Mount, and the pregnant statement of Mt 25 16 27. "The Son of Man in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then shall he render unto every man according to his deeds," and all the apostolic teaching upon the solemn theme is but the unfolding of the same great thought.

The conception of God as a perfect moral governor demands that His righteousness shall be fully vindicated. Looking at the course of history as it unfolds itself before us, we cannot fail to be struck with the anomalous Righteousness does not always triumph, goodness is often put to shame, wickedness appears to be profitable, and wicked men often prosper while good men are persecuted. Time and time signal Divine interpositions proclaim that God is indeed on the side of righteousness, but too often it seems as if He were unmindful, and men are tempted to ask the old question, "How doth God know? And is there knowledge in the Most High?" (Ps 73 11), while the righteous say in their distresses, "Jeh, how long shall the wicked, how long shall the wicked triumph?" (Ps 94 3). The moral sense cries out for some Divine vindication, and the Scriptures, in harmony with these, indicate that the final judgment will bring such vindication.

In the OT it is frequently presented as the solution of the baffling problems which beset the ethical
sphere, as for instance in that fine utterance of religious philosophy in Ph 7;3, the Psalmist has before him all the puzzling elements of the problem; the cohesiveness, the coherence upon too many assumptions and conjectures. The narrative as it stands is quite intelligible and self-consistent. There is no good reason to doubt that, as far as it goes, it is an authentic record of the life of Jacob’s son.

At the first census in the wilderness Reuben numbered 46,500 men of war (Nu 1 21); at the second they had fallen to 43,730; see


At this time Reuben was on the west side of the tabernacle; and with him were Simeon and Gad; the total number of fighting men in this division being 151,450. Tg Pseudojews says that the standard was a deer, with the legend “Hear O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord.” On the march this division took the second place (Nu 2 10 f). The prince of the tribe was Elizur ben Shedeur, whose oblation is described in 7 30 ff.

The Reubenite among the spies was Shammun ben Zaccur (13 4). It is possible that the conspiracy against Moses organized by Reuben, Simeon, and Abiram, with the assistance of Korah the Levite (Nu 16), was an attempt on the part of the tribe to assert its rights as representing the firstborn. It is significant that the children of Korah did not perish (13 11). Moses’ infamy in the desert is considered the reward and triumph of the righteous and the confession and punishment of the wicked, a great final, retributive judgment in Scriptural, reasonable, necessary.

1. Jacob’s Eldest Son: two derivations of the name. As it stands in MT it means “behold a son”; but the reason given for so calling him is “The Lord hath looked upon my affliction,” which in Heb is ru’ben, ‘reb’en. Of his boyhood we have only the story of the mandrakes (Gen 30 14). As the firstborn he should really have been leader among his father’s sons. His birthright was forfeited by a deed of peculiar infamy (35 22), and as far as we know his tribe never took the lead in Israel. It is named first, indeed, in Nu 1 5,20, but thereafter it falls to the fourth place, Judah taking the first (2 10, etc.). To Reuben’s intervention Joseph owed his escape from the fate prepared by his brethren (Gen 37 29). Some have thought Reuben designed to set him free, from a desire to rehabilitate himself with his father. But there is no need to deny to Reuben certain noble and chivalous qualities. Jacob seems to have appreciated these, and, perhaps, therefore all the more deeply lamented the lapse that spoiled his life (Gen 49 3 f). It was Reuben who felt that their perils and anxieties in Egypt were a fit recompense for the unbrotherly conduct (42 22). To assure his father of Benjamin’s safety Joseph is represented as requiring him to be taken, Reuben was ready to pledge his own two sons (ver 37). Four sons born to him in Canaan went down with Reuben at the descent of Israel into Egypt (49 8 f).

The incidents recorded are reported by a certain school of OT scholars as the vague and fragmentary traditions of the tribe, wrought into the form of a biography of the supposed ancestor of the tribe. This interpretation raises more difficulties than it solves, and the coherence made too many assumptions and conjectures. The narrative as it stands is quite intelligible and self-consistent. There is no good reason to doubt that, as far as it goes, it is an authentic record of the life of Jacob’s son.

At the first census in the wilderness Reuben numbered 46,500 men of war (Nu 1 21); at the second they had fallen to 43,730; see


At this time Reuben was on the west side of the tabernacle; and with him were Simeon and Gad; the total number of fighting men in this division being 151,450. Tg Pseudojews says that the standard was a deer, with the legend “Hear O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord.” On the march this division took the second place (Nu 2 10 f). The prince of the tribe was Elizur ben Shedeur, whose oblation is described in 7 30 ff.

The Reubenite among the spies was Shammun ben Zaccur (13 4). It is possible that the conspiracy against Moses organized by Reuben, Simeon, and Abiram, with the assistance of Korah the Levite (Nu 16), was an attempt on the part of the tribe to assert its rights as representing the firstborn. It is significant that the children of Korah did not perish (13 11). Moses’ infamy in the desert is considered the reward and triumph of the righteous and the confession and punishment of the wicked, a great final, retributive judgment in Scriptural, reasonable, necessary.

1. Jacob’s Eldest Son: two derivations of the name. As it stands in MT it means “behold a son”; but the reason given for so calling him is “The Lord hath looked upon my affliction,” which in Heb is ru’ben, ‘reb’en. Of his boyhood we have only the story of the mandrakes (Gen 30 14). As the firstborn he should really have been leader among his father’s sons. His birthright was forfeited by a deed of peculiar infamy (35 22), and as far as we know his tribe never took the lead in Israel. It is named first, indeed, in Nu 1 5,20, but thereafter it falls to the fourth place, Judah taking the first (2 10, etc.). To Reuben’s intervention Joseph owed his escape from the fate prepared by his brethren (Gen 37 29). Some have thought Reuben designed to set him free, from a desire to rehabilitate himself with his father. But there is no need to deny to Reuben certain noble and chivalous qualities. Jacob seems to have appreciated these, and, perhaps, therefore all the more deeply lamented the lapse that spoiled his life (Gen 49 3 f). It was Reuben who felt that their perils and anxieties in Egypt were a fit recompense for the unbrotherly conduct (42 22). To assure his father of Benjamin’s safety Joseph is represented as requiring him to be taken, Reuben was ready to pledge his own two sons (ver 37). Four sons born to him in Canaan went down with Reuben at the descent of Israel into Egypt (49 8 f).

The incidents recorded are reported by a certain school of OT scholars as the vague and fragmentary traditions of the tribe, wrought into the form of a biography of the supposed ancestor of the tribe. This interpretation raises more difficulties than it solves, and the coherence made too many assumptions and conjectures. The narrative as it stands is quite intelligible and self-consistent. There is no good reason to doubt that, as far as it goes, it is an authentic record of the life of Jacob’s son.

At the first census in the wilderness Reuben numbered 46,500 men of war (Nu 1 21); at the second they had fallen to 43,730; see

The land given by Moses to the tribe of Reuben reached from the Arnon, Wady el-Majib, in the S., to the border of Gad in the N. In Nu 32 34 of Gad's tribal boundary which lay far S., Aror being on the very lip of the Arnon; but they were probably to be taken as an enclave in the territory of Reuben. From Josh 13 15 ff. it is clear that the northern border ran from some point N. of the Dead Sea in a direction E.N.E., passing to the N. of Heshbon. The Dead Sea was the western boundary, and it matched with the desert on the E. No doubt many districts changed hands in the course of the history. At the invasion of Tiglath-pileser, e.g., we read that Aror was in the hands of the Reubenites, "even unto the entrance of the wilderness from the river Euphrates" (1 Ch 5 8 f.). Bezer the city of refuge lay in Reuben's territory (Josh 20 8, etc.). A general description of the country will be found under Moab; while the cities of Reuben are dealt with in separate articles.

Reuben and Gad, occupying contiguous districts, and even, as we have seen, to some extent overlapping, are closely associated in the history. Neither took part in the glorious struggle against Sisera (Jgs 5 15 f.). Already apparently the sun-drying influences were taking effect. They are not excepted, however, from "all the tribes of Israel" who sent contingents for the war against Benjamin (Jgs 20 10; 21 5), and the reference in 5 15 seems to show that Reuben might have done great things had he been disposed. The tribe therefore was still powerful, but perhaps absorbed by anxieties as to its relations with neighboring peoples. In guarding their numerous flocks against attack from the S., and sudden incursions from the desert, a warlike spirit and martial prowess were developed. They were "valiant men, men able to bear buckler and sword, and to shoot with bow, and skilful in war" (1 Ch 5 18). They overwhelmed the Hagrites with Jetur and Naphish and Nodab, and greatly enriched themselves with the spoil. In recording the raid the Chronicler pays a compliment to their religious loyalty: "They cried to God in the battle, and he was entreated of them, because they put their trust in him" (5 19 ff.). Along with Gad and Maaseiah (27,000) a contingent of 120,000 men "with all manner of instruments of war for the battle, . . . men of war, that could order the battle array," men who "came with a perfect heart to Hebron," to make David king (12 37 f.). Among David's mighty men was Adyq, chief of the Reubenites, and thirty with him" (11 42). In the 40th year of David's reign overseers were set over the Reubenites "for every matter pertaining to God, and for the affairs of the king" (26 32). Perhaps in spite of the help given to David the Reubenites had never quite got over their old hostility to the house of Saul. At any rate, when disruption came they joined the Northern Kingdom (1 K 11 31).

The subsequent history of the tribe is left in much obscurity. Exposed as they were to hostile influences of Moab, a breach and split-off from fellowship with their brethren in worship, in their isolation they probably found the descent into idolatry all too easy, and the once powerful tribe sank into comparative insignificance. Of the immediate cause of this decline we have no knowledge. Moab established its authority over the land that had belonged to Reuben; and Mesha, in his inscription (M S.), while he speaks of Gad, does not think Reuben worthy of mention. They had probably become largely absorbed in the northward stream. Meanwhile we are informed that the invasion of Hazael during the reign of Jehu (2 K 10 32 f.) that "they trespassed against the God of their fathers, and played the harlot after the gods of the peoples of the land" is given as the reason for the fate that befell them at the hands of Pul, king of Assyria, who carried them away, "and brought them unto Halah, and Habor, and Harra, and to the river of Gozan" (1 Ch 5 25 f.).

The resemblance of Reuben's case to that of Simeon is striking, for Simeon also appears to have been practically absorbed in the tribe of Judah. The prestige that should have been Reuben's in virtue of his birthright is said to have passed to Joseph (1 Ch 5 1). And the place of Reuben and Simeon in the land is taken by the son of Joseph, a fact referred to in the blessing of Jacob (Gen 48 6). Ezeckiel finds a place for Reuben in his picture of restored Israel (48 6). He appears also—in this case to proceed by Judah only—in Rev 7 5.

REUBENITES, rōʿbēn-ītēs (רֹעֲבֶן-יִתֵּן), hōʿr-rē-bēnī; Ḥēmōʿ Pāwēfān, dēmoi Ṣhōwbēn; Members of the tribe of Reuben (Nu 26 7, etc.). Adina, one of David's mighty men, was a Reubenite (1 Ch 11 42).

REUEL, rōʿēl (רֹעֶל), rōʿēl, "God is his friend": LXX Pāwōφā, Rhagōudāl.

(1) In the genealogical system Reuel is both a son of Esau by Basemath (Gen 36 4.10.13.17; 1 Ch 1 35.37) and the father of the father-in-law of Moses, Hobah (Nu 10 29). In the account of the marriage of Zipporah to Moses (Ex 2 16–21) Jethro seems to be called Reuel (of Hobah). The various names of Jethro perplexed the Talmudists, too; some held that his real name was "Hobab," and that Reuel was his father. Reuel is probably a clan name, "Nu" (NU), and Hobah is a member of the clan ("son") of Reuel (Nu 10 29 AV reads "Raguel").

(2) The father of Elishaph, the prince of Gad (Nu 2 14), called (by some copyist's mistake) "Deneel" in 1 14; 7 42–47; 19 20. LXX has uniformly Rhagouda.

(3) A Benjamite (1 Ch 9 8).

REUHMAH, rōʾōma (רֹעָה), rōʾēmah: The concubine of Nahor (Gen 22 24).

REVELATION, rev-ē-lā'shun:

I. THE NATURE OF REVELATION
1. The Religion of the Bible is the Only Supernatural Religion
2. General and Special Revelation
3. The Book of Revelation
4. Revelation among the Heathen
5. Revelation by Inspiration
6. Revelation by Imagination
7. Complete Revelation of God in Christ

II. THE PROCESS OF REVELATION
1. Phases of Revelation and the Redemptive Acts of God
2. Stages of Material Development

III. THE MODES OF REVELATION
1. The Several Modes of Revelation
2. Equal Supernaturalness of the Several Modes
3. The Prophet God's Mouthpiece
4. Visionary Form of Prophecy
5. "Passivity" of Prophets
6. Revelation by Inspiration
7. Complete Revelation of God in Christ

IV. BIBLICAL TERMINOLOGY
1. "Prophecy"
2. "Word of the Lord" and "Torah"
3. "The Scriptures"

LITERATURE

1. The Nature of Revelation.—The religion of the Bible is a frankly supernatural religion. By this it is not meant merely that, according to it, all men, as creatures, live, move and have their being in God. It is meant that, according to it, God has intervened extraordinarily, in the course of the sinful world's development, for the salvation of men otherwise lost. In Eden the Lord God had been present with sinless man in such a sense as to form a distinct element in his social
environment (Gen 3 8). This intimate association was broken up by the Fall. But God did not therefore withdraw Himself from concernment with men. Rather, He began at once a series of interventions in human history by means of which man might be rescued from his doom. And He brought to the end destined for them. These interventions involved the segregation of a people for Himself, by whom God should be known, and whose distinction should be that God should be "nigh unto them" and He was not to other nations (Dt 4 7; Ps 145 18). But this people was not permitted to imagine that it owed its segregation to anything in itself fitted to attract or determine the Divine preference; no consciousness was more poignant in Israel than that Jehovah had chosen it, not it Him, and that Jehovah's choice of it rested solely on His gracious will. Nor was this people permitted to imagine that it was for its own sake alone that it had been singled out to be the sole recipient of the knowledge of Jehovah; it was made clear from the beginning that God's mysteriously gracious dealing with it had as its ultimate end the blessing of the whole world (Gen 12 2 3; 17 4 5 6 16; 18 18; 22 18; of Rom 4 15), the bringing together again of the whole earth under the glorious reign of Jehovah, and the reversal of the curse under which the whole world lay for its sin (Gen 12 3). Meanwhile, however, Jehovah was known only in Israel. To Israel Jehovah showed His word and made known His intentions and judgments, and after this fashion He dealt with no other nation; and therefore none other knew His judgments (Ps 147 19 f). Accordingly, when the hope of Israel (who was also the desire of all nations) came, His own lips unhesitatingly declared that the salvation He brought, though of universal application, was "from the Jews" (Jn 4 22). And the nations to which this salvation had not been made known are declared by the chief agent in its proclamation to them to be, meanwhile, "far off" "having no hope" and "without God in the world" (Eph 2 12), because they were aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenant of the promise.

The religion of the Bible thus announces itself, not as being chosen among men. After God, if haply they may feel after Him and find Him, but as the creation in men of the gracious God, forming a people for Himself, that they may show forth His praise. In other words, the religion of the Bible proclaims essentially a revealed religion. Or rather, to speak more exactly, it announces itself as the revealed religion, as the only revealed religion; and sets itself as such over against all other religions, which are represented as all products, in a sense in which it is not, of the art and device of man.

It is not, however, implied in this exclusive claim to revelation—which is made by the religion of the Bible in all the stages of its history—that the living God, who made the heaven, and the earth and the sea and all that in them is, has left Himself without witness among the peoples of the world (Acts 14 17). It is asserted indeed, that in the process of His redemptive work, God suffered for a season all the nations to walk in their own ways; but it is added that to none of them has He failed to do good, and to give from heaven rains and fruitful seasons, filling their hearts with food and gladness. And not only is He represented as thus constantly showing Himself in His providence not far from any of them, they are also charged with His if haply they might feel after Him and find Him (Acts 17 27), but as from the foundation of the world openly manifesting Himself to them in the works of His hands, in which His everlasting power and Divinity are clearly seen (Rom 1 20).

That men at large have not retained Him in their knowledge, or served Him as they ought, is not due therefore to failure on His part to keep open the way to knowledge of Him, but to the darkening of their senseless hearts by sin and hardening of their sinfulness (Rom 1 21 ff), by means of which they have supplanted the truth of God by a lie and have come to worship and serve the creature rather than the ever-blessed Creator. It is, indeed, precisely because in their sin they have thus held on to the truthless righteousness and have refused to have God in their knowledge (so it is intended); and because, moreover, in their sin, the revelation God gives of Himself in His works of creation and providence no longer suffices for men's needs, that God has intervened supernaturally in the course of history to form a people for Himself, through whom at length all the world should be blessed.

It is quite obvious that there are brought before us in these several representations two species or stages of revelation, which should be discriminated to avoid confusion. There and Special is the revelation which God communicated Revelation ously makes to all men: by it His fore Divinity is announced. And there is the revelation which He makes exclusively to His chosen people: through it His saving grace is made known. Both species or stages of revelation are insisted upon throughout the Scriptures. They are, as a compromise, brought significantly together in such a declaration as we find in Ps 19: "The heavens declare the glory of God . . . their line is gone out through all the earth" (vs 4). "The law of Jehovah is perfect, restoring the soul!" (ver 7). "The heavens, the earth, the sea, and all that in them is, declare the glory of Jehovah, the Creator of all that is, which has been written upon the very heavens, that none may fail to see it. From this it is evident, however, quickly to the more full-throated praise of the mercy of Jehovah, the covenant God, who has visited His people with saving instruction. Upon this higher revelation there is finally based a prayer for salvation from sin, which ends in a great threefold acclamation, instinct with adoring wonder: "O Jehovah, my rock, and my redeemer!" (ver 14). "The heavens, the earth, and everything in them, declare the glory of God, but not of His will according to which the poet prays to be pardoned and sanctified." In so commenting, Lord Bacon touches the exact point of distinction between the two species. The stages of revelation are adapted to man as man; the other to man as sinner; and since man, on becoming sinner, has not ceased to be man, but has only acquired new needs requiring additional provisions to bring him to the end of his existence, so the revelation directed to man as sinner does not supersede that given to man as man, but supplements it with these new provisions for his attainment, in his new condition of blindness, helplessness and guilt induced by sin, of the end of his being.

These two species or stages of revelation have been commonly distinguished from one another by the distinctive names of natural and supernatural revelation, or general and special revelation, or natural and soteriological revelation. Each of these modes of discriminating them has its particular fitness and describes a real difference between the two in nature, reach or purpose. The one is communicated through the media of natural phenomena occurring in the course of Nature or of history; the other implies an attempt to follow the natural course of things and is not merely in source but in mode supernatural. The one is addressed generally to all intelligent creatures, and is therefore accessible to all men; the other is addressed to
a special class of sinners, to whom God would make known His salvation. The one has in view to meet and supply the natural need of creatures for knowledge of their God; the other to rescue broken and ruined sinners from their sin and its consequences. By and through them to one another, it is important that the two species or stages of revelation should not be set in opposition to one another, or the closeness of their mutual relations or the constancy of their interchange. They constitute the whole, the unitary whole, and each is incomplete without the other. In its most general idea, revelation is rooted in creation and the relations with His intelligent creatures into which God has brought Himself by giving them being. Its object is to realize the end of man's creation, to be attained only through knowledge of God and perfect and unbroken communion with Him. On the entrance of sin into the world, destroying this communion with God and obscuring the knowledge of Him derived from Nature, another phase of revelation was necessitated, having also another content, adapted to the new relation to God and the new conditions of intellect, heart and will brought about by sin. It must not be supposed, however, that this transition of revelation was an expected effect, introduced to meet an unforeseen contingency. The actual course of human development was in the nature of the case the expected and the intended course of human development, for which man in his destiny and revelation, therefore, in its double form was the Divine purpose for man from the beginning, and constitutes a unitary provision for the realization of the end of his creation in the actual circumstances in which he exists. We may call this unitary revelation and it consists of two elements by the cooperation of which the effect is produced; but we should bear in mind that only by their cooperation is the effect produced. Without special revelation, general revelation would be for sinful men incomplete and ineffective, and could issue, as in point of fact it has issued wherever it alone has been accessible, only in leaving them without excuse. (Rom 1:20). Without general revelation, special revelation would lack that basis in the fundaments of knowledge of the mighty and wise, righteous and good maker and ruler of all things, apart from which the further revelation of this great God's interventions in the world for the salvation of sinners could not be either intelligible, credible or operative. 

Revelation in Eden.—Only in Eden has general revelation been adequate to the needs of man. Not being a sinner, man in Eden had no need of that grace of God himself by which sinners are restored to communion with Him, or of the special revelation of this grace of God to sinners to enable them to live with God. And not being a sinner, man in Eden, as he contemplated the works of God, saw God in the unclouded mirror of his mind with a clarity of vision, and lived with Him in the untroubled depths of his heart with a trustful intimacy of association, inaccessible to sinners. Nevertheless, the revelation of God in Eden was not merely "natural." Not only does the provision of the forbidden fruit involve its own capacity for a personal relation with God, but the whole history implies an immediacy of intercourse with God which cannot fail to be set to the credit of the picturesque and spiritual nature of the creative, or be fully accounted for by the vividness of the perception of God in His works proper to sinless creatures. The impression is strong that what is meant to be conveyed to us is that man dwelt with God in Eden, and enjoyed with Him immediacy and voluntary communication. In that case, we may understand that if man had not fallen, he would have remained Eden's representative, in relation with God, and that the cessation of this immediate intercourse is due to sin. It is not that the sphere of knowledge which is rooted in sin, but, if we may be allowed the expression, the specialness of spiritual relation which is rooted in sin, that had fallen, he would have continued to lie about him through all his history, as it lay about his infancy, even man having the fall, and the cherubim and the flame of a sword, turning every way, keep the path; and God breaks His way in a round-about fashion into man's darkest hour, to reveal the guidance of providence. By slow steps and gradual stages He at once works out His saving purpose and molds the world for its reception, choosing people for Himself, and leading them through long and weary ages, until at last when the fulness of time has come He bears in His arm and proclaims before the whole world the proclamation of His great salvation to all the earth. 

(2) Revelation among the heathen.—Certainly, from the gate of Eden onward, God's general revelation ceased to be, in the strict sense, supernatural. It is, of course, not meant to say that God left His world and let it to fester in its iniquity. His providence still ruled over all, leading steadily onward to the goal for which man had been created, and of the attainment of which in God's own good time and way the very continuance of men's existence, under God's providential government, was a pledge. And His Spirit still everywhere wrought upon the hearts of men, stirring up all their powers (though created in the image of God, marred and impaired by sin) to their best activities, and to such splendid efforts in every sphere of achievement as to command the admiration of all ages, and in the highest region of all, that of conduct, to call out from an apostle the encomium that though they had no law they did by nature (observe the word "nature") the things which the law requires. But this, however, remains within the limits of Nature, that is to say, within the sphere of operation of Divinely directed and assisted second causes. It illustrates merely the heights to which the powers of man may be trained under the guidance of providence and the influences of what we have learned to call God's "common grace." Nowhere, throughout the whole ethnic domain, are the conceptions of God and His ways put within the reach of man, through God's revelation of Himself in the works of creation and providence, transcended; nowhere is the slightest knowledge betrayed of anything concerning God and His purposes, which could be known only by its being supernaturally told to men. Of the entire body of "saving truth," for example, which is the burden of what we call "special revelation," the whole heathen world remained in total ignorance. And even its hold on the general truths of religion, not being vitalized by supernatural enforcement, weakened, and men's conception of the very nature of God decayed, until it ran out to the dreadful issue which Paul sketches for us in that inspired philosophy of religion which he incorporates in the latter part of the first chapter of the Ep. to the Rom. 

Behind even the ethnic development, there lay, of course, the supernatural intercourse of man with God which had obtained before the entrance of sin into the world, and the supernatural revelations at the gate of Eden (Gen 3:8), and at the second origin of the human race, the Flood (Gen 8:21, 22; 9:1-17). How long the tradition of this primitive revelation lingered in minds and corners of the heathen world, conditioning and vitalizing the natural revelation of God always accessible, we have no means of estimating. Neither is it easy to measure the extent of God's special revelation itself, or that to His people upon men outside the bounds of Israel. And, coming into contact with, this chosen people, or sharing with them a common natural inheritance, Lot and Ishmael and Esau have all been wholly ignorant of the word of God which came to Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the race of Israel whose hands were trained with His power and whose hearts were enlightened through His grace. But He had been with those whose hands were trained with His power and whose hearts were enlightened through His grace. But He had been with the race who were hailed as a "special people," and whose experience and history were for the instruction of all. He had been with the race who were told something of the heavens and the earth, and what was in them; and who were told these things in such a manner as to make it plain that whatever impressions were thus conveyed reached apparently individuals only: the heathen which surrounded Israel, even those of the Gentile nations which were not the special people of God, and the heathen that had remained heathen; they had no revelation. In the special instances where He opened the eyes of men and sanctified natural communication—such as the dreams sent to Abimelech (Gen 20) and to Pharaoh (Gen 40, 41) and...
II. The Process of Revelation. — Meanwhile, however, God had not forgotten them, but was preparing salvation for them also through the supernatural revelation of His grace that He was making to His people. According to the Bib. representation, in the midst of and working confluently with the revelation which He has always been giving of Himself on the plane of Nature, God was making also from the very fall of man a further revelation of Himself on the plane of grace. In contrast with His general, natural revelation, in which all men by virtue of their very nature as men share, this special, supernatural revelation was granted only to a chosen few, and, progressively to a family, a tribe, a nation, a race, until, when the fulness of time was come, it was made the possession of the whole world. It may be difficult to obtain from Scripture a clear account of the order in which this revelation was given. One thing, however, is certain, the recipient of this revelation, it is so that He builds up His kingdom in the world and in the individual soul, which only gradually comes whether to the knowledge of God or to the fruition of His salvation. As to the fact, the Scriptures are explicit, tracing for us, or rather embodying in their own growth, the record of the steady advance of this gracious revelation through definite stages from its first faint beginnings to its glorious completion in Jesus Christ.

So express is its relation to the development of the kingdom of God itself, or rather to that great series of Divine operations which are directed to the building up of the kingdom of God in the world, that it is properly considered under the head of Redemptive Acts of God in the contemplating mind of man. Thus it is not infrequently said that revelation, meaning this special, redemptive revelation, has been communicated in deeds, not in words; and it is occasionally elaborately argued that the sole manner in which God has revealed Himself as the Saviour of sinners is just by performing those mighty acts by which sinners are saved. This is not, however, the Bib. representation. Revelation is, of course, often made through the instrumentality of deeds; and the series of His great redemptive acts by which He saves the world constitutes the preeminent revelation of the grace of God — so far as these redemptive acts are open to observation and are perceived in their significance. But revelation, after all, is the correlate of understanding and has as its proximate end just the production of knowledge, though not, of course, knowledge for its own sake but knowledge for the sake of salvation. The series of the redemptive acts of God, accordingly, can properly be designated “revelation” only when and so far as they are contemplated as adapted and designed to produce knowledge of God and His gracious works. No less the series of unexplained acts can be thought, however, adapted to produce knowledge, esp. if these acts be, as in this case, of a highly transcendental character. Nor can this particular series of acts be thought to have as its main design the production of knowledge; its main design is rather to produce an experience culminating in any event avail to modify the general fact that the life of the heathen peoples lay outside the supernatural revelation of God. The history of revelation were suffered to walk in their own ways (Acts 14:16).

1. Place of Revelation.

a. The acts of God in the development of the kingdom of God in the world, that it is properly considered under the head of Redemptive Acts of God in the contemplating mind of man. Thus it is not infrequently said that revelation, meaning this special, redemptive revelation, has been communicated in deeds, not in words; and it is occasionally elaborately argued that the sole manner in which God has revealed Himself as the Saviour of sinners is just by performing those mighty acts by which sinners are saved. This is not, however, the Bib. representation. Revelation is, of course, often made through the instrumentality of deeds; and the series of His great redemptive acts by which He saves the world constitutes the preeminent revelation of the grace of God — so far as these redemptive acts are open to observation and are perceived in their significance. But revelation, after all, is the correlate of understanding and has as its proximate end just the production of knowledge, though not, of course, knowledge for its own sake but knowledge for the sake of salvation. The series of the redemptive acts of God, accordingly, can properly be designated “revelation” only when and so far as they are contemplated as adapted and designed to produce knowledge of God and His gracious works. No less the series of unexplained acts can be thought, however, adapted to produce knowledge, esp. if these acts be, as in this case, of a highly transcendental character. Nor can this particular series of acts be thought to have as its main design the production of knowledge; its main design is rather to produce an experience culminating in any event avail to modify the general fact that the life of the heathen peoples lay outside the supernatural revelation of God. The history of revelation were suffered to walk in their own ways (Acts 14:16).

2. Stages of Material from the point of view, the development of God's redemptive revelation from its first beginnings, in the promise of Material given to Abraham—or rather in what Develop- ment at the gate of Eden—to its comple- tion in the advent and work of Christ and the teaching of His apostles; a steadily ad- vancing development, which, as it lies spread out to view in the pages of Scripture, takes to those who look at it from the consummation backward, the appearance of a series of stages or phases of God's acts by the great figure of Christ. Even from the formal point of view, however, there has been pointed out a progressive advance in the method of revelation, consonant with its advance in content, or rather with the advancing stages of the bringing up of the Kingdom of God, to subserve
which is the whole object of revelation. Three distinct steps in revelation have been discriminated from this point of view. They are distinguished precisely by the increasing independence of revelation from divine control, the disclosure of God's acts of revelation, and the redemption by the acts of God, in which, nevertheless, all revelation is a substantial element. Discriminations like this must not be taken too absolutely; and in the present instance the chronological sequence cannot be accurately dealt with. Moreover, there are three generally successive stages of revelation which may be recognized, producing periods at least characteristically of what we may somewhat conventionally call theophany, prophecy and inspiration. What may be somewhat indefinitely summed off as this Patriarchal age is characterized as "the period of External Manifestations, and Symbols, and Theophanies"; during it "God spoke to men through their senses, in physical phenomena, as the burning bush, the cloudy pillar, or in sensuous forms, as men, angels, etc., etc. . . . . In the Prophetic age, on the contrary, the prevailing mode of revelation was by means of inward prophetic inspiration": God spoke to men characteristically by the movements of the Holy Spirit in their hearts. "Prevalently, at any rate, revelation in the downward process, or revelation as it was called, was supernatural revelation was a revelation in the hearts of the foremost thinkers of the people, or, as we call it, prophetic inspiration, without the aid of external sensuous symbols of God?" (A. B. Davidson, OT Prophecy, 1903, p. 148; cf. pp. 12-14, 145 ff.) This internal method of revelation reaches its culmination in the NT period, which is preeminently the age of the Spirit. What is esp. characteristic of this age is revelation through the medium of the written word, what may be called the apodictic or outward prophetic inspiration. The revealing Spirit speaks through chosen men as His organs, but through these organs in such a fashion that the most intimate processes of their souls become the instruments by means of which He speaks His mind. Thus at all events there are brought clearly before us three well-marked modes of revelation, which we may perhaps designate respectively, not with perfect discrimination, it is true, but not misleadingly, (1) external manifestation, (2) internal suggestion, and (3) concursive operation.

III. Modes of Revelation.—Theophany may be taken as the typical form of "external manifestation"; but by its side may be ranged the other modes by which Revelation is to Himself known, including express miracles, no doubt, but along with them every supernatural intervention in the affairs of men, by means of which a better understanding is communicated of what God is or what are His purposes of grace to a sinful race. Under "internal suggestion" may be subsumed all the characteristic phenomena of what is most properly spoken of as "prophecy": visions and dreams, which, according to a fundamental passage (Nu 12 6), constitute the testimony, (2) internal suggestion, and with them the whole "prophetic word," which shares its essential characteristic with visions and dreams, since it comes not by the will of man but from God. By "concursive operation" may be meant that form of revelation constituted in an inspired psalm or oracles or history, in which no human activity—not even the control of the will—is superseded, but the Holy Spirit works in, and through them all in such a manner as to communicate to the product qualities distinctly supernatural and not to be found in the ordinary literature of the Bible, from that of Moses to that of Christ and His apostles, in which all these modes of revelation do not find place. One or another may seem particularly characteristic of this age of or that; but they all occur in every age. And they occur side by side, broadly speaking, on the same level. No discrimination is drawn between them in point of worthiness as modes of revelation, and much less in point of purity in the revelation. For revelation cannot be viewed in the circumstance that God spoke to Moses, not by dream or vision but mouth to mouth, is, indeed, adverted to (Nu 12 8) as a proof of the peculiar favor shown to Moses and even of the superior dignity of Moses above other organs of revelation: God admitted him to an intimacy of intercourse which He did not accord to others. But though Moses was thus distinguished above all others in the dealings of God with him, no distinction is drawn between the revelations given through him and those given through other organs of revelation in point of either of Divinity or of authority. And beyond this we have no Scriptural warrant to go on in contrasting one mode of revelation with another. Dreams may seem to us little fitted to serve as vehicles of Divine communications. But there is no suggestion in Scripture that revelations through dreams stand on a lower plane than any others; and we should not fail to remember that the essential characteristics of revelations through dreams are shared by all forms of communication in which men may or should call them visions or not the images or ideas which fill, or pass in procession through, the consciousness are determined by some other power than the recipient's own will. It may seem natural to suppose in such cases that the recipient is not in communication to the fullness of the engagement of the mental activity of the recipient in their reception. But we should bear in mind that the intellectual or spiritual quality of a revelation is not derived from the recipient, but from its source, and that the fundamental fact in all revelation is that it is from God. This is what gives unity to the whole process of revelation, given though it may be in diverse portions and in diverse manners and distributed though it may be through the ages in accordance with the mere will of God, or as it may have suited His developing purpose—this and its unitary end, which is ever the building up of the kingdom of God. In whatever diversity of forms, by means of whatever variety of modes, in whatever distinguishable stages it is given, it is ever the revelation of the One God, and it is ever the one consistently developing redemptive revelation of God.

On a prima facie view it may indeed seem likely that a difference of the nature of the cases, in which it is said that God spoke to Moses in a vision, would inevitably obtain between revelations given through dreams and those given through other organs. The completely supernatural character of revelations given in theophanies is obvious. To the several men, to make known His gracious purposes toward them, has no other recourse here than to pronounce the stories legendary. The objectivity of the mode of communication which is adopted is intense, and it is thrown up to observation with the greatest emphasis. Into the natural life of man there is intruded a mode of knowledge more purely supernatural communication. In these communications we are given accordingly just a series of "natural forms of prophecy," which are not supernatural. In the Patriarchal age were all revelations given in theophanies or objective appearances. Visions and visions, and revelations without explicit intimation in the narrative of how they were communicated. And when we pass on in the history, we do not. Indeed, leave behind us theophanies and objective appearances. It is not only made the very characteristic of Moses, the greatest figure in the whole history of revelation except only that of Christ, that he knew God face to face (Dt 34 10), and that He spoke to him "manifestly" and not in dark speeches (Nu 12 8); but throughout the whole history of the appearance of Jesus to Paul on the road to Damascus, God has shown Himself visibly to His servants whenever He has seemed so impressed to Him the occasion of making them in objective speech. Nevertheless, it is expressly made the characteristic of the Prophetic age that the God makes Himself known to His servants "in a vision, ... in a dream" (Nu 12 8). And although, throughout its entire duration, God, in fulfillment of His promise (Dt
18:18), put His words in the mouths of His prophets and gave them His commandments to speak, yet it would seem that the very employment of men as instruments of revelation that the words of God given through them might be spoken out are in the very nature of the purport of the supernatural may seem so far obscured. And when it is not merely the mouths of men with which God has spoken, but their minds and hearts as well—the play of their own mental processes of the logical reasoning, or the tenacity of their memories, as, say, in a psalm or an epistle, or a history—the supernatural element is less likely to appear easily something to retire still farther into the background. It can scarcely be a mystery that will be revealed, for vision has been raised to the same position of the nature and the supernatural in such revelations, and, in many cases, man's employment meaning or the completion of their supernatural has been limited and curtailed in the interests of the natural instrumentalities employed. The plausibility of such reasoning renders it the more necessary that we should observe the unvarying emphasis which the Scriptures place upon the absolute supernaturality of revelation in all its modes alike. In the view of the Scriptures, the completely supernatural character of revelation is in no way lessened by the circumstance that it has been given through the lips, mouth, hand, or oracle, as the case may be.

We have already been led to note that even on the occasion when Moses is exalted above all other organs of revelation (Nu 12:6 ff), in the highest point of dignity and favor, no suggestion whatever is made of any inferiority, in either the directness or the purity of their supernaturalness, attaching to other organs of revelation. There might never afterward arise a prophet in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face (Dt 34:10). But each of the whole series of prophets raised up by Jehovah the people that might always know His will was to be like Moses in speaking to the people only what Jehovah commanded them (Dt 18:15-18:20). In this great promise, securing to Israel the succession of prophets, there is also included a declaration of precisely how Jehovah would communicate His messages not so much to them as through them. "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto me, and will speak unto them in my name; and they shall hearken unto them" (Dt 18:18); and He will put His words in His mouth, and He shall speak unto them all that I shall command him." The process of revelation through the prophets was a process by which Jehovah put His words in the mouths of the prophets, and the prophet speaking precisely those words and not others. So the prophets themselves ever asserted. "Then Jehovah put forth his hand, and touched my mouth," explains Jeremiah in his account of how he received his prophecies, "and Jehovah said unto me, Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth" (Jer 1:9; of 6:14; Isa 51:16; 69:21; Nu 22:35; 23:5. 12:16). Accordingly, the words "with which" they spoke were not their own but the Lord's: "And he said unto me, records Ezekiel, "Son of man, go, get thee unto the house of Israel, and speak with my words unto them" (Ezk 3:4). It is a process of nothing other than "dictation" which is thus described (2 S 5:14.319), though, of course, the question may remain open of the exact processes by which the dictation is accomplished. The fundamental passage which brings the central fact before us in the most vivid manner is, no doubt, the account of the commissioning of Moses and Aaron given in Ex 4:10-17. 7-1. Here, in the case of Jehovah speaking to which Jehovah had made the mouth can be with it to teach it what to speak, and announces the precise function of a prophet to be that he is a "mouth of God," who speaks not his own but God's words. Accordingly, the Heb name for "prophet" (nabhāt), whatever may be its etymology, means throughout the Scriptures just "spokesman," though not "spokes-

man" in general, but spokesman by way of eminence, that is, God's spokesman; and the characteristic formula by which a prophetetic declaration is announced is: The Lord Jehovah says (Nu 12:6 [or the brief "saith Jehovah"] (nēḇū ʿāḇeḵ). In no case does a prophet put his words forward as his own words. That he is a prophet at all is due not to choice on his own part, but to a call of God, obeyed often with reluctance; and he prophesies or forbear to prophesy, not according to his own will or fancy, but at the Lord's bidding (Ezk 3:20), and for the benefit of the Lord, not of himself (Ezk 3:20). It is for the Lord to grant his sight (Ezk 12:24), and it is He who gives him the fruit of the spirit (Isa 57:19; cf 6:7; 50:4). In contrast with the false prophets, he strenuously asserts that he does not speak out of his own heart ("heart" in Bib. language includes the whole inner man), but that what he proclaims is the pure word of Jehovah. The fundamental passage does not quite leave the matter, however, with this general declaration.

4. Prophecy as Message. The word with which Jehovah communicated His messages to His prophets as through the medium of visions and dreams. Neither visions in the technical sense of that word, nor dreams, appear, however, to have been the common mode of deliverance of the prophets, the record of whose revelations has come down to us. But, on the other hand, there are numerous indications in the record that the universal mode of revelation to them was one which was in some way or other a vision, and so be classed only in the category distinctively so called.

The whole nomenclature of prophecy presupposes, indeed, its vision-form. Prophecy is distinctively a word, and was delivered by the Lord by means known to Him as the "word of Jehovah." That it should be announced by the name. "Thus saith the Lord," is, therefore, on what we expect, or expect to understand for such a description of its process as: "The Lord Jehovah saith unto man, to open mine ear;" (Isa 50:4-5). But this is not the story of speaking of their messages which is most usual in the prophets. Rather is the whole body of prophecy curiously presented as a thing seen. Isaiah places at the head of his books: "The vision of Isaiah which Jehovah spake unto him," (cf Isa 29:10; Ob 1); and then proceeds to set at the head of subordinate sections the remarkable words, "The word which Jehovah spake unto me. His burden [in "oracle" . . .] which Jehovah did see . . ." (Isa 13). Similarly, therefore, stand at the head of other prophetic books: the words of Amos (Am 1:1); the word of Jehovah which came to Amos (Am 2:1), "which Jehovah spake unto me" (Am 2:14); the oracle of Jehovah which was revealed unto the prophet did see (Hab 1:1); and elsewhere, such language occurs: the word that Jehovah hath spoken to the prophet, (Isa 35:18); the spirit of Jehovah that spake by me. . . . oracles (Lam 2:14); the word of Jehovah came to me (Ezek 13:3); and, beholding I am unto the foolish prophets, which follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing. (Ezek 13:8). I will look forth to see what he will speak with me. . . . Jehovah . . . said, Write the vision (Hab 2:1). It is an inadequate explanation of such language to suppose it merely a relic of a time when vision was more predominantly the form of revelation. There is no proof that vision in the technical sense was ever more predominantly the form of revelation than in the days of the great writers, and so language which have quoted too obviously represents the living point of view of the prophets to admit of the supposition that it was merely conventional on the part of the prophets in a word, represent the Divine communications which they received, to be given to them in the mode of words. It is possible, no doubt, to exaggerate the significance of this. It is an exaggeration, for example, to insist that therefore all the Divine communications before us in the most vivid manner is, no doubt, the account of the commissioning of Moses and Aaron given in Ex 4:10-17. 7-1. Here, in the case of Jehovah speaking to which Jehovah had made the mouth can be with it to teach it what to speak, and announces the precise function of a prophet to be that he is a "mouth of God," who speaks not his own but God's words. Accordingly, the Heb name for "prophet" (nabḥāt), whatever may be its etymology, means throughout the Scriptures just "spokesman," though not "spokes-
views is the good one of doing full justice to the objec-
tive fact of the vouchers to a prophecy, or, in other words, that these revelations took place entirely externally to the prophets, and, if they were implied, stood off and contemplated them, or if they were implied, that a mediation was passed through which so violent as not to supersede their mental activity, but for whose memory it is not possible they would be even in the least degree evident that they came from a source other than the prophets' own minds. It is undoubtedly the funda-
mental point of the question, which represents the complete picture of the prophets' own views; it is their own testimony that the revelations given through them are not their own but wholly God's. This point stands beyond question (Ezk 13 3; "Woe unto the foolish prophets, that follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing,"") a typical utterance of the prophet. The Revelation is not the prophet's. What distinguishes the false prophets is the medium through which it came; genuine prophecy (Ezk 13 16-17), on, or to, draw the anathema sharply, that they speaks a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord. But the extreme views fail to do justice, the one to the equally important fact that the word of God, given through the prophets, comes as the pure and unadulterated word of God not merely to, but from, the prophets; and the other to the equally obvious fact that the influence of the prophets is alert throughout the whole process of the reception and delivery of the revelation made through them (see INSPIRATION; PROPHECY).

That which gives to prophecy as a mode of revel-
lation its place in the category of visions, strictly so called, and dreams is that it shares with them the distinguishing characteristic which determines the class. In them all alike the movements of the mind to a vision are something extraneous to the subject's will, or, rather, they are speaking of supernaturally given dreams and visions, extraneous to the totality of the subject's own psychoses. A power not himself takes possession of his con-
sciousness and determines it according to its will. That power, in the case of the prophets, was fully recognized and energetically asserted to be Jeh-Himself or, to be more specific, the Spirit of Jeh (1 S 10 6:10; Neh 9 30; Zec 7 12; Joel 2 28.29). The prophets were therefore 'men of the Spirit' (Hos 9 7). What constituted them prophets was that the Spirit was put upon them (Isa 42 1) or poured out on them (Joel 2 28.29), and they were consequently filled with the Spirit (Mic 3 8), or, in another but equivalent location, that "the hand" of the Lord, or "the power of the hand" of the Lord, was upon them (1 Ki 1 3; 2 11:22; 3 22; 37 1; 40 1), that is to say, they were under the Divine control. This control is represented as complete and compelling, so that, under it, the prophet becomes not the "mover," but the "court," the "articulator," of the thing. This is how the apostle Peter very purely reflects the prophetic consciousness in his well-known declaration: 'No prophecy of scripture comes of private interpre-
tation; for prophecy was never brought by the will of man; but it was born by the Holy Spirit that men spoke from God' (2 Pet 1 20.21).

What language of Peter emphasizes—and what is emphasized in the whole account which the prophets give of their own conscious-
ness—is, to speak plainly, the passivity of the revelation given through them. This is the significance of the phrase; 'it was as borne by the Holy Spirit that men spoke from God.' To be "borne" (φησιν, προει) is not the same as to be led (ἀκολούθος, μέλτος) (εὐφραίνω, εὐφραίνω): he that is "borne" contributes nothing to the movement in-
duced, but is the object to be moved. The term "passivity" is, perhaps, however, liable to some misapprehension, and should not be over-stressed. It is not intended to deny that the intelligence of the prophets was active in the reception of their message; it was by means of their active intelligence that their message was received; their in-
telligence was the instrument of revelation. It is intended to deny only that their intelligence was active in the production of their message: that it was creatively as distinguished from receptively active. For reception itself is a kind of activity.

What the prophetic passivity conceals is this: that we shall understand is that they are in no sense co-authors with God of their messages. Their mes-
gages are given them, given them entire, and given them precisely as they are given out by them. God may make use of personal instruments, but he does not give a part of his revelation to his messengers, but "His mouth." But at the same time their intelligence is active in the reception, retention and announcing of their messages, contrib-
uting nothing to them but presenting fit instru-
ments for the communication of them— instruments capable of delivering the message profoundly to and zealously proclaiming it.

There is, no doubt, a not unnatural hesitancy abroad in thinking of the prophets as exhibiting only such meretricious and mechanical traits, and nothing of their personal character. For the term 'prophetic,' so far from being applied in \*1\* a derogatory sense, is equally applicable to the personal and to the prophetic character of the prophet. We are led to the conclusion that the true prophet is not only a speaker of God but an authority in his own right. The prophet is an independent source of divine authority, a revealer of God in his own unique way, and as such, is not only a mouth-piece of the living God, but also a representative of his wisdom, with a unique faculty of presenting it. He is a called, and an inspired. "He is a teacher in his own right." And the same thing is true of the message; it is a message that is given to the prophet and is not simply 'mover,' of the element of life, or "born of God," in the sense that he is a mouth-piece of the living God, but also as the authority in his own right, with a unique faculty of presenting it. He is a called, and an inspired. "He is a teacher in his own right." And the same thing is true of the message; it is a message that is given to the prophet and is not simply

The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia: Revelation

5. Passivity of the Prophets—The revelation given through them. This is the significance of the phrase; 'it was as borne by the Holy Spirit that men spoke from God.' To be "borne" (φησιν, προει) is not the same as to be led (ἀκολούθος, μέλτος) (εὐφραίνω, εὐφραίνω): he that is "borne" contributes nothing to the movement induced, but is the object to be moved. The term "passivity" is, perhaps, however, liable to some misapprehension, and should not be over-stressed. It is not intended to deny that the intelligence of the prophets was active in the reception of their message; it was by means of their active intelligence that their message was received; their intelligence was the instrument of revelation. It is intended to deny only that their intelligence was active in the production of their message: that it was creatively as distinguished from receptively active. For reception itself is a kind of activity.

What the prophetic passivity conceals is this: that we shall understand is that they are in no sense co-authors with God of their messages. Their messages are given them, given them entire, and given them precisely as they are given out by them. God may make use of personal instruments, but he does not give a part of his revelation to his messengers, but "His mouth." But at the same time their intelligence is active in the reception, retention and announcing of their messages, contributing nothing to them but presenting fit instruments for the communication of them— instruments capable of delivering the message profoundly to and zealously proclaiming it.

There is, no doubt, a not unnatural hesitancy abroad in thinking of the prophets as exhibiting only such meretricious and mechanical traits, and nothing of their personal character. For the term 'prophetic,' so far from being applied in a derogatory sense, is equally applicable to the personal and to the prophetic character of the prophet. We are led to the conclusion that the true prophet is not only a speaker of God but an authority in his own right. The prophet is an independent source of divine authority, a revealer of God in his own unique way, and as such, is not only a mouth-piece of the living God, but also a representative of his wisdom, with a unique faculty of presenting it. He is a called, and an inspired. "He is a teacher in his own right." And the same thing is true of the message; it is a message that is given to the prophet and is not simply 'mover,' of the element of life, or "born of God," in the sense that he is a mouth-piece of the living God, but also as the authority in his own right, with a unique faculty of presenting it. He is a called, and an inspired. "He is a teacher in his own right." And the same thing is true of the message; it is a message that is given to the prophet and is not simply
beasts speak, and mysterious voices sound forth from the void; and there have not been lacking instances in which men have been compelled by the same power to speak what they would not, and it is not without cause we speak of the strangling power of their ears. But ordinarily when God the Lord would speak to men He avails Himself of the services of a human tongue with which to speak, and He employs this tongue according to its nature as a tongue and according to the particular nature of the tongue which He employs. It is vain to say that the message delivered through the instrumentality of this tongue is conditioned at least in its form by the tongue by which it is spoken, if not, indeed, limited, curtailed, in some degree determined even in its matter, by it. Not only was it God the Lord who made the tongue, and who made this particular tongue with all its peculiarities, not without regard to the message He would deliver through it; but His control of it is perfect and complete, and it is as absurd to say that He cannot speak His message by it purely without that message suffering change from the peculiarities of its tone and modes of enunciation, as it would be to say that no new truth can be announced, no new element of speech by the combination of which the truth in question is announced are already in existence with their fixed range of connotation. The marks of the several individualities imprinted on the messages of the tongues of men, are not the crowning mark of the general fact that these messages are couched in human language, and in no way beyond that general fact affect their purity as direct communications from God.

6. Revelation by Inspiration. This mode of revelation differs from prophecy, properly so called, precisely by the employment in it, as is not done in prophecy, of the total personality of the organ of revelation, as a factor. It has been common to speak of the mode of the Spirit's action in this form of revelation, therefore, as an assistance, a superintendence, a direction, a control, the meaning being that the effect aimed at— the discovery and enunciation of Divine truth—is attained through the action of the human powers—historical research, logical reasoning, ethical thought, religious aspiration, not by themselves, however, but under the prevailing assistance, superintendence, direction, control of the Divine Spirit. This manner of speaking has the advantage of setting this mode of revelation sharply in contrast with prophetic revelation, as involving merely a determining, and not, as in prophetic revelation, a supercessive action of the revealing Spirit. We are warned, however, against pressing this discrimination too far by the inclusion of the whole body of Scripture in the category of revelation under this heading. It is true, as a category of prophecy, and the assignment of their origin not to a mere "leading" but to the "bearing" of the Holy Spirit. In any event such terms as assistance, superintendence, direction, control, inadequately express the nature of the Spirit's action in revelation by "concussive operation." The Spirit is not to be conceived as standing outside of the human powers employed for the effect in view, ready to supplement any inadequacies they may show and to supply any defects they may manifest, but as working confluently, with a superiority, elevating them, directing them, controlling them, energizing them, so that, as His instruments, they rise above themselves and under His inspiration do His work and reach His aim. The product, therefore, which by their hand is theirs, is His product through them. It is this fact which gives to the process the right to be called actively, and to the product the right to be called passively, a revelation. Although the circumstance that what is done is done by and through the action of human powers keeps this product more properly in a true sense human, yet the confluent operation of the Holy Spirit throughout the whole process raises the result above what could by any possibility be achieved by mere human powers and constitutes it expressly a supernatural product. The human traits are traceable throughout, but at bottom it is a Divine gift, and the language of Paul is the most proper mode of speech that could be applied to it: "Which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth" (1 Cor 2:13); "The things which I write unto you...are the commandment of the Lord" (1 Cor 14:37).

7. Complete may without violence be subsumed under "Revelation" the other of these three modes of God—external manifestation, internal significance in Christ, and concursive operation. All, that is, except the culminating revelation, not through, but in, Jesus Christ. As in His person, Jesus Christ is a Godhead bodily, He rises above all classification and is sui generis; so the revelation accumulated in Him stands outside all the divers portions and divers manners in which otherwise revelation has been given and sums up in itself that which has been or can be made known of God and of His redemption. He does not so much make a revelation of God as Himself is the revelation of God; He does not merely disclose God's purpose of redemption, He is unto us wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification and redemption. The theophanies are but faint shadows in comparison with His manifestation of God in the flesh. The prophets could prophesy only as the Spirit of Christ which was in them testified, revealing to them as to servants one or another of the secrets of the Lord Jehovah; from Him as His Son Jehovah has no secrets, but whatsoever the Father knows that the Son knows also. Whatever truth men have been made partakers of by the revelation of the Spirit of truth, those have it. But the Father hath them all in Himself, and is taken by the Spirit of truth and declared to men that He may be glorified. Nevertheless, though all revelation is thus summed up in Him, we should not fail to note very carefully that it would also be all sealed up in the Spirit of truth and declared to men in Him—so little is revelation conveyed by fact alone, without the word—had it not been thus taken by the Spirit of truth and declared unto men. The entirety of the NT is but the explanatory word accompanying and explaining the revelation of Christ. And when this fact was in all its meaning made the possession of men, revelation was completed and in that sense ceased. Jesus Christ is no less the end of revelation than He is the end of the law.

IV. Biblical Terminology.—There is not much additional to be learned concerning the nature and processes of revelation, from the terms currently employed in Scripture to express the idea. These terms are often used in the book of Proverbs and of Psalms, as closing, making known, making manifest, applied with more or less heightened significance to supernatural acts or effects in kind. In the Eng. Bible (AV) the vb. "revel" occurs about 51 t., of which 22 are in the OT and 29 in the NT. In the OT the word is always the rendering of a
Heb term נָצָר, gālāh, or its Aram. equivalent נָצָר, gālāh, the root meaning of which appears to be "nakedness." When applied to revelation, it seems to hint at the removal of obstacles to perception of the underlying objects to perception. In the NT the word "reveal" is always used with the singular exception of Lk 2:5 where the rendering of a Gr term ἀποκαλύπτω, ἀποκάλυπτος (but in 2 Thess 1:7; 1 Pet 4:13 the corresponding noun ἀποκάλυψις, ἀποκάλυπτος), which has a very similar basic significance with our word. As this Hebrew word formed no substantive in this sense, the noun "revelation" does not occur in the Eng. OT, the idea being expressed, however, by other Heb terms variously rendered. It occurs in the Eng. NT, on the other hand, about a dozen times, and always as the rendering of the substantive corresponding to the vb. rendered "reveal" (ἀποκάλυπται). On the face of the Eng. Bible, the terms "reveal," "revelation" bear therefore uniformly the general sense of "disclose," "disclosure." The idea is found in the Bible, however, much more frequently than the terms "reveal," "revelation" in EV. Indeed, the Heb and Gr terms exclusively so rendered occur more frequently in this sense than in this rendering in the Eng. Bib. And by their side there stand various other terms which express in one way or another the general conception.

In the NT the vb. ἀποκρίνομαι, ἀποκρίνεσθαι, with the general sense of making manifest, manifesting, is the most common of these. It differs from ἀποκαλύπτω as the more general and external term from the more special and inward. Other terms also are occasionally used: ἀποκάλυπται, ἀποκάλυπτος, "manifestation" (2 Thess 2:8; 1 Tim 6:14; 2 Tim 1:10; 4:1; Tit 2:13; cf ἀπαντάω, ἀπανθάνω, Tit 2:11; 3:4); ἀποκάλυψις, ἀποκάλυψισ (Rev 1:1; 17:1; 22:16.8; cf 1 Jos 19:16; 1 Tim 4:15); ἀποκαλύβομαι, ἀποκαλύβο δότας (Ju 1:18), of which, however, one only perhaps—χρηματίζω, χρηματιζόμαι (Mt 2:12.22; Lk 2:20; Acts 10:22; He 8:5; 11:7; 12:25); χρηματίζω, χρηματιζόμαι (Rom 11:4)—calls for particular notice as in a special way, according to its usage, expressing the idea of a Divine communication.

In the OT, the common Heb vb. for "seeing" (תָּנָה, rādāh) is used in its appropriate stems, with God as the subject, for "appearing," "showing": "the Lord appeared unto..."; "the word which the Lord spoke..."

And from this vb. not only is an active substantive formed which supplied the more ancient designation of the official organ of revelation: רָדָה, rēdāh, "seer;" but also objective substantives, נֶצֶר, nēzēr, נָצָר, marēh, and נַצְר, marēh, which were used to designate the thing seen in a revelation—the "vision." By the side of these terms there were others in use, derived from a root which supplies to the Aram. its common word for "seeing," but in Heb has a somewhat more pregnant meaning, נָצָר, hāzāh. Its active derivative, נָצֵר, nēzēr, had become practically obsolete; and its passive derivatives hāzōn, hāzzōn, hāzōn, hāzēth, hāzōn, which provided the ordinary word for the substance of the revelation or "vision." The distinction between the two sets of terms, derived respectively from רָדָה and hāzōn, while not to be unduly pressed, seems to lie in the direction that the former suggests external manifestations and the latter internal revelations. The רָדָה is to whom Divine manifestations, the hāzōn he to whom Divine communications, have been vouchsafed; the marēh is an appearance, the hāzōn and its companions a vision. It may be of interest to observe that marēh is the term employed in Nu 12:6, while it is hāzōn which commonly occurs in the headings of the written prophecies to indicate their revelatory character. From this it may possibly be inferred that the former, informing it is the mode, in the latter the contents of the revelation that is emphasized. Perhaps a like distinction may be traced between the hāzōn of Dnl 8:15 and the marēh of the next verse. The ordinary vb. for "knowing," יֶדֶח, yēḏeh, expressing in its causative sense the idea of making known, informing, is also very naturally employed, with God as its subject, in the sense of revealing, and that, in accordance with the natural sense of the word, with a tendency to pregnancy of implication, of revealing effectively, if not merely uncovering to observation, but making to know. Accordingly, it is paralleled not merely with נָצָר, gālāh (Ps 98:2: "The Lord hath made known his salvation; his righteousness hath he displayed in the sight of the nation"), but also with such terms as נֶצֶר, lānāh (Ps 26:4: "Make known to me thy ways, O Lord: teach me thy paths"). This vb. yēḏeh forms no substantive in the sense of "revelation" (cf נֶצֶר, do'lah, Nu 24:16; Ps 19:3).

The most common vehicles of the idea of "revelation" in the OT are, however, two expressions which are yet to be mentioned. These are the phrase, "word of Jeh," and the term commonly rendered in the EV by "law." The former (dēḇār Yhwh, varied to dēḇār Yhwh, masāl Yhwh) occurs scores of times and is at once the simplest and the most colorless designation of a Divine communication. By the latter (torāh), the proper meaning of which is "instruction," a strong implication of authoritativeness is conveyed; and, in this sense, it becomes what may be called the technical designation of a specifically Divine communication. The two are not infrequently brought together, as in Isa 1:10: "Hear the word of Jeh, ye rulers of Sodom; give ear unto the law [in "teaching"] of our God, ye people of Gomorrah;" or Isa 2:3; Mic 4:2: "For out of Zion shall go forth the law, and from Yhwh his word." Both terms are used for any Divine communication of whatever extent; and both came to be employed to express the entire body of Divine revelation, conceived as a unitary whole. In this comprehensive usage, however, both terms, as already said, came to fall more on the graciousness, and of the other more on the authoritativeness of this body of Divine revelation; and both passed into the NT with these implications. The "word of God," or simply "the word," comes thus to mean in the NT, just the gospel, "the word of the proclamation of redemption, that is, all that which God has to say to man, and causes to be said" looking to his salvation. It expresses, in a word, precisely what we technically speak of as God's redemptive revelation. "The law," on the other hand, means in this NT use, just the whole body of the authoritative instruction which God has given men. It expresses, in other words, what we commonly speak of as God's supernatural revelation. The two things, of course, are the same: God's authoritative revelation is His gracious revelation; God's redemptive revelation is His supernatural revelation. The two terms merely look at the one aggregate of revelation from two aspects, and each emphasizes its own aspect of this one aggregate revelation.

Now, this aggregated revelation lay before the men of the NT in a written form, and it was impossible to speak freely of it without consciousness of and at least occasional reference to its written form. Accordingly we hear of a Word of God that
is written (Jn 15:25; 1 Cor 15:54), and the Divine Word is naturally contrasted with mere tradition, and its written body of its very idea (Mc 7:10); indeed, the written Scriptures’ body of revelation—with an emphasis on its written form—is designated expressly ‘the prophetic word’ (2 Pet 1:19). More distinctly still, the Law comes to be thought of as written, not exactly, code, but body of Divine authoritative instructions. The phrase, “It is written in your law” (Jn 10:34; 15:25; Rom 3:19; 1 Cor 14:21), acquires the precise sense of, ‘...the Law, faith, the Gospel, the Scripture, the content of which is “law,” that is, Divine instruction.’ Thus “the Word of God,” “the Law,” came to mean just the written body of revelation, what we call, and what the NT writers called, in the same hagiographic sense which we give the term, “the Scriptures.” These “Scriptures” are thus identified with the revelation of God, conceived as a well-defined corpus, and two conceptions rise before us which have had a determining part to play in the history of Christianity—the conception of an authoritative Canon of Scripture, and the conception of this Canon of Scripture as just the Word of God written. The former conception was thrown into prominence in opposition to the gnostic heresies in the earliest age of the church, and gave rise to a new variety of apocalyptic speech concerning the Scriptures, emphasizing their authority in legal language, which goes back to and rests on the Bib. usage of “law.” The latter it was left to the Reformation to do justice to in its struggle against, on the one side, the Roman depression of the Scriptures in favor of the traditions of the church, and on the other side the Enthusiasts’ supercession of them in the interests of the “inner Word.” When Tertullian, in the one hand, speaks of the Scriptures as an “Instrument,” a legal document, his terminology has an express warrant in the Scriptures’ own usage of tórho, “law,” to designate their entire content. And when John Gerhard argues that “between the Word of God and Sacred Scripture, taken in a material sense, there is no real difference,” he is only declaring plainly what is definitely implied in the NT use of “the Word of God” with the written revelation in mind. What is important to recognize is that the Scriptures themselves represent not merely containing the Word, and there the record of revelations—“words of God,” tórho—given by God, but as themselves, in all their extent, a revelation, an authoritative body of gracious instructions from God; or, since they alone, of all the other books God may have written, are “True Word of God” accessible to men, all their parts “law,” that is, authoritative instruction from God.


Benjamin B. Warfield

REVELATION OF JOHN

I. TITLE AND GENERAL CHARACTER OF BOOK

1. The title.

The oldest form of the title would seem to be simply, “Apocalypse of John,” appended with the “Divine” (θεόλογος, theológos, i.e. “theological”) not being older than the 4th. cent. (of the title given to Gregory of Nazianzus, “Gregory the theologian”). The book belongs to the class of works commonly named “apocalyptic,” as containing visions and revelations of the future, frequently in symbolical form (e.g. the Book of Enoch, the Apocalypse of Bar, the Apocalypse of Ezra; see APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE), but it is doubtful if the word here bears this technical sense. The frequency at which this title is given to the NT Apocalypse with these others, and attributed to it the same kind of origin as theirs, viz. in the unbridled play of religious phantasy, clothing itself in unreal visual form.

But there is a wide distinction. These other works are pious, extravagant; on the face of them products of imagination; 2. Uniqueness and Reality of Visions.

The Apocalypse bears on Visions the name of its author—an apostle of Jesus Christ (see below); claims to rest on real visions; rings with the accent of sincerity; is orderly, serious, sublime, purposeful, in its conceptions; deals with the most solemn and momentous of themes. On the modern New-theory, to which most recent expositors give adherences, it is a farrago of baseless phantasies, no one of which came true. On its own claim it is a product of true prophecy (1 3; 20 181), and has or will have sure fulfillment. Parallels here and there are found between the Book of Enoch or the Apocalypse of Ezr. As a rule the resemblances arise from the fact that these works draw from the same store of the ideas and imagery of the OT. It is there the key is chiefly to be sought to the symbolism of John. The Apocalypse is steeped in the thoughts, the images, even the language of the OT (of the illustrations in Lightfoot, Gal, 361, where it
is remarked: "The whole book is saturated with illustrations from the OT. It speaks not the language of Paul, but of Isaiah and Ezekiel and Daniel." These remarks will receive elucidation in what follows.

II. Canonicity and Authority.—The two questions of canonicity and authorship are closely connected. Eusebian states that opinion in his day was divided on the book, and among the disputed books or ranking it among the disputed books or ranking it with the acknowledged (homologotìnma). "Among these," he says, "if such a view seem correct, we must place the Apocalypse of John" (HE, III, 25). That it was right to place it so is proved by a survey of the evidence. The first to refer to the book expressly is Justin Martyr (c 140 AD), who speaks of it as the work of "a certain man, whose name was John, one of the apostles of Christ" (Dial. 81). Irenaeus (c 180 AD) repeatedly and decisively declares that the Apocalypse was written by John, a disciple of the Lord (Adv. Haer., iv.20, 11; 30, 4; v.26, 1; 35, 2, etc), and comments on the number 666 (v.30, 1). In his case there can be no doubt that the book of John is meant. Andreas of Cappadocia (5th cent., c 410) in the "Chronicles" states that Papias (c 130 AD) bore witness to its credibility, and cites a comment by him on Rev 12 7–9. The book is quoted in the Ec. on the martyrs of Vienne and Lyons (174 AD); had commentary written on it by Melito of Sardis (c 170 AD), one of the churches of the Apocalypse (Euseb., HE, IV, 26); was used by Theophilus of Antioch (c 185 AD) and by Apollonius (c 210 AD); HE, V, 25) from these cases being cited as the Apocalypse of John. It is included in John's in the Canon of Muratori (c 200 AD). The Johannine authorship (apostolic) is abundantly attested by Tertullian (c 200 AD; Adv. Mar., iii.14, 24, etc); by Hippolytus (c 240 AD), who wrote a work upon it; by Clement of Alexandria (c 200 AD); by Origen (c 230 AD), and other writers. Doubt about the authorship of the book is first heard of in the obser- saec of the Alogi (end of 2d cent.), who, with Caius, a Rom presbyter (c 205 AD), attributed it to Cerinthus. More serious is the criticism of Dionysius of Alexandria (c 250 AD) who, on internal grounds, held that the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse could not have come from the same pen (Euseb., HE, VII, 25). He granted, however, that it was the work of one of John's contemporaries and followers. The result was that, while "in the Western church," as Bousset grants, "the Apocalypse was accepted unanimously from the first" (EB, I, 193), a certain doubt attached to it for a time in sections of the Gr and Syrian churches. It is not found in the Pesh. and a citation from it in Ephraim the Syrian († 373) seems not to be genuine. Cyril of Jerusalem (c 386 AD) omits it from his list, and it is unmentioned by the Antiochian writers (Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret). The Canon attributed to the Council of Laodicea (c 360 AD) does not name it, but it is doubtful whether this document is not of later date (cf Westcott; also Bousset, Die Offenb. Joh., 28). On the other hand, the book is acknowledged by Methodius, Pamphilus, Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril Alex., Epiphanius, etc.

The testimony to the canonicity, and also to the Johannine authorship, of the Apocalypse is thus exceptionally strong. In an age when the Syntorion was the climax of the books of the canon, there is no doubt of the book's position, not indeed, as an apostle, yet, in his inspired character, position of authority in the Asian churches, and selection as the medium of these revelations, can hardly be thought of as other than the well-known John of the Gospels and of consentent church tradition. The alternative view, first suggested as a possibility by Eusebius, has, however, largely been abandoned. The reason is that the John intended is the "presbyter John" of a well-known passage cited by Eusebius from Papias (HE, III, 39). Without entering into the intricate questions connected with this "presbyter John"—whether he was really a distinct person from the apostle (Zahn and others dispute it), or whether, if he was, he resided at Ephesus (see John, Gospel of)—it is enough here to say that the reason already given, viz: the importance and place of authorship of the Apocalypse in the Asian churches, and the emphatic testimony above cited connecting him with the apostle, forbid the attribution of the book to a writer wholly unknown to church tradition, save for this casual reference to him in Papias. Had the assumed presbyter really been the author, he could not have dropped so completely out of the knowledge of the church, and had his place taken all but immediately by the apostle.

One cause of the hesitancy regarding the Apocalypse in early circles was dislike of its millennial- and apocalyptic character. This was recently emphasized with much critical skill by Dionysius the Areopagite (c 500 cent.). He held that the Apocalypse of John is "of a later period", and is a work filled with "unnecessary details and exaggerated amplification, and a curious mingling of the spiritual with the mythical, and a poetical confusion of ideas, which may have been added by the author to make his statements more effective, or in order to make them more pleasing to the multitude."

3. Objections to Johannine Authorship.—It was the undoubted custom in church circles to accept a work as the Johannine authorship of a work, and to attribute it to the Fourth Gospel, likewise claiming to be from the pen of John. Two Gospel works so diverse in character—the Gospel of the Johannine authorship, and the Apocalypse, abrupt, mysterious, material in its imagery, inexact and barbarous in its idioms, sometimes employing solemnicisms—could not, it was argued, proceed from the same author. Not much, beyond amplification of detail, has been added to the force of the arguments of Dionysius. There were three possibilities—either first, admitting the Johannine authorship of the Apocalypse, to assail the genuineness of the Gospel; this was the method of the School of Bolland (c 1700); secondly, to seek a different author for the Apocalypse—John the presbyter, or another: thus not a few reverent scholars (Bleek, Neander, etc); or, third, with most moderns, to deny the Johannine authorship of both. The solution most often reached is to say that the "presbyter" as the author of the latter (Harnack, Bouset, Moffatt, etc). Singularly there has been of late in the advanced school itself a movement in the direction of recognizing that this difficulty of style is less formidable than it looks—that, in fact, beneath the surface difference, there is a strong body of resemblances pointing to a close relationship of Gospel and Apocalypse. This had long been argued by the older writers (Gossett, Luthardt, Alford, Salmon, etc), but the more freer and more openly acknowledged. As instances among many may be noted the use of the term Logos (19 13), the image of the Lamb, "water of life," words and phrases as "true," "he that over- cometh," "keep the commandments," etc. A striking coincidence is the form of quotation of Zec 12 10 in Jn 19 37, and Rev 1 7. If the Gr in parts shows a certain abruptness and roughness, it is plainly evidenced by the use of the correct construction in the full accord with want of knowledge of the language. "The very rules which he breaks in one place he observes in others" (Salmon). There are, besides, subtle affinities in the Gr usage of the two books, and some of the very irregularities complained of are found in the Gospel (for ample details consult Bousset, op.
2.584 unified the other declared 1-8, to the discuss means, seems, of Domitian, in which case the Gospel will be the earlier, and the Apocalypse the later work. This, likewise, seems to yield the better explanation. The tremendous experiences of Patmos, bursting through all ordinary and calmer states of consciousness, must have produced startling changes in thought and style of composition. The "rapt seer" will not speak and write like the self-collected, calmly brooding evangelist.

III. Date and Unity of the Book.—Eusebius, in summing up the tradition of the Church on this subject, assigns John's exile to Patmos, and consequently the composition of the Apocalypse, to the latter part of the reign of Domitian (Josephus, Ant. xvi. 6:5). Domitian Irenaeus (c. 180 AD) says of the book, "For it was seen, not a long time ago, but almost in our own generation, at the end of the reign of Domitian." (Adv. Haer., v. 30, 5). This tradition is confirmed by Clement of Alexandria (who speaks of "the tyrant"), Origen, and later writers. Epiphanius (4th cent.), indeed, puts (Haer., ii.12, 233) the exile to Patmos in the reign of Claudius (41-54 AD); but as, in the same sentence, he speaks of the apostle as 90 years of age, it is plain there is a strange blunder in the name of the emperor. The former date answers to the conditions of the book (deedance of the churches; widespread and severe persecution), and to the prediction of Domitian for this mode of banishment (of Tacitus Hist. i.2; Euseb., HE, III, 18).

This, accordingly, may be regarded as the traditional date of composition of the Apocalypse, though good writers, influenced partly by a desire to give a date for the later part of the Apocalypse, have signified a preference for an earlier date (e.g. Westcott, Salmon). It is by no means to be assumed, however, that the Apocalypse is the earlier part of the Gospel; the same criticism, if anything, will be seen immediately, is to revert to the traditional date (Bouset, etc); but for a decade or two, through the prevalence of what may be called the "Nero-theory" of the book, the pendulum swung strongly in favor of its composition shortly after the death of Nero, and before the destruction of Jerusalem (held to be shown to be still standing by ch 11), i.e. about 68-69 AD. This date was even held to be demonstrated beyond all question. Reuss may be taken as an example. According to him (Christian Theology of the Apostolic Age, I, 369 ff, ET), apart from the ridiculous preconceptions of theologians, the Apocalypse is "the most simple, most transparent book that prophet ever penned." There is no other apostolic writing, he says, which can be more exactly fixed. "It was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, under the emperor Galba—that is to say, in the second half of the year 68 of our era." He proceeds to demonstrate "the incontestable proof of this. The proof, in brief, is found in the beast (not introduced till ch 13) with seven heads, one of which has been mortally wounded, but is for the present healed (13 3). "This is the Rom empire, with its first 7 emperors, one of whom is killed, but is to live again as Antichrist" (cf 17 10 f). The key to the whole book is said to be given in 13 18, where the number of the beast is declared to be 666. Applying the method of numerical values (the Jewish Gematria), this number is found to correspond with the name of Nero (omitted in Heb letters). The number of Nero then is the 5th head that is to live again; an interpretation confirmed by rumors prevalent at that time that Nero was not really dead, but only hidden, and was soon to return to claim his throne. As it to make assurance doubly sure, it is found that by dropping the final n in "Neron the number becomes 616—a number which Irenaeus in his comments on the subject (v.30.1) tells us was actually found in some ancient copies. The meaning therefore is thought to be clear. Writing under the emperor Galba, the 6th emperor (reckoning from Augustus), the author anticipates, after a short reign of a 7th emperor (17 10), the return of the Antichrist Nero—an 8th, but of the 7, with whom is to come the end. Jesus is to be miraculously preserved (ch 11), but Rome is to perish. This is to happen within the space of 3 years. "The final catastrophe, which was to destroy the city and empire, was to take place in three years and a half. . . The writer knows . . . that Rome will . . . in three years . . . perish, will come to an end again." It does not matter for this theory that not one of the things predicted happened—that every anticipation was falsified. Nero did not return; Jesus was not saved; Rome did not perish; 33 years did not see the end of all things. Yet the Christian church, though the failure of every one of these predictions had been decisively demonstrated, received the book as of Divine inspiration, apparently without the least idea that such things had not been intended (see the form of this theory in Renan, with a keen criticism in Salmon's Intro to the NT, lect xiv).

What is to be said with reference to this "Nero-theory" belongs to subsequent sections: mean while it is to be observed that, while portions of the theory are retained, significant changes have since taken place in the view entertained of the book as a whole, and with this of the Jewish Theory of the "Nero-number." Lahmeyer (1882) and others, have carried the line of criticism a long distance, and have, for the most part, been led to the conclusion that the "Nero-number" was a mere invention of the compiler of the book. Thus, the realization of which the "Nero-number" had been supposed to be a prophecy. It may be added, however, that, while the "Nero-number" is no longer accepted as a prophecy, it is still held by many weights, though in a different sense from that of the "Nero-number". The "Nero-number" is now held to be a symbol of the Antichrist, and is therefore said to be "impossible". But it is not impossible to think that the number of the beast may be symbolical, though it is impossible to think that the number of the beast may be symbolical. The number of the beast may be symbolical, though it is impossible to think that the number of the beast may be symbolical.
this, in turn, reminiscent of Bab mythology). These supposed Jewish sections are, however, without real support in anything that is known, and the symbolism admits as easily of a Christian interpretation as any other part of the book. We are left, therefore, as before, with the book as a unity, and the tide of opinion flows back to the age of Domitian as the time of its origin. Moffatt (connecting it mistakenly, as it seems to us, with Domitian’s emphasis on the imperial cultus, but giving also other reasons) goes so far as to say that “any earlier date for the book is hardly possible” (Expos Gr Test., V, 317). The list of authorities for the Domitianic date may be seen in Moffatt, Intro, 508.

IV. Field and Analysis of the Book. The method of the book may thus be indicated. After an introduction, and letters to the 1. General seven churches (chs 1-3), the properly prophetic part of the book commences with a vision of heaven (chs 4, 5), following upon which are two series of visions of the future, parallel, it would appear, to each other—the first, the 7 seals, and under the 7th seal, the 7 trumpets (chs 6-11, with interludes in ch 7 and again in 10; 11: 1-12); the second, the woman and her child (chs 12, 13), and, after, the 4 new interludes (ch 14), the bowls and 7 last plagues (chs 15, 16). The expansion of the last judgments is given in separate pictures (the scarlet woman, doom of Babylon, Har-Magedon, chs 17-19); then come the closing scenes of the millennium, the last apostasy, resurrection and judgment (ch 20), followed by the new heavens and new earth, with the descending new Jesus (chs 21, 22). The theme of the book is the conflict of Christ and His church with secular Roman power, the devil, the beast, the false prophet, 16:13), and the ultimate and decisive defeat of the latter; its keynote is in the words, “Come, Lord Jesus” (22: 20; cf 1:7), but it is to be noticed, as characteristic of the book, that while this “coming” is represented as, in a manner, ever near, the end, as the crisis approaches, is again always postponed by a fresh development of events. Thus, under the 6th seal, the end seems reached (6:12-17), but a pause ensues (ch 7), and on the seventh seal a new series begins with the trumpets (8: 2 ff). Similarly, at the sounding of the 6th trumpet, the end seems at hand (9:12-21), but a new pause is introduced before the last sounding takes place (11:15 ff). Then is announced the final victory at last, and its summary.

A new series of visions begins, opening into large perspectives, till, after fresh interludes, and the pouring out of 6 of the bowls of judgment, Har-Magedon itself is reached; but though, at the outpouring of the 7th bowl, it is proclaimed, “It is done” (16:17), the end is again held over till these final judgments are shown in detail. At length, surely, in ch 19, with the appearance of the white horseman—“The Word of God” (ver 13)—and the decisive overthrow of all his adversaries (vs 18-21), the age of its seventh seal is found; but just then, to our surprise, intervenes the announcement of the binding of Satan for 1,000 years, and the reign of Jesus and His saints upon the earth (the interpretation is not here discussed), followed by a fresh apostasy, and the general resurrection and judgment (ch 20). Precise time-measures evidently fail in dealing with a book so constructed; the 3 1/2 years of the Nero-interpreters sink into insignificance in its crowded panorama of events. The symbolic numbers more chiefly indicate: “seven,” the number of completeness (7 spirits, seals, trumpets, bowls, heads of beasts); “ten,” the number of worldly power (10 horns); “four,” the earthly number (4 living creatures, corner of earth, winds, etc); 3 1/2 years—time, and times, and half a time” (12:14) =1,290 days, the period, borrowed from Dnl (7: 25; 12:7), of anti-Christian ascendency.

The following is a more detailed analysis:

I. Introduction 1. Title and Address (1: 1-8)

II. The Things to Come. First Series of Visions: The Seals and Trumpets 1. The seal of heaven (1-6)

(a) Adoration of the Creator (ch 4)

(b) The 7-sealed Book: Adoration of God and the Lamb (ch 5)

2. Opening of Six Seals (ch 6)

(a) A white Horse (vs 1-2)

(b) The Red Horse (vs 3-4)

(c) The Black Horse (vs 5-6)

(d) The Pale Horse (vs 7-8)

(e) Seals under the altar (vs 9-11)

(f) The Wrath of the Lamb (ch 15:1-17)

3. Interludes (chs 7-10)

(a) The 4 horsemen: 2,000 on earth vs 1-8)

(b) Triumphant Multitude in Heaven (vs 9-17)

4. Opening of Seventh Seal: Under This Seven Trumpets, of Which Six Are Sounded (chs 8, 9)

(a) Hail and Fire on Earth (8: 7)

(b) Burning Mountain in Sea (vs 9, 9)

(c) Burning Star on Rivers and Fountains (vs 10: 11)

(d) One-third Sun, Moon, and Stars Darkened (9: 12)

(e) Woe to Trumpets (ver 13)

(f) The Fallen Star-locusts (9: 13)

(g) Angels Loosed from Euphrates—the Horsemen (9: 14-15)

5. Interludes—

(a) First with Little Book (ch 10)

(b) Measuring of Temple and Altar—the Two Witnesses (11: 1-13)

6. Seventh Trumpet Sounded—Final Victory (vs 14-19)

III. Second Series of Visions: The Woman and the Red Dragon: The Two Beasts; The Bowls and Last Plagues

1. The Woman and Child: the Red Dragon and His Persecutions (ch 12)

2. The Beast from the Sea, Seven-headed, Ten-horned (13: 1-10); the Two-horned Beast (vs 11-18)

3. Interludes (ch 14)

(a) The Lamb on Mt. Zion: the 144,000 (vs 1-5)

(b) The Angel with “an Eternal Gospel” (vs 6: 7)

(c) Second Angel—(Anticipatory) Proclamation of Fall of Babylon (ver 8)

(d) The Angel—Proclamation of worshippers of the Beast (vs 9-12)

(e) Blessness of the Dead in the Lord (ver 13)

(f) The Son of Man and the Great Vantage (vs 14-20)

4. The Seven Last Plagues—the Angels and Their Bowls: the Preparation in Heaven (ch 15)—the Outpouring (ch 16)

(a) On Earth (16: 2)

(b) On Sea (vs 3)

(c) On Rivers and Fountains (vs 4-7)

(d) On Sun (vs 8, 9)

(e) On Seat of Beast (vs 10, 11)

(f) On Euphrates, Har-Magedon (vs 12-16)

(g) In the Air—Victory and Fall of Babylon (vs 17-21)

IV. Expansion of Last Judgments (chs 17-19)

1. The Scarlet Woman on Beast—Her Judgment (ch 17)

2. Doom of Babylon and Lament over Her (ch 18)

3. Interlude—Announcement of Marriage of the Lamb (ch 19: 1-10)

4. Rider on White Horse (“The Word of God”—the Son of God and the armies—Lamb and Drest of Beast, False Prophet, and Their Followers (vs 11-21)

V. The Millennium—New Heavens and New Earth (chs 20-22)

1. Saint’s End: First Resurrection and Reign of Saints for 1,000 Years (20: 1-6)

2. Loosing of Satan and Final Conflict—Doom of Advocates and of the Devil (vs 7-10)

3. General Resurrection and Last Judgment (vs 11-15)
4. New Heavens and New Earth
(1) The New Jerus from Heaven (21 1–9)
(2) The New Jerusalem (xx 10–21)
(3) The Blessedness of Its Citizens (22 1–7)
(4) Epilogue (vs 22–21)

V. Principles of Interpretation.—As a book intended for the consolation of the church under future afflictions, the Apocalyptic is meant by its author to be understood (1 3; 22 7). He must have been aware, however, that, while its general scope might be apprehended, many of its symbols, till the time of their actual fulfilment. The book relates to “things which must shortly come to pass” (1 1)—in their beginnings at least—and the divers interpretations since put upon its prophecies are the best evidence of the difficulties attaching to them. Schemes of interpretation have generally been grouped into preterist (the prophecies being regarded as already fulfilled), futurist (the fulfilment being thrown wholly into the future), and the historical (the fulfilment being looked for in the continuous history of the church from the death of the author). (1) The older preterist view may be taken as represented by Moses Stuart, who finds the fulfilment of chs 6–11 in the destruction of Jerus (Comm., 520 ff.), and of chs 13–19 in the reign of Nero (690 ff.). Even he, however, has to interpret the chapter on the last things of the future. (2) The futurist view connects the whole with the times of the second advent and the millennium. The beast is an individual who shall then appear as Antichrist. This rejects the plain intimations of the book that the events predicted lay, in their beginnings, at least, immediately in the future of the writer. (3) The historical view connects the various symbols with definite occurrences—as the invasions which overthrew the Rom Empire (the first 4 trumpets), the Saracens (first woe-trumpet), the Turks (second woe-trumpet), the papacy (the beast, ch 13; the scarlet woman, ch 17), etc. A day-year principle is applied to the periods (1,260 days—1,260 years). As representatives of this view may be mentioned Mede, Vitringa, Sir Isaac Newton, and the Rev. Horae Apocalypsicæ, A. Barnes. These older schemes are largely horizon, already alluded to, in which the Apocalyptic is explained out of contemporary conditions, the legend of the returning Nero, Jewish apocalyptic, Amg, and Bible symbolists. Of these the older theories, however, differ from the older in that in them all real prophecy is denied. A mainstay of such theories is the declaration of the book that the events announced are close at hand (1 1–3; 22 20). When, however, it is remembered that, on any view, this nearness includes a period of 1,000 years before the judgment and descent of the new Jerus, it will be felt that it will not do to give these expressions too restricted a temporal significance. The coming horizon is wider. The coming of Christ is ever near—ever approaching—but it is not to be tied down to “times and seasons”; it is more of the nature of a process and has anticipatory exemplifications in many crises and providential events forecasting the end. The “coming,” e.g., to the church at Ephesus (2 5), or to the church at Pergamos (2 16)—contingent events—can hardly exhaust the full meaning of the Parousia. The Nero-theory demands a date nearest under Gal, at 68, but that date we have seen to be generally abandoned. Those who place it under Vespasian (omitting three short reigns) sacrifice the advantage of dating the book before the destruction of Jerus, and have to fall back on a supposititious Jewish fragment in ch 11, which those who incorporated it must have known had never been fulfilled. The attempt to give a “contemporary historical” interpretation to the symbols of the successive churches, as Gunkel has neatly shown, completely breaks down in practice, while Gunkel’s own attempt at a Bab explanation will be judged by most to be overstrained. “The new Jerus” in the OT and elsewhere may be associated with widespread oriental ideas, but the definite symbolism of the Apocalyptic in ch 12 has no provable connection with Bab myths. There is the widest disagreement of the theories (from Jewish apocalyptic). What seems simple and demonstrable to one has no plausibility to others. A form of “Nero Caesar,” indeed, yields the mystic 666, but so do 1,000 other names—almost any name, with proper manipulation (cf. Salmon, lect xiv). Lastly, the returning-Nero legend yields no satisfactory explanation of the language in 13 3,12,14; 17 11. The theory is that these words allude to the belief that Nero would return from the dead and become Antichrist (see above). Tacitus attests that there were vague rumors that Nero had not really died (Hist. ii.8), and later a pretender arose in Parthia taking advantage of this feeling (Suet. Nero. 57). The idea of Nero returning from the dead is categorically denied in Sib Or 4 119–22 (c 80 AD). Augustine mentions the idea (City of God, xx.19, 3), but without connection with the Apocalyptic. By Domitian’s time, however, it was perfectly certain that Nero had not returned and there was no longer, on this interpretation, any appositeness in speaking of a “head” the “deathstroke” of which was healed (13 3), which became the “eighth head” of 17 11—it, indeed, the apostle could be conceived of as being instructed by such a return. The prophecy of the future of the past. The key to the book lies at the basis of the historical interpretation, viz. that there are reconstructed the great crises in the age-long conflict of Christ and His church with pagan and anti-Christian adversaries. Events and tendencies may be grouped, or under different forms may relate to the same subject (e.g. the 144,000 sealed on earth—a spiritual Israel—in 7 1–8, and the triumphant multitude in heaven, vs 9–17); successions of events may be foreshortened; different pictures may overlap; but, shining through the symbols, great truths and facts which have historical realization appear. There is no need for supposing that, in a drama of this range, the “heads” of the beast of chs 13 and 17 (behind whom is the Dragon-enemy, Satan, of ch 12) stand, in contrapuntal to the analogy of Dan, for seven individual emperors, and that the “image of the beast,” which has life given to its and “speaks” (13 4,15), is the statue of the emperor; or that such tremendous events as the fall of the Rom Empire, or the rise of the papacy—both which have been combined, ecclesiastical anti-Christianism—or the false prophecy of later intellectual anti-Christianism have no place in the symbolism of the book. Sane, reverent thought will suggest many lines of correspondence with the
course of God's providence, which may serve to illuminate its dark places. More than this need not be said here.

VI. Theology of the Book.—On this it is hardly necessary to dwell, for expositors are now well aware that one of the great duties of God, Christ, man, sin, redemption, the teaching of the Apocalypse does not vary essentially from the great types in the Epp. The assonances with John's mode of thinking have already been alluded to. It is granted by all writers that the Christology is as high as such an unfolding permits. This it is thought necessary to be acknowledged," says Reuss, "that Christ is placed in the Apocalypse on a par with God" (op. cit., I, 397-98; cf Rev 1 4-17; 2 3; 5 2-14; 22 13, etc.). Not less striking are the correspondences with the teaching of Paul, Peter on redemption through the blood of Christ (1 5; 5 9; 7 14; 14 4, etc.). The perverted conception of the school of Baur that we have in the book an anti-Pauline manifesto (thus also Pieper, cf. Hibbert Lectures, 178), is now practically dead (see the criticism of it by Reuss, op. cit., I, 308-12). The point in which its eschatology differs from that of the rest of the NT is in its introduction of the millennium before the final resurrection and judgment. This, however, is not necessarily contrary, the earlier stage of thought.

LITERATURE.—Moses Stuart, Comm. on Apocalypse; Alford, Gr Text, IV, "The Revelation"; S. Davidson, Intro to the NT (3d ed), 176 ff; G. Salmon, Intro to the NT (2d ed), lects xiii, xiv; Elliott, Horae Apocalipticae, with lit. the dissertation, "On the Eschatology of Christianity," ch xxviii; Milligan, Discussions on the Apocalypse; H. Gunkel, Schöpfung und Chaos; W. Bouisset, Die Offenbarung Johannes und die "Apokalypse" in Er. I, H. Anderson Scott, "Revelation" in Century Bible; J. N. Muir, "Preserving Lost Words of the NT," Ztschr f. die Wissenschaft von der Religion, vol. xxv, 1894, p 230; also "Revelation" in Expositor's Bible; Tronn, Epoch, to the Seven Churches; W. M. Ramsay, Letters to the Seven Churches; H. B. Swete, The Apocalypse of St. John.

JAMES ORR

REVELLINGS, rev'el-ingz (kōma; ἱππομακαρία). The word is found both in AV and in RV in Wis 14 23 (RV "revels," orgiastic heathen worship is in point); 2 Mac 6 4; Gal 5 21; 1 Pet 4 3. In Gal 5 21 it is clasped with fornication, uncleanness, licentiousness as one of the works of the flesh. In 1 Pet 4 3 it is spoken of the Gentiles and is classed with drunkenness and carousings and such like. In Rom 13 11 RV has "revelling" instead of AV "riotings," and in 2 Pet 2 13, "revel" replaces "riot." Am 6 7, "revelling" replaced "banquet." The obvious meaning of the word is excessive and boisterous intemperance and lustful indulgence. G. H. GEBRERDING

REVENGE, re-vēn'ej, REVENGER, re-vēn'jar. The same Heb and Gr words are used to express the idea of "to avenge" and "to revenge" (צל, נאף, or derivative; ἀρρήτως, ἀναζημότως, or derivative). In Eng. these words are synonymous in that they are both used to express the infliction of punishment upon the wrongdoer. But "to avenge" means also simply a spiteful, wrongful or malignant spirit. In the latter case RV preserves "revenge" (cf Jer 20 10; Ezek 25 15; 26 17 an anthropomorphism), but, wherever it is synonymous with "avenge," this word is used (cf Nu 31 23; Ps 79 10; Nah 1 2; Jer 12 20; Rom 3 4; 2 Cor 7 11; 10 6 RV; AV has "revenge" in all these cases). In Dt 32 42, AV "revenge" is a wrong tr. Read with RV "from the head of the leaders of the enemy" or RVm the "haired head of the enemy." Cf Avenge, Avenger; Blood; Goel. A. L. BREIICH

REVENUE, rev'n-ya: (1) צלאה, ἀπρόθομον, "revenue or income" (Ezk 4 13 AV); (2) צלאה, ἀνατρέφον, "increase," "revenue" (Prov 8 19; 15 6

Isa 23 3; Jer 12 13); προμοδος, προμόδος, "income" (2 Mac 3 3; 4 8 [RV "fund"]; 9 16).

REVERENCE, rev'er-ens: In the OT, "reverence" occurs as the tr of two Heb words, יָדֶר and שדְּחָד. The root idea of the former is "to hold fast," it is used to express the attitude toward God Himself, as in Ps 89 7 AV; or toward His sanctuary, as in Lev 19 30; 26 2. So the group of ideas there would be "fear," "awe," "reverence." The root idea of the second is "falling down," as prostration of the body. It is used of the act of the man who is considered superior, as in 2 Sam 6 6 AV; 1 K 1 31 AV; Est 3 2.5. The group of ideas here, therefore, is "honor," "obeisance," "reverence."

In the NT "reverence" occurs as the tr of three Gr words, ἀλήθος, φθοβόμαι, and εντροπέω. In the first, the idea is "modesty" (He 12 28; cf 1 Tim 2 9). In the second, "fear" (Eph 5 23 AV), though here it is used to set forth the attitude of proper subjection on the part of a wife toward her husband (cf 1 Pet 3 2). In the third, the idea is that of "self-valuation of inferiority," and so set forth an attitude toward another of doing him honor (Mt 21 37; Mk 12 13; Hl 12 9; 23 8). In the Apoc εντροπέω occurs in Ws 2 10; Sir 4 22. In addition, προσκυνέω, "make obeisance," occurs in Jth 10 23; 14 7; thumadzō, "wonder," Sir 7 29, and ἄφθονον, "be ashamed," (Hb 14 15).

Reverend occurs in the OT in Ps 111 9, of the name of God (יָדֶר), and in the Apoc in 2 Mac 15 12, "a man revered [αιδηνόν, "mostest"] in bearing," and in the NT RV has "reverent in demeanor" (ηθοπροσόπου) in Tit 2 3 and "revered" in Phil 4 8 (σεμνός). E. J. FORRESTER

REVEL, ré-vel. See Crimes; Punishments.

REVIVE, ré-vīv, REVIVING, ré-vīving: "To revive" is the tr of בֹּקֵד, בֹּקְדָה, "to live," "cause to live," "to use of restored to life (Gen 45 27; Jgs 16 19, etc.); of rebuilding (Neh 4 2); of restoration to well-being (Ps 85 6 AV ["quicken"]; 138 7; Is 57 15; Hos 5 2; 14 7); of Jeh's gracious work for His people (Hab 3 2, "revive thy work in the midst of the years"); "reviving" is the tr of מָחַר, מַחְּרָה, "preservation," or "means of life" (Ezr 9 8). "Revive" occurs in the NT as the tr of διασώσεως, διασώςας, "to live again" (Rom 7 9, and 14 9, AV "to live both died and rose, and revived"); RV ["resurrection of [and rose"] "Christ died and lived again," σῶς].

In 1 Mac 13 7 RV we have "And the spirit of the people revived," διασώσεως, διασώσας, "to stir or kindle up as a fire," the same word as in 1 Tim 1 6, RV "stir up the gift of God, which is in thee," AV "to stir into flame." "

In view of the frequent modern use of "revive" and "revival," it is worthy of notice that it is to Timothy himself the exhortation is addressed. We too often merely pray for "revivals," forgetting that it is for us to "stir into flame" the gift of the spirit which we have already received of God. It is ours from Him, but we let it lie dormant, as a slumbering ember merely.

REWARD, ré-wārd: In modern Eng. (except when influenced by the Bib, forms) a "reward" is something given in recognition of a good act. In EV, however, "reward" is used quite generally for anything given, and the term covers the recompense of evil (Ps 14 5, AV "wages of" 1 K 21 15 AV); of good works (Mic 7 3), and gifts (Jer 40 5 AV). RV has specialized the meaning in a number of cases (Ps 94 2; Ezek 16 34; Jer 40 5, etc.), but not systematically.
REZEH, rá'zéh (227), receph; B, Páños, Rhá-
pllés, 'Páños, Rháplhes, A, Tébálh, tin Rháphoth
(2 K 19:12); By, Rézé'h. 1. Forms of A, Páños (1 Sa 37:12; Vulg, Rezeph the
name [2 K 19:12]. Rezeph [1 Sa 37:12]): One of
the places referred to by Sen-
nacherib's Rabbashkeh when delivering that king's
message to Hezekiah demanding the surrender of
Jerusalem. The names which precede are Gozan and
Haran; and "the children of Eden that were in
Telinassar" follows. It is now represented by רֶפֶךְ, E, of Tipshah
and N.E. of Hamath, and is regarded as the
תֹּפְסָא (תֹּפְסָא) of Toloemy (v.15).
2. Now
It was for some time under Assyrian dom-
ination, and appears in a geographical
list (2 R 36, 57a) preceded by Arrapha
(Arrapachitis) and Halapeh (Halah),
and followed by Tammunu, under the form of Ra-
şappa (elsewhere Rașapi).
From the Eponym Κανίνα, Ninip-kibly-uṣur was,
it appears, prefect in 530 BC, Urae-eres from 894
to 775 BC, Sin-salimun in 757, and
3. Its
Bēl-emuranni in 737 BC. Judging
Assyrian from their names, all these were
Governers
Assyrians, but a seemingly native gov-
erner, Abd[u ('or Abdâ'), possibly
later than the preceding, is mentioned in a list of
officials (K. 9291). Yašu[u was šann (deputy-
governor?) of Rezeph in 673 BC. Its mention in
the Assyrian geographical lists implies that Rezeph
was an important trade-center in OT times.
T. G. FINCHES

REZIA, ré-zi'a. See Rizia.

REZIN, ré'zin (777, rē'zin; Ρασσών, Rhass-
ôn): The last of the kings of Syria who reigned in
Damascus (2 K 15:17; 16:5–10; Isa 7:1; 8:4–7).
Along with Pekah, the son of Remaliah, who reigned
20 years over Israel in Samaria, he joined in the
Syro-Ephraimitic war against Ahaz, the king of
Judah. Together they laid siege to Jerusalem, but
were unsuccessful in the effort to take it (2 K 16:5;
Isa 7:1). It was to calm the fears, and to restore
to the smoking spirit of the men of Judah, that the
Israel was commissioned by the Lord to assure them that
the schemes of "these two tails of smoking fire-
brands" (Isa 7:4) were destined to miscarry. It
was then, too, that the sign was given of the virgin
who should conceive, and bear a son, and should
name him Rezin. Rezin deliberately contented himself
on this campaign to the S. with the capture of
Edath from the men of Judah and its restoration
to the men of Edom, from whom it had been taken
and made a seaport by Solomon (2 K 16:6, where
it is agreed that "Syriu" and "Syrians" should be
read "Edom" and "Edomites," which in the Heb.
script are easy to be mistaken for one another,
and are in fact often mistaken). Rezin, however,
had a more formidable enemy to encounter on his
return to Damascus. Ahaz, like kings of Judea
before and after him, placed his reliance more on the
arm of flesh than on the true King of his people,
and appealed to Tiglath-pileser III, of Assyria,
for help. Ahaz deliberately sacrificed the inde-
pendence of his country in the terms of his offer of
submission to the Assyrian: "I am thy servant
and thy son" (2 K 16:7). Tiglath-pileser had
already carried his arms to the W. and ravaged the
northern border of Israel; and now he crossed the
Euphrates and hastened to Damascus, slaying
Rezin and carrying his people captive to Kir (2 K
16:9). In the course of his efforts, Tiglath-pileser
Rezin figures with the designation Ṣārusūni, but
the tablet recording his death, found and read by
Sir Henry Rawlinson, has been irrecoverably lost,
and only the fact of its existence and loss remains
(Schrader, COT, I, 252, 253).

T. NICOL

REZIN, ré'zin (יוו, rē'zin; Ρασσών, Rhassó-
ä): Son of Eliadah, and a subject of Hadadezer,
kings of Zobah (2 K 11:23). His name appears to
be given as ייו, hezön, "Athir, Hazein (1 K
15:18; see Hezxon), where he is the father of Tab-
rinmon, whose son Ben-hadad I is known through
his league with Assa, king of Judah. When David
conquered Zobah, Rezin renounced his allegiance to
Hadadezer and became powerful as an independent
chief, capturing Damascus and setting up as king.
Along with Hadad, the noted Edomite patriot,
he became a thorn in the side of Solomon, the one
making himself obnoxious in the S., the other in the N.,
of the kingdom of Israel, both being animated with
the bitter hatred of the common foe. It is said of
Rezon that he "reigned over Syria" (1 K 11:25),
and if the surmise adopted by many scholars is
correct that he is the same as Hezion (1 K 15:
18), then he was really the founder of the dynasty
of Syrian kings so well known in the history of
this period of Israel; and the line would run:
Rezon, Tabrimmon, Ben-hadad I, and Ben-hadad
II.

T. NICOL

RHEUMIUM, ré'jü-üm: This city (Ῥευμίων, Ῥήμιωγ
[Acts 28:13]), the modern Reggio di Calabria was
a town situated on the east side of the Sicilian
Strait, about 6 miles S. of a point opposite Messana
(Messina). Originally a colony of Chalcidian
Greeks, the place enjoyed great prosperity in the
5th cent. BC, but was captured and destroyed by
Dionysius, tyrant of Syracuse, in 387 BC, when all
the surviving inhabitants were sold into slavery
(Diodorus xiv.106–8, 111, 112). The city never
entirely recovered from this blow, and was
partially restored by the younger Dionysius. On
the occasion of the invasion of Italy by Pyrrhus,
the people of Rhegium had recourse to an alliance
with Rome (280 BC) and received 4,000 Campanian
troops within their walls, who turned out to be
very unruy guests. For, in imitation of a similar
band of mercenaries across the strait in Messana,
they massacred the male inhabitants and reduced
the women to slavery (Polybius 1.7; Oroshus
iv.3). They were not punished by the Romans until
270 BC, when the town was restored to those of its
former inhabitants who still survived. The people
of Rhegium were faithful to their alliance with Rome
during the Second Punic War (Livy xxi.30; xxiv.1;
xxvi.12; xxix.8). At the time of the Social War
they were incorporated with the Roman state,
Rhegium becoming a municipality (Cicero Verr.
v.60; Pro Archia, 3).
The ship in which Paul sailed from Melita to
Puteoli encountered unfavorable winds after leaving
Tarentum, and was compelled to run by means of
sailing. It waited at Rhegium a day for a south wind
which bore it to Puteoli (Acts 28:13), about 180
miles distant, where it probably arrived in about
20 hours.

GEORGE H. ALLEN

RHESA, rē'sa (Ῥεσά, Rhēdô): A son of Zeru-
babel in the genealogy of Jesus according to St.

RHESES, rē'se, 2 (Ῥῆσε, Rhēs): A city of
Mysia, on the coast. It was on the road from
Amasia to Pergamum.
RHINOCEROS, ri-nos'ær-os: This word is found in AV in Is 34 7 ("rhinocerots") for οὐνάκον, re'naim, AV "unicorns," RV "wild-oxen." The word is quite inappropriate to the passage, which refers to Edom. The horned rhinoceros, Rhinoceros unicornis, is confined to India. Other rhinocerous are found in India and in equatorial Africa, but it is hardly to be presumed that those animals were meant by the Heb writers. See Unicorn.

RHODA, ró'da (Póso, Rhóδ, "rose"): A maid in the house of Mary the mother of John Mark. She came to answer when Peter knocked at Mary's door after his miraculous release from prison. On recognizing his voice, she so forgot herself with joy that she neglected to open the door, but ran in to tell the others the glad news. They would not believe her, thinking she was mad; and when she persisted in her statement they said it must be his angel. The Jewish belief was that each man had a guardian angel assigned to him. Peter continued knocking, and was ultimately admitted (Acts 12 12 f).

S. F. HUNTER

RHODES, ró'da (Pósoe, Rhóδo): An island (and city) in the Aegean Sea, W. of Crete, rough and rocky in parts, but well watered and productive, though at present not, extensively cultivated. Almost one-third of the island is now covered with trees in spite of earlier deforestation. The highest mountains attain an altitude of nearly 4,000 ft. The older names were Ophiusa, Asteria, Trinacria, Corymbia. The capital in antiquity was Rhodes, at the northeastern extremity, a strongly fortified city provided with a double harbor. Near the entrance of the harbor stood a colossal bronze statue of a woman—half the seven wonders of the ancient world—a colossal bronze statue dedicated to Helios. This colossus, made by Chares about 290 BC, at a cost of 300 talents ($300,000), towered to the height of 104 ft.

In the popular mind—both before and after Shakespeare represented Caesar as bestriding the world like a colossus—this gigantic figure is conceived as an image of a human being of monstrous size with legs spread wide apart, at the entrance of the inner harbor, so huge that the largest ship with sails spread could move in under him. In reality, however,this conception is based seems to have no foundation.

The statue was destroyed in 223 BC by an earthquake. It was restored by Ptolemy VI. In 212 AD the Saracens sold the ruins to a Jew. The quantity of metal was so great that it would fill the cars of a modern freight train (900 camels loads).

The most ancient cities of Rhodes were Ialyssos, Ochyros, and Lindus. The oldest inhabitants were immigrants from Crete. Later came the Carians. But no real advance in civilization was made before the immigration of the Dorians under Tlepolemus, one of the Heraclidae, and (after the Trojan war) Aethamenes. Lindus, Ialyssos and Camirus formed with Cos, Cnidus and Halicarnassus the so-called Dorian Hexapolis (Six Cities), the center of which was the temple of the Triopian Apollo on the coast of Caria. Rhodes now founded many colonies—in Spain (Rhode), in Italy (Parthenope, Salapia, Sirus, Sybaris), in Sicily (Gela), in Asia Minor (Solii), in Cilicia (Gages), and in Lycia (Corydalla). The island reached no liturgical greatness until the three chief cities formed a confederation and founded the new capital (Rhodes) in 408 BC. In the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, Rhodes sided with the Athenians, but, after 19 years of hostility to Athens, went over to the Spartans (412 BC). In 394, when Conon appeared with his fleet before the city, the island fell into the hands of the Athenians again. A garrison was stationed at Rhodes by Alexander the Great. After his death this garrison was driven out by the Rhodians. It is at this time that the really great period of the island's history begins. The inhabitants bravely defended their capital against Demetrius Poliorcetes in 304 BC—the same Demetrius who two years before had won a naval victory and had coins stamped with a "Victory" that is the counterpart of the "Winged Vict.

ory" which commands the unabounded admiration of the modern world—and extended their dominion over a strip of the Carian coast, as well as over several of the neighboring islands, and for the first time in the history of the world established an international maritime and commercial law. The arts and sciences now began to flourish in the fair island in the southeastern Aegean. Aeschines, the famous orator of Athens, fled to Rhodes after his defeat by Demosthenes, and founded a school of oratory, which was attended by many Romans. Rhodes became the faithful ally of Rome after the defeat of Anitochus in 189 BC. As a reward for her loyalty she received Caria. In 168, however, only a small portion of this territory remained under Rhodian sway (Pserna, or the Chersones). In 42 BC the island was devastated by Cassius. Later it was made a part of the Roman province of Asia (44 AD). Strabo says that he knows no city so splendid in harbor, walls and streets. When the Roman power declined, Rhodes fell into the hands of Caliph Moawijah, but later was taken by the Greeks, from whom at a later date the Genoese wrested the island. In 1249 John Cantacuzenus attempted to recover Rhodes, but in vain. Finally, however, success crowned the efforts of the Greeks under Theodoros Protobastos. In 1310 the Knights of St. John, who had been driven from Pal, made Rhodes their home. After the subjugation of the island by Sultan Soliman in 1522 the Knights of St. John, driven to Malta (later called Rhoda), remained uninterruptedly a possession of the Sublime Porte down to the recent war between Turkey and the Balkan allies, forming, with the other islands, the province of the "Islands of the White Sea" (Archipelago). It has a Christian governor whose seat, though mostly at Rhodes, is sometimes at Chios. The population of the island has greatly diminished by emigration. In 1890 the total number of inhabitants was 30,000 (20,000 Greeks, 7,000 Mohammedans, 1,500 Jews). The chief products of Rhodes are wheat, oil, wine, figs and tropical fruits. A very important industry is the exportation of sponges. The purity of the air and the mildness of the climate make Rhodes a most de- lightful place to live in during the fall, winter and early spring. The city, built in the shape of an amphitheater, has a magnificent view toward the sea. It contains several churches made out of old mosques. The once famous harbor is now almost filled with sand. The inhabitants number nearly 12,000 (all Turks and Jews). Rhodes is mentioned in the NT only as a point where Paul touched on his voyage southward from the Hellespont to Caesarea (Acts 21 1); but in 1 Macc 15 23 we are informed that it was one of the states to which the Romans sent letters in behalf of the Jews.
RHODOCUS, rod'k-ús (Ῥοδόκος, Rhodokos): A Jewish traitor who disclosed the plans of Judas to the Roman Emperor (2 Mac 13 21) 162 BC. Of his fate nothing more is known.

RIB (ריב), rab (ריב, rabbd; LXX 'Poûba, Ribaib, with variants): A Benjamite, the father of ITTAI (q.v.), one of David's "mighty men" (2 S 23 29 | 1 Ch 11 31).

RIBBAND, rib'and, rib'and (ריבב, pāthil [Nu 15 38 AV]). See Colon, (Cor), (Cord).

RIBLAIH, rib'la (ריבלא, riblah; 'Peb'lae, Riblehād, Riblehād, with variants): (1) Riblah in the land of Hamath first appears in history in 608 BC. Here Pharaoh-nechoh, after defeating Josiah at Megido and destroying Kedytis or Kadlesh on the Orontes, fixed his headquarters, and while in camp he deposed Jehoahaz and cast him into chains, fixed the tribute of Judah, and appointed Jehoiskim king (2 K 23 33–35). In 588 BC Nechohea:nazarat, at war with Egypt and the Syrian states, also established his headquarters at Riblah, and from it he directed the subjugation of Judas. When it fell, Zedekiah was carried prisoner to Riblah, and there, after his sons and his nobles had been slain in his presence, his eyes were put out and he was given in charge of the smiths' prison to Nebuzaradan (2 K 25 6 20; Jer 39 5–7; 52 8–14). Riblah then disappears from history, but the site exists today in the village of Riblid, 35 miles N.E. of Baalbek, and the situation is the finest that could have been chosen by the Egyptian or Bab kings for their headquarters in Syria. An army camped there had abundance of water in the control of the copious springs that go to form the Orontes. The Egyptians coming from the S. had behind them the command of the rich corn and forest lands of Coele-Syria, while the Bab army from the N. was equally fortunate in the rich plains extending to Hamath and the Euphrates. Lebanon, close by, with its forests, its hunting grounds and its snows, ministered to the needs and luxuries of the legions. Riblah commanded the great trade and war route between Egypt and Mesopotamia, and, besides, it was at the dividing-point of many minor routes. It was in a position to attack with facility Phoenicia, Damascus or Pal, or to defend itself against attack from those places while a few miles to the S. the mountains on each side close in forming a pass where a mighty host might easily be resisted by a few. In every way Riblah was the strategical point between North and South Syria. Riblah should probably be read for Diblah in Ezk 14; While in Nu 34 11 it does not really appear. See (2).

(2) A place named as on the ideal eastern boundary of Israel in Nu 34 11, but omitted in Ezk 47 15–18. The MT reads "Hariblah"; but the LXX probably preserves the true vocalization, according to which we should read "to Harbel." It is said to be to the east of 'Ain, and that, as the designation of a district, can only mean Merj 'Ayun, so that we should seek it in the neighborhood of Hermon, one of whose spurs furner found to be named ' défini Arb.'

W. M. CHRISTIE

RICHES, rich'ez, rich'iz: Used to render the following Heb and Gr words: (1) 'Osher, which should, perhaps, be considered the most general word, as it is the most often used (Gen 31 16; Ecol 4 8; Jer 9 23). It looks at riches simply as riches, without regard to any particular feature. Alongside this would go the Gr σαρόν, ploutos (Mt 13 22; Eph 2 7). (2) ἅρπαξ (Pro 27 24; Jer 20 5), ἀρματίζον and ἐκφύλου (Gen 36 7; Dn 11 13 24 AV) look at riches as things accumulated, collected, amassed (6 3; ἧλιον looks upon riches as earnings, the fruit of toil (Ps 119 14; Prov 8 18; Ezk 27 27). (4) Ἐλαμον regards riches in the aspect of being much, this coming from the original idea of noise, through the idea of a multitude as making the noise; the idea of many, or, more precisely, being in multitude (Ps 37 16 AV). (5) Ὑσιλ regards riches as power (Ps 62 10; Isa 8 4; 10 14). (6) θυτήρ means "running over," and so presents riches as abundance (Jer 46 36 AV). Along with this may be placed ἄθροι, which has the idea of the fifth, and so of a kind of abundance (Job 36 19 AV). (7) Κυριάν regards riches as a creation, something made (Ps 104 24; cf m); (8) χρημα (chreme) looks at riches as useful (Mk 10 23 f). Like the NT, the Apc uses only ploutos and chreme.

Material riches are regarded by the Scriptures as neither good nor bad in themselves, but only according as they are properly or improperly used. They are transitory (Prov 27 24); they are not to be trusted (Mk 10 23; Lk 18 24; 1 Tim 6 17); they are not to be gloried in (Jer 9 23); the heart is not to be set on them (Ps 62 10); but they are made by God (Ps 104 24), and come from God (1 Ch 29 12); and they are the crown of the wise (Prov 14 24). Material riches are used to body forth for us the most precious and glorious realities of the spiritual realm. See, e.g., Rom 9 23; 11 33; Eph 2 7; Phil 4 19; Col 1 27. Cf MAMMON; TREASURE; WEALTH. E. J. FORRESTER

RiD, riD, RIDDANCE, ri'd'ans: "Ri'd" originally meant "rescue" (AV Gen 37 22; Ex 6 6; Ps 82 4; 144 7 11), whence the meaning "remove" or "clean out" (Lev 26 6 AV, with "riddance" in Lev 23 22; Zeph 1 18). The word occurs in ARV and in ERV in Ex 6 6.
RIGHT, rìt (תְּרֵי, yôshâr, יְשָׁרָה, mishpâh; δικαίος, dikaios, ἰδιός, euthus): Many Heb words are trd "right," with different shades of meaning. Of these the two noted are the most important: yôshâr, with the sense of being straight, direct, as "right in the sight" of Jeh (Ex 15 26; Dt 12 25, etc.) and a forensic term, as "shall not the Judge of all the earth do right" (Gen 18 25). In Job 34 17, RV has "justice" (ver 6, "right"), etc. The words cfâbek, כְּדַבֵּק, ordinarily trd "righteousness," are in a few cases rendered "right" (2 S 19 28; Neh 2 20; Ps 9 4; 17 1; 119 75; Ezk 18 5, etc.). In the NT the chief word is dikaios, primarily "even," "equal" (Mt 20 4; Lk 12 57, etc.); more generally the word is rendered "just" and "righteous." Euthus, used by LXX for yôshâr (1 S 12 23; Hos 14 9), occurs a few times (Acts 8 21; 13 10; 2 Pet 2 15); so orthos, "straight," "upright" (Lk 10 28). The word "right," representing Heb yôshâr, and kindred forms (Gen 48 13 14 17; Ex 15 6, etc.), the Gr, in this sense, is deizôs (Mt 6 3; 20 21, etc.).

RIGHTEOUSNESS, rìd'chus-nès ( isize, cadidk, adj., "righteous," or occasionally "just"; isize, caâhek, noun, occasionally = "righteousness," occasionally = "justice"; δικαίος, dikaios, adj. δικαιοσύνη, dikaiosûnê, noun, from δίκη, dikê, whose first meaning seems to have been "custom"; the general use suggested conformity to a standard; righteousness, "the state of him who is such as he ought to be" [Thayer]):

1. Double Aspect of Righteousness: Changing and Permanent
2. Social Customs and Righteousness
3. Changing Conception of Character of God: Obligations of People
4. Righteousness as Inner
5. Righteousness as Social
6. Righteousness as Expanding in Content with Growth in Ideas of Human Worth

LITERATURE

In Christian thought the idea of righteousness contains both a permanent and a changing element. The fixed element is the will to do right; the changing factor is the conception of what may be right at different times and under different circumstances. Throughout the entire course of Christian revelation we discern the emphasis on the first factor. To be sure, in the days of later Pharisaism righteousness came to be so much a matter of externals that the inner intent was often lost sight of altogether; but, on the whole and in the main, Christian thought in all ages has recognized as the central element in righteousness the intention to be and do right. This common spirit binds together the first worshippers of God and the latest. Present-day conceptions of what is right differ by vast distances from the conceptions of the earlier Hebrews, but the intentions of the first worshippers are as discernible as are those of the doors of righteousness in the present day.

There seems but little reason to doubt that the content of the idea of righteousness was determined in the first instance by the customs of social groups. There are some of Customs and Righteousness.

2. Social Customs, which would have us believe that what we experience as inner moral sanction is nothing but the fear of consequences which come through disobeying the will of the social group, or the feeling of pleasure which results as we know we have acted in accordance with the social demands. At least some thinkers would have us believe that this is all there was in moral feeling in the beginning. If a social group was to survive it must lay upon its individual members the heaviest exactions. Back of the performance of religious rites was the fear of the group that the god of the group would be displeased if certain honors were not rendered to him. Merely to escape the penalties of an angry deity the group demanded ceremonial observances. From the basis of fear to the group the individuals of the group have come all our lofter movements toward righteousness.

It is not necessary to deny the measure of truth there may be in this account. To point out its inadequacy, however, a better statement would be that from the beginning the social group utilized the native moral feeling of the individual for the defence of the group. The moral feeling, by which we mean a sense of the difference between right and wrong, would seem to be a part of the native furnishing of the mind. It is very likely that in the beginning this moral feeling was directed toward the performance of the rites which the group looked upon as important (see ALMS).

As we read the earlier parts of the OT we are struck by the fact that much of the early Heb morality was of this group kind. The righteous man was the man who performed the rites which had been handed down from the beginning (Dt 5 25). The meaning of the observance of these rites was, however, not yet determined, but from a very early period the characteristic of Heb righteousness is that it moves in the direction of what we should call today the enlargement of humanity. There seemed to be at work, not merely the forces which make for the betterment of the group, not merely the desire to please the God of the Hebrews for the sake of the material favors which He might render the Hebrews, but the factors which make for the betterment of humanity as such. As we examine the laws of the Hebrews, even at so late a time as the completion of the formal Codes, we are indeed struck by traces of primitive survivals (Nu 5 11 31). There are some injunctions, whose purpose we cannot well understand. But, on the other hand, the vast mass of the legislation has to do with really human considerations. There are rules concerning sanitation (Lev 13), both as it touches the life of the group and of the individual; laws whose mastery begets emphasis, not merely upon external consequences, but upon the inner result in the life of the individual (Ps 51 3); and prohibitions which would indicate that morality, at least in its plainer decencies, had come to be valued on its own account. If we were to seek for some clue to the development of the moral life of the Hebrews, we should find it in a contemplation of the growing demands of human life as such. A suggestive writer has pointed out that the apparently meaningless commandment, "Thou shalt not boil a kid in its mother's milk" (Ex 23 19), has back of it a real human purpose, that there are some
things which in themselves are revolting apart from any external consequences (see also Lev 18).

An index of the growth of the moral life of the people is to be found in the changing conception of the character of God. We need not stop to think of the thought of God as yet when we come to the very beginning we see clearly that the outward reciprocal God of the Hebrews started, but from the very beginning we see clearly that the Hebrews believed in their God as one associated with the Hebrews, and by the right (Gen 18 25). It may well be that at the start the God of the Hebrews was largely a God of War, but it is to be noticed that His eminence was against the peoples who had little regard for the larger human considerations. It has often been pointed out that one proof of the inspiration of the Scriptures is to be found in their moral superiority to the Scriptures of the peoples around about the Hebrews. If the Heb writers used material which was common property of Chaldeans, Babylonians, and other peoples, they nevertheless used these materials with a moral difference. They breathed into them a moral life which forever separates them from the Scriptures of other peoples. The marvel also of Hebrew history is their growing and growing immorality. The Hebrews grew to such ideals of human worth. The source of these ideals is to be found in their thought of God. Of course, in moral progress there is a reciprocal effect; the thought of God affects the thought of human life and the thought of human life affects the thought of God; but the Hebrews no sooner came to a fresh moral insight than they made their moral discovery a part of the character of God. From the beginning, we represent the God of the Hebrews was a God directed in His moral wrath against all manner of abominations, aberrations and abnormalities. The purpose of God, according to the Hebrews, was to make a people "separated" in the sense that they were to be free from anything which would detract from a full moral life (Lev 20 22).

We can trace the more important steps in the growth of the Heb ideal. First, there was an increasingly clear discernment that certain things are to be ruled out at once as immoral. The primitive decrees upon which Jewish and social life depended were discerned at an early period (cf passages in Lev cited above). Along with this it must be admitted there was a slower approach to some ideals which we today consider important, that is, certain rules of moral conduct (Dt 24 1 2). Then there was a growing sense of what constitutes moral obligation in the discharge of responsibilities upon the part of men toward their fellows (Isa 6 8 22). There was increasing realization also of what God is, as a moral Being, is obligated to do. The hope of salvation of nations and individuals rests at once upon the righteousness of God.

By the time of Isaiah the righteousness of God had come to include the obligations of power (Isa 63 1). God will save His people, not merely because He has promised to save them, but because He must save them (42 6). The must is moral. If the people of Israel show themselves unworthy, God must punish them; but if a remnant, even a small remnant, show themselves faithful, God must show His favor toward them. Moral worth is not conceived of as something that is to be paid for by external rewards, but if God is moral He must treat the righteous and the unrighteous differently. This conception of what God must do as an obligation and Being influences profoundly the Heb interpretation of the entire course of history (10 20 21).

Upon this ideal of moral obligation there grows later the thought of the virtue of vicarious suffering (ch 53). The sufferings of the good man and of God for those who do not in themselves deserve such sufferings (for them) are a mark of a still higher righteousness (see Hosea Book of). The movement of the Scriptures is all the way from the indifference of those who receive their benefit to the thought of a God who receives in Himself the heaviest shocks of that battle others may have opportunity for moral life.

These various lines of moral development come, of course, to their crown in the NT in the life and death of Christ as set before us in the Gospels and interpreted by the apostles. Jesus stated certain moral axioms so clearly that the world never will escape their power. He said some things once and for all, and He did some things once and for all; that is to say, in His life and death He set on high the righteousness of God as at once moral obligation and self-sacrificing love (Jn 3 16) and with such effectiveness that the world has not escaped and cannot escape this righteous influence (Jn 12 32). Moreover, the course of apostolic and subsequent history has shown that Christ put a winning and compelling power into the idea of righteousness that it would otherwise have lacked (Rom 3 31).

The ideas at work throughout the course of Heb and Christian history are, of course, at work today.

4. Righteousness as Inner

Christianity deepens the sense of obligation to do right. It makes the moral spirit essential. Then it utilizes every force working for the increase of human happiness to set on high the meaning of righteousness. Jesus spoke of Himself as "Life," and declared that He came that men might have life and have it more abundantly (Jn 10 10). The keeping of the commandments was a large part in the unfolding of the life of the righteous Christian, but the keeping of the commandments is not to be conceived of in artificial or mechanical fashion (Lk 10 25-37). With the passage of the centuries some commandments once conceived of as essential drop into the secondary place, and other commandments take the controlling position. In Christian development increasing place is given for certain swift insights of the moral spirit. We believe some things happen that at once appeal to us as righteous. Again, some other things seem righteous because their consequences are beneficial, both for society and for the individual. Whatever makes for the largest life is in the direct line of righteousness in the Christian life, however, we must remember the essentially Christian conception that man does not live through external consequences alone. In all thought of consequences the chief place has to be given to inner consequences. By the surrender of outward happiness and outward success a man may attain inner success. The spirit of the cross is still the path to the highest righteousness.

The distinctive note in emphasis upon righteousness in our day is the strong emphasis on social service. This does not mean that

5. Righteousness as Social

Christianity is to lose sight of the righteousness of the individual in itself. As Social We have come pretty clearly to see that the individual is the only moral end in himself. Righteousness is to have as its aim the upbuilding of individual lives. The commandments of the righteous life are not for the sake of society as a thing in itself. Society is nothing apart from the individuals that compose it; but we are coming to see that those individuals have worth than we had once imagined and greater responsibilities than we had dreamed of. The influence of the individual touches others at more points than we had formerly realized. We have at times con-
tainty best always have insisted that to the fullest degree the present world must be redeemed by the life-giving forces of Christianity. We still insist that all idea of earthly righteousness takes its start from heavenly righteousness, or, rather, that the righteousness of man is to be based upon his conception of the righteousness of God. Present-day thinking concerns itself largely with the idea of the irrefutability of God. In this present world, this does not mean that there may not be other worlds, or are not other worlds, and that God is not also in those worlds; but the immediate revelation of God to us is in our present world. Our present world consists of the sphere of the righteousness of God and of man to be set forth. God is conscience, and God is love. The present sphere is to be used for the manifestation of His holy love. The chief channel through which that holy love is to manifest itself is the conscience and very essence of the Christian, but that inner spirit to live the life of God out into society.

In all our thought of righteousness it must be borne in mind that there is nothing in Christian revelation which will tell us what righteousness calls for in every particular circumstance. The differences between circumstances and the differences between different standards in different circumstances have led to much confusion in the realm of Christian thinking. We can keep our bearing, however, by remembering the double element in righteousness which we mentioned in the beginning: on the one hand, the will to do right, and, on the other, the difficulty of determining in a particular circumstance just what the right is. The larger Christian conceptions always have an element of fluidity, or, rather, an element of expansiveness. For example, it is clearly a Christian obligation to transmit a spiritual spirit of good will or with the spirit of Christian love. But what does love call for in a particular case? We can only answer the question by saying that love seeks for whatever is best, both for him who receives and for him who gives. This may lead to one course of conduct in one situation and to quite a different course in another. We must, however, keep before us always the aim of the largest life for all persons whom we can reach. Christian righteousness today is even more important upon material things such as salary arrangements, than was the Code of Moses. The obligation to use the latest knowledge for the hygienic welfare is just as binding now as then, but “the latest knowledge” is a changing term. Material progress, education, spiritual instruction, are all influences which necessarily make for full life.

Not only is present-day righteousness social and growing; it is also concerned, to a large degree, with the thought of the world which now is. Righteousness has too often been conceived of merely as the means to the end of the present life. Future Kingdom of Heaven. Present-day emphasis has not ceased to think of the life beyond this, but the life beyond this can best be met and faced by those who have been in the full sense righteous in the life that now is. There is here no break in true Christian continuity. The seers who have understood Christ


**FRANCIS J. McCONNELL**

**RIMMON, rimon:**

(1) The rock Rimmon (רימון, rimmon, שֵׁרָמְנָה, Shermōn) and *Rimmon (גֵּרִימון, gerimmon); אֶרֶם (אֶרֶם, Aram), a place of refuge of the 600 surviving Benjamites of Gibeah (Elisha 21:13). Robinson’s identification (RB, 1, 440) has been very generally accepted. He found a conical and very prominent hill 6 miles. K. E. S. A. E. gives the name upon which stands a village called Rimmon. This site was known to Eusebius and Jerome (OS 146:6, 287:98), who describe it as 15 Roman miles from Jerus. Another view, which would locate the place of refuge of the Benjamites in a large cavern on the south of the Wady Suwein, near Jeba’, is strongly advocated by Ravnslcy and Birch (see PEF, III, 137-48). The latter connects this again with 8 21 14, 2, where Saul, accompanied by his 600, “in the uttermost part of Gibeah under the pomegranate tree (Rimmon).”

(2) (רִימְנָם, rimmon; רִימְנוֹן, Rimmon, or Pesh. Rimmon, or *שְׁרָמְנָה, Shermēnāh): A city in the Negev, near the border of Edom, ascribed to Judah (Josh 15:32) and to Simeon (19:7; 1 Ch 4:32, AV “Rimmon”). In Zec 14:10 it is mentioned as the extreme S. of Judah—“from Geba to Rimmon, S. of Jerus.” In the earlier references Rimmon occurs in close association with ’Arin (a spring), and in Neh 11:29, what is apparently the same place, ’Arin Rimmon, is called Ein-rimmon (q.v.).

(3) (רִימָן, rimmon [Josh 19:13, נָרֶם, nārēm], rimmōnāh, in some Heb MSS מִרְמוֹן, dimmond [see Dimnah [Josh 21:63], and מִרְמוֹן (1 Ch 6:77]): In AV we have identified the name of the city of Rimmon in Josh 19:13, but RV translates the latter as “which stretcheth.” This was a city on the border of Zebulun (Josh 13:31) allotted to the Levites (Josh 21:35, Dimnah; and 1 Ch 6:77). The site is now the little village of Rimmonāh on a low ridge S. of the marshy plain of the B оф in Galilee; there are many rock-cut tombs and cisterns. It is about 4 miles.
N. of el Mesh-hed, usually considered to be the site of Gath-hepher. See PEF, I, 363, Sh VI.

E. W. G. Masterman

RIMMON (ירמון), rimmon, "pomegranate"; see RIMMON-PEREZ:

(1) A Syrian god. Naaman the Syrian leper after being cured is troubled over the fact that he will still have to bow down to the house of the Syrian god, Rimmon, when his master goes into the house to worship leming on his hand (2 K 5 18). Elisha answers him ambiguously: "Go in peace." Judging from Naaman's position and this incident, R. must have been one of the leading gods of the Syrians worshipped in Damasc. He has been identified with Rammanu, the Assyrian god of wind, rain and storm. The name appears in the Syrian personal names Hadar-Rimmon and Tan-Rimmon (q.v.) and its meaning is dubious (ramanu, "to thunder"? (2)

A Benjamite of Beeroth, whose sons Bannah and Rechab assassinated Ish-bosheth (2 S 4-2 59).

Nathan Isaacs

RIMMON-PEREZ, r-pērez (רפרץ, rimmon perez; AV Rimmon-parez): A desert camp of the Israelites (Nu 33 19 2), unidentified. Gesenius translates rimmon as "pomegranate," the place deriving its name from the abundance of pomegranates. But Conder derives it from rimmon, "so be high," and translates it "clove height." See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

RIMMON, ROCK OF. See RIMMON, (1).

RIMMONAH, rim-mō'na, RIMMONO, rim-mō'no. See RIMMON, (3).

RING (AS HEB "ring"): The word renders (ARV) two Heb words (in AV and ERV three) and two Gr words. תֹּבָּד, tobbath, the principal Heb word, is from תֹּבָּד, tâbho, "sick," either because the ring is something "cast" or molded or, more prob-

ably, since the principal use of the ring was as a seal, because it "sank" into the wax or clay that received the impression. In Ex, tâbbath, "ring," is a detail of furniture or equipment, as the rings of the ark through which the staves were thrust. (Ex 25 12, etc), rings for curtains, in the high priest's ephod. (Ex 26 28; 39 21, etc). Its other use was perhaps the hope, to describe the article of personal adornment worn on the finger, apparently in the OT always a signet-ring, and as such an indispen-
sable article of masculine attire. Such a ring Pharaoh gave Joseph as a symbol of authority (Gen 41 42); and Abasuerus gave Haman (Est 3 10); with it the royal missive was sealed (Est 3 12; 8 8 hor. 10). It also was a feminine ornament in Israel's list of the fashionable feminine paraphernalia, "the rings and the nose-jewels" (quite likely rings also) (Isa 3 21). Either as ornaments or for their in-

trinsic value, or both, rings were used as gifts for sacred purposes from both men and women: "brooches, ear-rings, and signet-rings" (NRSV "pome-
granates") (Ex 22 22); "bracelets, rings (ARV "signet-
grings"), ear-rings" (Nu 31 50 AV). יִרְמִית, hêbham, "signet," mentioned in Gen 38 18 25; Ex 28 11. 21 36; Ex 39 16.14; Jer 22 24; Hag 2 23, etc, was probably usually a seal ring, but in Gen 38 and elsewhere the seal may have been swung on wire, and suspended by a cord around the neck. It was not only an identification, but served as a stamp for signature. יָרַם, gâdîl, "circle" (of "Galilee," "Circle" of the Gentiles), rendered "ring" in Est 1 6; Cant 5 14, may rather mean "cylinder" or "rod" of metal. Earring (q.v.) in AV is from totally different words: יִרְמִית, nezem, whose etymology is unknown, יָרַם, "eghîl, "round," or בּוֹרֵט, lehoah, "amulet"; so RV. The "rings" of the wheels in Ezek 1 18 (AV) are בּוֹרֵט, gâth, "curved," and mean "rings" (ARV), "felloes." Egyptians esp. wore a great profusion of rings, principally of silver or gold, engraved with scarabaei, or other devices. In the NT the ring, δακτύλιον, daktulion, "finger-
ring," is a token of means, position, standing: "put a ring on his hand!" (Lk 1 16). So it included the right to give orders in his father's name. To be χειροδακτυλιον, chrosdaktulios, "golden-
ringed," perhaps with more than one, indicated wealth and social rank: "a man with a gold ring" (Jas 2 2). See also EARRING; SIGNET; SEAL.

Philip Wendell Channell

RINGLEADER, ring-lēd-ər: In Acts 21 5 the τὰ τρίγωνα, trígōna, "one who stands first," Not an opprobrious word in the Gr.

RINGSTREAKED, ring'strēkt (AV and ERV ringstreaked): Gen 30 35 39 40; 31 8 (bes) 10 12 for תֹּבַּד, tâbôth. In the context of 30 35, etc, tâbôth certainly denotes defective coloring of some sort, but the exact meaning of the word is uncertain. The τρ "ringstreaked" ("marked with circular bands") comes from connecting the word with the γ' λαθο, "to bind" (Gen 22 9), but this connection is dubious.

RINNAH, rin'a (רִנָה, rimnah, "praise to God"); LXX B, Ἀνά, Ἄνδα, Α', Phanwv; Rhamon}: A Judahite, according to MT a son of Shimon (1 Ch 4 20). But LXX makes him a son of Haman (B, Phond, A, Andra) by reading "ben" in the next name (Ben-hanan) as "son of.

RIOT, r'ut: Properly, "unrestrained behavior" of any sort, but in modern Eng. usually connoting mob action, although such phrases as a "rhetorical banquet" are still in common use. AV uses the word in the first sense, and it is retained by RV in Lk 15 13; Tit 1 6; 1 Pet 4 4 for δίκτυων, asōte, "strata, astóis, "having no hope of safety," "profligate." In Prov 23 20; 28 7 RV has preferred "gluttonous," "glutton," in Rom 13 13, "revelling," and in 2 Pet 2 13, "revel.

Burton Scott Easton

RIPHATH, r'iphath (ריפא, riphath): A son of Gomer, the eldest son of Japheth (Gen 10 3; 1 Ch 1 6, where MT and RV read Darr, etc. Joes 1, vi 1) identifies the Ripheans with the Paphgalions, through whose country on the Black Sea ran the river "Rhebas" (Pinya, NH, vi 4).

RISING, r'is'ing (רַע, rē'ah, "a tumor," "swell-
ing" (Lev 13 2, 10, etc). See Leprosy.

RISSAH, ris'a (רִיסָה, rīsēh, "dew"): A camp of the Israelites in the wilderness Wanderings between
RITHMAH, rith‘ma (רִיתָם, rīthmāh, “broom”): A desert camp of the Israelites (Nu 33 18-19). The name refers to the white desert broom. See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

RIVER, riv‘ér: (1) The usual word is רָֽיִן, nāḥār (Aram. ṯā‘r, ṯərā‘, ḥār [Ezr 4 10, etc.]), used of the rivers of Eden (Gen 2 10-14), often of the Euphrates (Gen 15 18, etc.); of Arab. and Pharrar (2 K 5 12), the river of Gozan (2 K 17 15), the river Geder (Ezr 1 1), the rivers (canals?) of Babylon (Ps 137 1), the rivers of Ethiopia (Isa 18 1; Zeph 3 10). Cf נָֽהַר, nahar, the common Aram. word for “river.”

(2) נַֽעַר, yōʿer, according to BDB from אֲבֹא (nikhār), yārēḏ nāgōr, AV “brooks of defense,” RV has “streams of Egypt.” In Isa 19 7,8, for נַֽעַר, yōʿer, AV “brooks,” and Zec 11 10, AV “river,” RV “River.” In Job 28 10, AV “He cutteth out rivers among the rocks,” RV “has channels,” RV “diggeth Avvasses.”

(3) There are nearly 100 references to נָֽהַר, nahal, in about half of these AV has “brook” and in about half “river.” RV has more often “brook” or “valley.” But RV has river in “whatsoever hath fins and scales in the waters, in the seas, and in the rivers” (Lev 11 9); “the river Jehovah” (Dt 2 37; Josh 12 2); the stream issuing from the temple (Ezk 47 5-12). RV has “brook of Egypt,” i.e. el-Arish (Nu 34 5; Josh 16 57; 1 K 8 65; 2 K 24 7; 2 Ch 7 8; Am 6 14, “of the Arabah”); “brook [AV ‘river’ of Karnah” (Josh 16 18); “valley [AV ‘river’] of the Amron” (2 K 24). EV has “valley” of Gerar (Gen 26 17), of Zered (Nu 21 12), but “brook Zered” (Dt 2 13), of Eschol (Nu 32 9), of Sorek (Jgs 16 4), of Shittim (Jos 3 15). EV has “brook” Besor (1 S 30 10), Kidron (2 S 23 16), Gaash (2 S 23 30), Cherith (1 K 17 3); also the fem. נָֽהָל, nahalah, “brook [AV ‘river’] of Egypt” (Ezk 47 19; 48 28). The torrent-valley (wayd) is often meant.

(4) נֶֽפֶל, pelakh, with fem. נֶֽפֶל, pēlaḥāh, AV “river,” is in RV τρόον* “stream” except EV “river of Egypt” (Ps 65 9); “streams of water” (Ps 1 3); Prov 5 15; Lam 4 8); “streams of honey” (Job 20 17); “streams of oil” (Job 29 6).

(5) נֵֽעָב, Nā‘ab, AV “river,” except EV “water brooks” (Ps 42 11, is in RV “watercourses” (Ezk 6 3; 31 12; 32 36; 34 13; 35 8; 36 46), “water-brooks” (Cant 5 12; Joel 1 20).

(6) נֵֽעָב, Nā‘ab, AV “river” (Jer 17 8). נֵֽעַב, ‘aḥabal, and נֵֽעַב, ‘eḥabal, AV “river” (Dnl 8 2.3.6).

(7) נָֽוָאָב, pokamah, AV the Jordan (Mk 1 5); Euphrates (Re 9 14); “rivers of living water” (Jn 7 38); “river of water of life” except EV “water brooks” (Ps 42 11). Note also always in Gr for “river” in RV Apoc (1 Esd 4 23, etc.): See BRIDGE, STREAM; VALLEY.

ALFRED ELY DAY

RIVER OF EGYPT. See BROOK OF EGYPT.

RIVER, THE (GREAT). See EUPHRATES.

RIVERS OF EDEN. See EDEN (1).

RIZIA, riz‘ía (רִצִּי, rīṣī‘ā), rīṣā (רֵיצָא, rīṣā): An Asherite (1 Ch 7 39).

RIZPAH, rīṣā‘ā (רָֽיִסָּה, rīṣā‘ā, “hot stone”); Jos, Por-Ba‘a, Rahispah): In 2 S 3 7 the subject of a coarse slander. 2 S 21 contains the pathetic story of Rizpa‘ah’s faithful watch over the bodies of her dead sons Mephibosheth and Armoni (vs 10.11). Did this story suggest Tennyson’s “Rizpah”? A three years’ famine had made David anxious, and in seeking a reason for the affliction he concluded that it lay in Saul’s unavenged conduct to the Gibeonites (ver 2). To appease Jehovah he gave up to the Gibeonites the two sons of Saul, Mephibosheth and Armoni, as well as Saul’s 5 grandsons (whether by Michal or Mera‘ah; see MERAB). These seven were hanged at Gibeath. Rizpa‘ah watched 5 months over their exposed bodies, but meanwhile the famine did not abate. Word was brought to David of Rizpa‘ah’s act (vs 10.11), and it is possible that her action suggested to David his next step in expiation. At any rate, he remembered the unavenged-for bones of Jonathan and Saul lying in ignominy at Jabesh-gilead, whether they had been carried by stealth after the Philis had kept them hung in the streets of Beth-shan for some time. The bones were recovered and apparently mingled with the bones Rizpa‘ah had guarded, and they were together buried in the family grave at Zelah. We are told that then “God was entreated for the land” (ver 14).

HARRY WALLACE

ROAD, rōd (INROAD) AV (1 S 27 10; of 23 27). See RAIL.

ROAD (WAY). See ROMAN EMPIRE AND CHRISTIANITY, II; WAY.

ROAST, rōst. See Food.

ROBBER, rob‘er, ROBBERY, rob‘er-ē. “Robber” represents no particular Heb word in the OT, but in the Apoc and the NT is always a tr of λῃστής, lēstēs (see THIEF). In AV Job 5 5; 18 9, “robber” stands for the doubtful word γραμμός, gammōn, RV “hungry” in 5 5 and “sinner” in 18 9. The meaning is “thirsty” and perhaps “thirsty, hungry” should be read in both places. Ps 62 10, “Become not vain in robbery,” means “put not your trust in riches dishonestly gained.” RV’s changes of AV in Prov 21 7; Dnl 11 14; Nah 3 1 are obvious. In Phl 2 6 AV reads “thought it not robbery to be equal with God.” EV has “a prize,” while ERVm and ARV read “thing to be grasped,” ARV wording “counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped.” The Gr here is ἐξουσιαστᾶν ἀρπαγμόν, a word derived from ἀρπάζω, “to ravish away, ‘carry off,’ ‘plunder’ (cf.” ‘harpy’”). Properly speaking, the termination -mos should give the derived noun an active sense, “the act of plundering,” whence AV’s “robbery.” The verse reads then more naturally “who thought that being on an equality with God did not consist in grasping,” and this tr gives good sense in the context and has some excellent scholarly support. But a passive significance is frequently found despite a -mos termination, giving to ἀρπαγμός the sense of “thing grasped,” as in RV. Usually ENG. commentators take “grasped” as meaning “cling to”—“did not think equality with God should be clung to tenaciously”—but “to cling to” seems unknown as a tr of ἀρπαγμός. Hence render “a thing to be grasped” rather “did not seek equality with God by selfish methods but by humbling himself.” It is to be noticed, naturally, that St. Paul is thinking of “equality with God” simply in the sense of “receiving explicit adoration from men” (vs 10.11), and that the metaphysical relation of the Son to the Father is not at all in point. See also GRASP.

BURLINGTON EASTON

ROBBERS OF TEMPLES (ἱεροσόλυτοι, hierosolūtōi, “guilty of sacrilege”): A term used by the town clerk of Ephesus (Acts 19 30), as applied to Ephesian churches”). As the temple of Diana had a great treasure-chamber, the offence might not be unknown among them; cf Rom 2 22.
ROEB, rōb. See Drues, 1, (3).

ROBOAM, rōbō-ām (Poebōa, Rhabodam). AV; Gr form of 'Rehoboam' (thus RV) (Mt 1:7); successor of Solomon.


1. Names [Job 30:6; Jer 4:20]; cf Kūṭās, Kūṭūhās, "Cophan" = Ḥrēpēs, Piṭērēs, "Peter" (Jn [1] 42 AV and RVm); [5] ṭēpēa, ṭētra: ġār and sela' are the words most often found, and there is no well-defined distinction between them. They are frequently coupled together in the parallelism which is characteristic of the Heb writers: e.g.

"Be thou to me a strong rock [ḡār], a house of defence to save me. For you hast set my rock [sela'] and my fortress" (Ps 118:1).

"He clave rocks [ḡār] in the wilderness, And gave them drink as abundantly as the depths. He brought streams also out of the rock [sela'], And caused rivers to run down like rivers" (Ps 78:15,16).

It is plain here that the two words are used for the sake of variety, without any clear difference of meaning. Even ḥōlānnāsh (tr'f "flint") is used in the same way with ġār in Ps 114:8:

"Who turned the rock [ḡār] into a pool of water, The flint [ḥalānnāš] into a fountain of waters."

(1) Some of the most striking and beautiful imagery of the Bible is based upon the rocks. They are a symbol of God: "Jeh is my rock, and my fortress" (2 S 22:2; Ps 18:2; 71:3); "God, the rock of my salvation" (2 S 22:47; cf Ps 62:27; 89:26); "my God the rock of my refuge" (Ps 94:22); "the rock of my strength" (Isa 17:10); "Lead me to the rock that is higher than I" (Ps 61:2); repeatedly in the song of Moses (Dt 32:3.4.18.30.31; cf 2 S 22:32). Paul applies the term to the wilderness (Ex 17:6; Nu 20:11) to Christ as the source of living water for spiritual refreshment (1 Cor 10:4).

(2) The rocks are a refuge, both figuratively and literally (Jer 48:28; Cant 5:14). The rocks are a "refuge for lions" (Ps 104:14). Many a traveler in Pal has felt the refreshment of "the shade of a great rock in a weary land" (Isa 32:2). A very different idea is expressed in Isa 8:14, "And he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence" (cf Rom 9:33; 1 Pet 2:8).

(3) The rock is a symbol of hardness (Jer 5:3; cf Isa 60:7). Therefore the breaking of the rock exemplifies the power of God (Jer 23:29; cf 1 K 19:11). The rock is also a symbol of that which endures, "Oh that they ... were graven in the rock for ever!" (Job 19:23,24). A rock was an appropriate place for offering a sacrifice (Jgs 6:20; 13:19). The central feature of the Mosque of 'Umar in Jerusalem is Kubbat-Šekhrat, the "dome of the rock." The rock or sōkher under the dome is thought to be the site of Solomon's altar of burnt offering, and further thought is to be the site of the threshing-floor of Arahunah the Jebusite which David purchased and built an altar upon.

(1) The principal rock of Pal and Syria is limestone of which there are many varieties, differing in color, texture, hardness and degrees of impurity, some of the limestone having considerable admixtures of clay or sand. Some of the harder kinds are very dense and break with a conchoidal fracture similar to the fracture of flint. In rocks which have for ages been exposed to atmospheric agencies, erosion has produced striking and highly picturesque forms. Nodules and layers of flint are of frequent occurrence in the limestone of Pal.

(2) Limestone is the only rock of Western Pal, with the exception of some local outpourings of basaltic rock and with the further exception of a light-brown, porous, partly calcareous sandstone, which is found at intervals along the coast. This last is a superficial deposit of Quaternary recent age, and is of aeolian origin. That is, it consists of dune sands which have solidified under the influence of atmospheric agencies. This is very exceptional, nearly all stratified rocks having originated as beds of sand or mud in the bottom of the sea.

(3) In Sinai, Edom, Moab, Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon is found the Nubian sandstone, a silicious sandstone which, at least in the N., is of middle or lower Cretaceous age. In the S., the lower strata of this formation seem to be paleozoic. Most of it is not sufficiently coherent to make good building stone, though some of its strata are very firm and are even used for millstones. In some places it is so incoherent or friable that it is easily dug with the pick, the grains falling apart and forming sand that can be used in mortar. To color the Nubian sandstone is on the whole dark reddish brown, but locally it shows great variation, from white through yellow and red to black. In places it also has tints of blue. The celebrated rock tombs and temples of Petra are carved in this stone.

(4) Extensive areas of the northern part of Eastern Pal are covered with igneous rock. In the Jau'dân S.E. of Mt. Hermon, this has been for ages exposed to the atmosphere and has formed superficially a rich dark soil. Further S.E. is the Le'ja (Arab. "refuge"), a wild tract covered with a deposit of lava which is geologically recent, and which, while probably earlier than man, is still but little affected by the atmosphere. It is with difficulty traversed and frequently furnishes an asylum to outlaws. See Crag; Flint; Geology; Lime.

ALFRED ELY DAY

ROCK OF AGES. See Ages, Rock of; Isaiah, VII.

ROCK-BADGER, r.-bah-jēr: This term is found in RVm for "coney," ṣēbēphān (Lev 11:5; cf Dt 14:7; Ps 104:18; Prov 30:26). It is a tr of klij dōs, the name given by the Boers to the Cape hyrax or coney. See Coney.

ROD (多种形式, makkēl, ṣēlah, māteh, ḫēthēth, Ḣēbēth; Ḥēbēs, Ḥēbēlo): Little distinction can be drawn between the Heb words used for "rod" and "staff." Māteh is the word used in Gen 30:37 ff for the twigs of poplar put by Jacob before his sheep, and in Jer 11:11 of the "rod of an almond-tree." Ḫēthēth is used of the rod in the hand of Moses and of Aaron (Ex 4:2 ff; 7:9 ff, etc). Ḩēbēth is used, but sometimes also māteh, of the rod used for correction (Ex 21:20; 2 S 7:14; Prov 10:13; 13:24; Isa 10:5, etc). In Ps 33:4 Ḫēthēth is used of a rod and of any staff, though, however, Ḩēbēth is the shepherd's rod, figurative of Divine guidance and care. In Ezk 21:10.13, the word stands for the royal scepter. In the NT Ḫēthēth is used of a rod of correction (1 Cor 4:21); Aaron's rod of midst (Num 17:10); a measuring rod (Rev 11:1). See also Armor, Arms.

JAMES ORR
RODANIM, rod'a-min: The reading of MT in 1 Ch 17:7 for the Rodanim (q.v.) of Gen 10:4 correspond to the Phoen, RhodOi of LXX in both passages. The Rodanim are generally identified as inhabitants of the island of Rodos (q.v.), well known to the ancient Phoenicians (Romer's Hidat).

ROE, rophe, ROEBUCK, ro'beck: AV has "roe" and "roe-buck" for ṣeḇṭa, ṣeḇṭāh, ṣēḇṭayāh. RV usually substitutes "gazelle" in the text (Dt 12:15, etc) or m (Prov 6:5, etc), but retains "roe" in 2 S 2:18, 1 Ch 12:8; Cant 3:5; 7:3. So RV has "gazelle" for AV "roe" in Sir 27:20 (dokoras). RV has ing or closing a book. The m'ghillah sephēr (Jer 36:2) means the unwritten roll, or the roll considered in its material form as contrasted with the work. M'ghillah, which is found in Ezr 6:2 (RV "roll"), Jer (often), Ezek (often) and Zec, is a somewhat late word, and came to mean a small roll (but with a complete work) as distinguished from a book, corresponding to the modern distinction of manuscript and book or document and book. The word gillumah is tr in RV as "tablet," and is univerally regarded as meaning (Isa 8:1) "some smooth surface, corresponding to the same word in Isa 3:23 which is rendered, "hand-mirror." But "cylinder-seal" would possibly fit the sense in both cases; this being hung round the neck as an ornament in one case and inscribed with a personal name in the other.

Biblion is regarded by the Bible translators as equivalent to m'ghillah in the sense of small roll. It is in fact 4 in the LXX of Jer 36 used as the tr for m'ghillah, but very much oftener it is the tr for sephēr, for which in fact it is the correct technical equivalent (Birt, Buchrolle, 21). Indeed the "small book" (Thayer, Lex., 101) is hardly consistent with the ideas of the heavens as a scroll, of the Lamb's Book of Life, or of the vast quantity of books of Jn 21:25, although in Lk 4:17 it may perhaps correspond closely with m'ghillah in the sense of a complete roll and work, which is at the same time a whole part of a larger work. Its use in Rev 6:14 is reminiscent of Isa 34:4 ("scroll"), and is conclusive for the roll form. It is indeed always technically a roll and never codex or tablet.

It is not likely that Isaiah and St. John (here and in his Gospel, 21:25) refer directly to the biblia idea that the heavens are a series of written tablets or to the rabbinic saying that "if all the oceans were ink, all seas pens, the heavens and earth sheets to write upon, and all men writers, still it would not suffice for writing out the teachings of my Masters" (Blau, op. cit., 34). Nevertheless, the "whole Cosmos" does suggest "the heavens and earth" as sheets to write upon, and under all there does perhaps lurk a conception of the broad expanse of heaven as a roll for writing upon.


E. C. RICHARDSON

ROLLER, rol'ber: AV and ERV in Ezk 30:21 for ṣḥad, ṣḥil, "bandage" (so ARV). "Roller" was formerly a technical term in surgery for a wide bandage.

ROLLING, rol'ing, THING: Isa 17:13, AV "like a rolling thing before the whirwind," a non-committal tr of ṣeḇṭa, gulgul, "revolving thing," "wheel" (Ecc 12:6). RV "like the whirling dust before the storm" is probably right. But see CHAFF; DUST; STUBBLE.

ROMANTI-EZER, rō-mam-ti-e'zer, rō-mam-ti-ezer (םתם תיוזר, rōmanti-wayzer): Son of Heman, appointed chief of the 24th division

Egyptian Roll and Case.
of singers in David's time (I Ch 25:4,31). See
JOSHEKASHAH.

ROMAN ré'man, ROMANS, ré'manz. See
ROME, III, 2; CITIZENSHIP.

ROMAN ARMY. See Army, Roman.

ROMAN EMPIRE, en'plir, AND CHRISTIANITY.

I. OUTLINE OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

1. Roman Empire a Result of Social Conflict
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LITERATURE

I. OUTLINE OF ROMAN EMPIRE.—The founding
of the Roman empire was the grandest political achieve-
ment ever accomplished. The conquests of Alexander the
Great, Charle-
empire a magne and Napoleon seem small com-
pared with the durable structure reared by Julius and his successor,
Augustus. In one sense Julius Caesar was the most
wonderful man that Rome or any other country
produced—was the founder of the empire, and
Augustus the founder of the princeps. But the
Roman empire was the culmination of a long process
of political, constitutional, and social growth which
gave a lasting prestige to monarchy. The Roman
empire was the only possible solution of a 700
years' struggle, and Roman history is the story of the
conflict of class with class, patrician against pleb-
lian, popular against pious, the antagonism of
oligarchy and democracy, the struggle against neglected
masses. It is the account of the triumphant march
of democracy and popular government against an
exclusive governing caste. Against heavy odds the
plebeians asserted their rights till they secured at
least a measure of social, political and legal equality
with their betters (see Rome, I, 2, 4). But in the
long conflict both parties degenerated until neither
militant democracy nor despotic oligarchy could
hold the balance with justice. Democracy
had won in the uphill fight, but lost itself and was
obliged to consent to a common master with absolute
power. It was of no small importance for Christian-
ity that the Roman empire—practically synonymous
with the orbis terrarum—had been converging both
from internal and external causes toward a one-
man government, the political counterpart of a
universal religion with one God and Saviour.

(1) JULIUS CAESAR.—For a couple of generations political
leaders had foreseen the coming of supreme power and
had tried to grasp it. But it was Julius Caesar who first
succeeded in exploiting democracy for his own aggrand-
izement. He proved the potent factor of the first
triumvirate (see BC, his consulship 63 BC), was consul
in 49 BC he crossed the Rubicon and declared
war upon his country, but in the same year was ap-
donated Dictator and thus made his enemies the
ones of
his country. He vanquished the Pompeian—senas-
orial and republican—at Pharsalia in 48 BC, Pius
in 46 BC, and Munda in 45 BC. Between 46 and the
Ies of March, the emperor before Diocletian was
imperial. He was recognized officially as "demigod";
temples were dedicated to his "elementy." He en-
couraged the people to accede to his purposes
self-government and right of election, became chief
princeps of senate and high priest (pontifex
masus), so that he could manipulate even the will of the
gods to his own purposes. His plans were equally great
and beneficent. He saw the necessity of blending the
heterogeneous populations into one people and extend-
ing the Roman citizenship. His outlook was larger and more
favorable to the coming of Christianity than that of his
successor, Augustus. The latter learned from the fate
of Caesar that to keep the imperial power in the
empire, he must pronounce the new "secret of
(2) OCTAVIAN.—In 48 AD a new "secret of empire" was
revealed, viz., that emperors could not hold office
in one line and that emperors could be
nominated by the armies. After the bloody civil wars
of 68, "the year of the four emperors." Vespasian
founded the Iud Dynasty, and dynastic succession was
for the present again adopted. With the Flavians begins
a new epoch in Roman history of pronounced importance
for Christianity. The exclusive Roman emperors are
the
wane. Vespasian was of plebeian and Sabine rank and there
thus non-Rom, the first of many non-Rom emperors.
His ideas were provincial rather than imperial. But a new
in the autocratic spirit stands halfway between the
Augustan principate and the absolute monarchy of Diocletian.
Augustan, that is, the age of the "two Augustus" is
the old Roman republic. The commonwealth sank in
exhaustion after the protracted civil and internece
strife. It was a case of the survival of the fittest. It
was a great crisis in human history, and a great man
was at hand for the occasion. Octavian realized that
emperor, and became a Roman citizen. His outlook was larger and more
favorable to the coming of Christianity than that of his
successor, Augustus. The latter learned from the fate
of Caesar that to keep the imperial power in the
empire, he must pronounce the new "secret of
(3) FLAVIAN.—In 68 AD a new "secret of empire" was
revealed, viz., that emperors could not hold office
in one line and that emperors could be
nominated by the armies. After the bloody civil wars
of 68, "the year of the four emperors." Vespasian
founded the Iud Dynasty, and dynastic succession was
for the present again adopted. With the Flavians begins
a new epoch in Roman history of pronounced importance
for Christianity. The exclusive Roman emperors are
the
wane. Vespasian was of plebeian and Sabine rank and there
thus non-Rom, the first of many non-Rom emperors.
His ideas were provincial rather than imperial. But a new
in the autocratic spirit stands halfway between the
Augustan principate and the absolute monarchy of Diocletian.
Augustan, that is, the age of the "two Augustus" is
the old Roman republic. The commonwealth sank in
exhaustion after the protracted civil and internece
strife. It was a case of the survival of the fittest. It
was a great crisis in human history, and a great man
was at hand for the occasion. Octavian realized that
emperor, and became a Roman citizen. His outlook was larger and more
favorable to the coming of Christianity than that of his
successor, Augustus. The latter learned from the fate
of Caesar that to keep the imperial power in the
empire, he must pronounce the new "secret of
(4) ADAPTIVE or ANTONINE emperors.—The Antonine
was another dynasty of empire, andsına an equally
entranced by the ideas of universalism. Under Trajan the
empire was expand.; a series of new oratories was
established; a contention that Rome could advance no
further. Under Hadrian a policy of retreat began; henceforth Rome is never again a
always on the defensive against restless barbarians.
unmistakable signs of weakness and decay set in under
Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius. This, the best and longest of the great imperial ages, was the beginning of the end. In this era, in fact, we see the growing centralization of authority; the senate practically became a mere debating club. The office of emperor was established which culminated in bureaucracy under Hadrian, 117-138 A.D. On the death of Commodus, whose reign 180-192 A.D. was remarkable for its industry, his empire was put up for sale by the soldiery and knocked down to the highest bidder.  In the period of the 2nd century the empire was emasculated—which was indeed essential in the face of the period of barbaric aggressiveness to postpone the fall of the empire for another three centuries a.m. accomplished. A rapid succession of emperors followed, almost each of whom attempted to shift the weight of the empire under his sway. The center of gravity now shifted to Italy, where the Roman spirit asserts itself proportionately. The year 212 A.D. is memorable for the edict of Caracalla granting citizenship to all. (6) From Diocletian till partition.—In the next period absolute monarchy of pure oriental type was established by Diocletian, one of the ablest of Roman rulers. He inaugurated the principle of division and subdivision of imperial power. Thus in 284, Diocletian divided the empire into the Western and Eastern parts, with the growing prominence of the East, becomes apparent. Rome and Italy are reduced to the rank of provinces, and new courts are opened by the two Augusti and two Cæsars. Diocletian's division of power led to civil strife, which soon divided the whole empire under his sway. The center of gravity now shifted toward the declining position of the Western portion, the Rhine and Danube. The empire was again partitioned out to the sons of Constantine, one of whom, Constantius, succeeded in the Western portion and continued the Empire for 46 years. In 312, however, a new and again divided, Valentinian receiving the West and Valens the East. (7) Final partition.—On the death of Theodosius I (395), West and East fell to his sons Honorius and Arcadius, respectively. They were unable to hold the steady ground degenerated before barbaric hordes and weakening rulers. The western provinces and Africa were overrun by the Franks fleeing from Germanic, and the Eastern provinces invaded by the Goths. The Vandals under Genseric settled first in Southern Spain, then in Africa, and restored the Mediterranean to Rome. The Roman frontier, settled in Illyria and invaded Italy. After his death, 408, his son Hormius and his Germanics in 470, he announced the world that the Roman state had ceased to exist in 3124 and its final capture by the Turks in 1453, 500, when its spiritual and intellectual treasures were opened to the Westerns. It proved to be of great benefit in providing the way for the Reformations of the 16th century. The Roman Empire was not the same as the old Roman Empire, but it was the old, the Roman spirit. In the East was the birth of humanism. (1) Exhaustion of parties.—The Roman world had for two generations been ruled by aristocracy, and at least one generation before the empire became divided, so it was set up, the inevitable necessity of one-man government or supreme power, and each political leader made this its ambition to grasp it. The civil wars ceased for a century with the death of Antoninus. But the struggles of Tiburius Gracchus and Scipio Aemilianus, Caius Gracchus and Opimius, Drusus and Philippus, Marius and Sulla, Pompey and Caesar, and lastly Octavion and Antony had exhausted the state, and this exhaustion of political parties opened the way for monarchy. It was, however, a republic, a republic whose wealth is that one should be able who could fairly hold the balance between oligarchy and republicanism, and an empire which could not lose and could not longer work under the arm of the oppressed powers. If any form of government is truly sublime effectual, and an enthroned, un-
ambition could best meet their grievances. The senate had ruled with a rod of iron; the provinces could not possibly have existed in any form except government. Besides, monarchy was more congenial to the provincials than a republic which they could not comprehend.

2. *Influence of Orient.*—The Orient had long been used to living under imperial and absolute forms of government. The Roman conquests added to the new conquerors. Besides, residence in the Orient had affected Roman military leaders with the three after another. This was the only form possible to the old city-state system, and as yet federal governments had not been dreamed of. Another consideration: the vast and dissimilar masses of population living within the Roman dominions could more easily be held together or emasculated by a series of ever-changing administrations, just as the Austro-Hungarians and the British Empire are probably held together better under the present monarchies than would be possible under a republican system. This survey may make clear the whole of the Bible history, for all students of human history. The Roman empire was established indeed in the fulness of the times for its citizens and for Christianity.

II. *Preparation of the Roman Empire for Christianity.*—About the middle of the reign of Augustus a Jewish child was born who was destined to rule an empire more extensive and lasting than that of the Caesars. It is a striking fact that almost spontaneous planting of the whole Roman empire. Christianity appeared in the world. Although on a superficial glance the Roman empire may seem the greatest enemy of early Christianity, and at times a bitter persecutor, yet it was in many ways the greatest benefactor and in some ways the bulwark of Christianity. It ushered in politically the fulness of the times. The Caesars—whatever they may have been or done—prepared the way of the Lord. A brief account must here be given of some of the services which the Roman emperors rendered to humanity and esp. to the kingdom of God.

The first universal blessing conferred by the empire was the famous *pax Romana* ("Roman peace").


The world had not been at peace since the days of Alexander the Great. The quarrels of the Diadochi, and the aggression of the Roman republic had kept the nations in a state of constant turmoil. A universal peace was first established with the beginning of the reign of Augustus and the closing of the temple of Janus. In all the countries round the Mediterranean and from distant Britain to the Euphrates the world was at rest. Rome had made an end of her own civil war and had put an end to wars among the nations. Though her wars were often iniquitous and unjustifiable, and she conquered like a barbarian, she ruled her conquests like a humane statesman. The quarrels of the Diadochi which caused so much turmoil in the East were ended, the territory of the Lagids, Attalids, Seleucids and Antigonus having passed under the sway of Rome. The empire united Greeks, Romans and Jews all under one government. Rome thus blended the nations and made them all Roman. Now for the first time we may speak of the *world* as universal humanity, the *orbis terrarum*, ἡ οἰκουμένη, hé oikoumenê (Lk 2:1), the *genus humannum*. These terms represented humanity as living under a uniform system of government. All were members of one earthly state; the Roman empire was their *communis omnium patria*.

This state of affairs contributed largely to the spread of cosmopolitanism which had set in with the Macedonian conqueror. Under the empire all provincial barriers were removed; the great cities—Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, etc.—became meeting-places of all races and languages. The Romans were everywhere carrying their laws and civilization; Greeks settled in thousands at all important centers as professors, merchants, physicians, or orators;

Orientals were to be found in large numbers with their gods and mysteries in Rome, "the epitome of the world." In the Rom armies soldiers from all quarters of the empire became companions. And many thousands of slaves of fine education and high culture were driven among the new conquerors. Being in many cases far superior in culture to their masters, they became their teachers. And in every city of importance, East or West, large bodies of the Jewish Diaspora were settled.

This cosmopolitanism gave great impetus to a corresponding eclecticism of thought. Nothing could have been more favorable to 3. *Ecclesiology.* Christianity than this mixture of the various races and mutual exchange of thought. Each people discovered how much it had in common with its neighbors. From the days of the Diadochi, Stoicism had been preaching the gospel of a civic and ethical brotherhood of humanity. In the fusion of different philosophical systems the emphasis had shifted from the city-state or republic or national to the universal human point of view. All men were thus reduced to equality before the One; only virtue and vice were the differentiating factors. Men were akin with the Divine—at least the wise and good—so that one poor Stoic said, "The gods are all one.

Stoicism did a noble service in preparation for Christianity by preaching universalism along the path of individualism. It also furnished comfort and strength to countless thousands of weary human lives and ministered spiritual support and calm resignation at many a hearth desolated by death. It may be said that the system of religious thought—for it was a religion more than a philosophy—which made a serious study of the diseases of the human soul. We know of course its weaknesses and imperfections, that it was an aristocratic system appealing only to the elect of men, that it had a little message for the fallen and lower classes, that it was cold and stern, that it lacked—as Seneca felt—the inspiration of an ideal life. But with all its failings it proved a worthy pedagogue to a religion which brought a larger message than that of Greece. It afforded the spiritual and moral counterpart to the larger human society of which the Roman empire was the political and visible symbol. Hitherto a good citizen had been a good man. Now a good man is a good citizen, and that not of a narrow city-state, but of the world. Stoicism also proved the interpreter and mouthpiece to the Roman empire of the higher moral and spiritual qualities of Gr civilization. It gave the cosmopolitan and universal ideas of Greece, and the West. Those Jews bringing from the homeland the spiritual monotony of their race combined it with Gr philosophy which had been setting steadily for monothelism. With the Jews the exclusively national element was subordinated to the more universal, the ceremonial to the religious.

They even adopted the world-language of that day—Greek—and had their sacred Scriptures translated into this language in which they carried on an active proselytism. The Roman spirit was at first essentially national, and exclusive. But the Romans soon fell beneath the spell of this cosmopolitanism and eclecticism. As their conquests increased, their mind was correspondingly widened. They adopted the policy of Alexander—sparing the gods of the conquered and admitting them into the responsibility of guarding Rome, and them with their own Pantheon or identified them with Roman gods. In this way naturally the religious ideas of conquered races more highly civilized than the conquerors laid hold on Roman minds (see Dispersions).
Another inestimable service rendered to humanity and Christianity was the protection which the Rom power afforded the Gr civilization. We must remember that the Romans were at first only conquering barbarians who had little respect for culture, but idealized power already had wiped out two ancient and superior civilizations—that of Carthage without leaving a trace, and that of Etruria, traces of which have been discovered in modern times. It is hard to conceive what a vast change Rome did to the world she had not fallen under the influence of the superior culture and philosophy of Greece. Had the Rom Mars not been educated by Pallas Athene the Romans would have proved Vandals and Tartars in blotting out civilization and arresting human progress. The Greeks, on the other hand, could conquer more by their preeminence in everything that pertains to the intellectual life of man than they could hold by the sword. A practical and political power was needed to protect Gr speculation. But the Romans after causing much devastation were gradually educated and civilized and have contributed to the uplifting and enlightenment of subsequent civilizations by both preserving and opening to the world the wondrous heritage of Greece. The kinship of man with the Divine, learned from Socrates and Plato, went forth on its wide evange. This Gr civilization, philosophy and theology trained many of the great theologians and leaders of the Christian church. The Clement of Alexandria said that Gr philosophy and Jewish law had proved schoolmasters to bring the world to Christ. Paul, who prevented Christianity from remaining a Jewish sect and proclaimed its universalism, learned much from Gr—especially from Stoicism. He thought his mission to be a normal koiné or “common language.” By the conquests of Alexander and the Hellenistic sympathies of the Diadochi this common Gr language became the lingua franca of antiquity. Gr was known in Northern India, at the Parthian court, and on the distant shores of the Euxine (Black Sea). The native land of the gospel was surrounded on all sides by Gr civilization. Gr culture and language penetrated into the midst of the obstinate home-keeping Palestinian Jews. Though Gr was not the mother-tongue of our Lord, He understood Gr and apparently could speak it when occasion required—Aram. being the language of His heart and of His public teachings. The history of the Macabean struggle affords ample evidence of the extent to which Gr culture and words of the Gr language were familiar to the Jews. There were in later days Hellenistic bodies of devout Jews in Jerus itself. Gr was recognized by the Jews as the universal language: the inscription on the wall of the outer temple court found under the pavement stated that in Gr was the koinē. The language became the koinē language of religion—where a foreign tongue is least likely to be used—of the large Jewish Diaspora. They perceived the advantages of Gr as the language of commerce—the Jews’ occupation—of culture and of proselytizing. They threw open their sacred Scriptures in the LXX and other VSS to the Gr-Rom world, adapting the tr in many respects to the requirements of Gr Readers. The Gr Jews of Qumran and the Gr Yahweh was the Bible of one people: the Bible whose God was κύριος (κυρίος, “Lord”) was the Bible of humanity.” When the Romans came upon the scene, they found this language so widely known and so deeply rooted they could not hope to suppress it. The women in Sicily and Magna Graecia—to suppress Gr, but rather gladly accepted it as the one common means of intercourse among the peoples of their eastern dominions (see LANGUAGE OF THE NT).

Though Latin was of course the official language of the conquerors, the decrees of governors generally appeared with a Gr tr, so that they might be “understood of the people,” and Gr overcame Lat, as English drove out the French of the Norman invaders. Lat poets and historians more than once complained that Graecus crypto ferrum nemoris cepit (“conquered Greece vanquished its stern conqueror”). With the spread of Lat there were two world-languages side by side for the whole Rom empire, but Gr was prevailingly the language of the eastern half, the Rom empire, and soil for Christian churches and the first half of the empire to be Christianized. Later when Christianity was able to extend her activity to the West, she found Lat ready as the common means of intercourse. That Rome respected Gr is greatly to her credit and much to the advantage of Christianity. For Christianity, when it began to aim at universalism, dropped its native Aramic. The gospel in order to become a world-evangel was tr' into Gr. The early Christian missionaries apologetically inserted languages or potois of the Rom empire, but confined themselves to centers of Gr culture. Paul wrote in Gr to the church in Rome itself, of which Gr was the language. And while Christianity was spreading through the Gr East under the supervision of Rom administration, the Romans were Romanizing and leveling the West for Lat Christianity (see LATIN). In the West it may be noted that the first foothold of the Christian religion was in Gr—it was Latin in Gaul, Greek in Italy.

In material ways too Rome opened the way for Christianity by building the great highways for the gospel. The great system of roads that knit the then civilized world together served not only the legionaries and the imperial escorts, but were of equal service to the early missionaries, and when churches began to spring up over the empire, these roads greatly facilitated that church organization and brotherhood which strengthened the church to overcome the empire. With the dawn of the pax Romana all these roads became alive once more with a galaxy of caravans and traders. Commerce revived and was carried on under circumstances more favorable than any that obtained till the past century. Men exchanged not only material things, but also spiritual things. Many of these early traders and artisans were Christians, and while they bought and sold the things that perish, they did not lose an opportunity of spreading the gospel. For an empire which embraced the Mediterranean shores, the sea was an important means of intercommunication; and the Mediterranean routes were safer for commerce and travel at that period than during any previous one. POMPEY cleared the sea. The ships which pld in countless numbers from point to point of this great inland sea
offered splendid advantages and opportunity for early Christian missionary enthusiasm.

The large measure of freedom permitted by Rom authorities to the religions of all nations greatly favored the growth of infant Christianity. The Rom empire was never in principle a persecutor with a permanent court of inquisition. Strange cults from the East and Egypt flourished in the capital, and except when they became a danger to public morality or to the peace of society they were allowed to exist at a distance from the eyes of the police. See below on non-Rom religions.

Further, the Rom empire afforded Christianity a material and outward symbol for its spiritual ambition. It enlarged the vision of the church. Only a citizen (Paul) of such a religion for all humanity. If the Rom Church sword could so conquer and unify the orbis terranum, the militant church should be provoked to attempt nothing less in the religious sphere. It is said by a supreme testimony to the early organizers of the new community, until the Christian church became the spiritual counterpart of the Rom empire. The Christians appropriated many a weapon from the arsenal of the might and learned from them aggressiveness, the value of thorough organization and of military methods.

Rom law in its origins was characterized by the narrowest exclusiveness, and the first formal Rom code was written by the Cisarians, yet their Romans here is as so many other respects improved upon what they had borrowed and become masters of jurisprudence in the antique world. As their empire and conceptions expanded, they remodelled their laws to accommodate all their subjects. One of the greatest boons conferred by Rome on the antique world was a uniform system of good laws—the source of much of our European jurisprudence. The Rom law played an equally important rôle with the Jewish in molding and disciplining for Christianity. It taught men to obey and to respect authority, and proved an effective leveling and civilizing power in the empire. The universal law of Rome was the pedagogue for the universal law of the gospel. See ROMAN LAW.

The Romans could offer their subjects good laws, uniform government and military protection, but not a satisfactory religion. A universal empire called for a universal religion, which Christianity alone could offer. Finally, not only by what Rome accomplished by what she was incapable of accomplishing, the way of the Lord was made ready and a people prepared for His coming. It was a terrible crisis in the civilization and religion of antiquity. The old national religions and systems of belief had proved unable to soothe the increasing imperious moral and spiritual demands of man's nature. A moral bankruptcy was imminent. The old Rom religion of abstract virtues had gone down in formalism; it was too cold for human hearts. Man could no longer find the field of his moral activity in the religion of the state; he was no longer merely an atom in society performing religious rites, not for his own soul, but for the good of the commonwealth. Personality had been slowly emerging, and the new schools of philosophy called man away from the state to seek peace with God in the solitude of his own soul first of all. But even the best of these schools found the crying need of a positive, not a negative religion, the need for a perfect ideal life as of use. Thus was felt the demand for a new revelation, for a fresh vision or knowledge of God. In earlier days men had believed that God had revealed Himself to primitive wise men or heroes of their race, and that subsequent generations must accept with faith what these earlier seers, who stood nearer God, as Cicero said, had been pleased to teach of the Divine. But soon this stock of knowledge became exhausted. Plato, after soaring to the highest point of poetic and philosophic thought about the Divine, admitted the need of a demon or an angel to tell us the secrets of eternity. With the early Rom empire began a period of tremendous religious unrest. Men tried philosophy, magic, astrology, foreign rites, to find a sure place of rest. This accounts for the rapid and extensive diffusion of those mysteries which promised to the initiated communion with God here, a “better hope” in death, and satisfied the craving for immortality beyond time. These were the more serious souls who would gladly accept the connotations of Jesus. Others, losing all faith in any form of religion, gave themselves up to blank despair and accepted Epicureanism with its gospel of annihilation and its carpe diem morals. This system had a terrible fascination for those who had lost themselves; it is presented in its most attractive form in the Letters of Lucretius, the Omar Khoziym of Latin literature. Others again, unable to find God, surrendered themselves to cheerless skepticism. The sore need of the new gospel of life and immortality will be borne in upon the mind of those who read the Gr and Rom religious anticipations. And even Seneca, who was almost a Christian in some respects, speaks of immortality as a "beautiful dream" (bellum somnium), though tribulation later gave a clearer vision of the city of God.” Servius Sulpicius, writing to Cicero a letter of consolation on the death of his much-missed Tullia, had only a sad “if” to offer about the future (Cic. Fam. iv.5). Nowhere does the unbelief and pessimism of pre-Christian days among the higher classes strike one more forcibly than the discussion recorded by Sallust (Bel. Cat. li f) as to the punishment of the Catilinarian conspirators. Caesar, who held the Rom high-priesthood and the highest authority on the religion of the state, proposes life imprisonment, as death would only bring annihilation and rest to these villains—no hereafter, no reward or punishment (eam cuncta mortalium mala dissolvunt; ultra neque curae neque gaudii necem esse). He next speaks of the religious man of his generation—in terms which cast but reprove upon Caesar’s Epicureanism and materialism (ib. 62). Cicero (In Cat. iv.4) is content to leave immortality an open question. The philosophy of pre-Christian days was a prelude to the discussion recorded by Sallust (Bel. Cat. li f) as the attitude of the educated classes of the Gr-Rom world at the dawn of Christianity, though it cannot be denied that there was also a strong desire for continued existence. The other classes were either perfunctorily performing the rites of a dead national religion or were seeking, some, excitement or aesthetic worship or even scope for their baser passions, some, peace and promise for the future, in the eastern mysteries. The distinction between moral and physical evil was coming to the surface, and hence a consciousness of sin. Religion and ethics had not yet been united. “The throne of the human mind” was declared vacant, and Christianity was at hand as the best claimant. In fact, the Gr-Rom mind had been expanding to receive the pure teachings of Jesus.

III. Attitude of the Roman Empire to Religions.—The history of Rom religion reveals a continuous penetration of Italian, Etruscan, Gr, Egyptian, and oriental religions, until the old Rom religion became almost unrecognizable, and even the antiquarian learning of a Varro could scarcely discover the original meaning or use of

1. Roman Religion

Rome was a state divinity, until the old Rom religion became
The Roman Empire

The Roman empire, as a political and religious entity, was one of the most significant in history. It expanded rapidly and became a powerful force in the Mediterranean world. The empire's influence was felt throughout the known world, and its legacy can still be seen today.

The Roman religion was polytheistic, meaning it had many gods and goddesses. The Romans believed in a pantheon of gods and goddesses, each with their own domain and responsibilities. These deities were associated with various aspects of life, such as war, love, and agriculture.

The Roman religion was also syncretic, meaning it incorporated elements from other religions. The Romans were known for their tolerance of other religions, and many foreign gods and goddesses were accepted into the Roman pantheon.

The Roman religion had a significant impact on the development of Christianity. The principles of Christianity, such as the idea of a single god, a savior, and salvation, were influenced by the Roman religion. The Roman empire's decline and fall also contributed to the spread of Christianity, as many people sought a new religion to replace the corrupt and decadent Roman religion.

In summary, the Roman religion was a crucial aspect of Roman culture and played a significant role in the development of Christianity. Its legacy can still be seen in modern-day religious practices and beliefs.
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tianity were aiming at a social organization to embrace the genus humanum. But though these two empires were so alike in several points and the one had done so much to prepare the way for the other, yet the contrast was too great to allow conciliation. The Jews had so far disintegrated themselves that it aimed at universalism along the path of individualism—giving new value to human personality.

(b) Unique claims of Christianity: It seemed also to provoke Rom pride by its absurd claims. It preached that the world was to be destroyed by fire to make way for a new heaven and new earth, that the Eternal City (Rome) was doomed to fall, that a king would come from heaven whom Christians were to obey, that amid the coming desolations the Christians should remain tranquil.

(c) Novelty of Christianity: Again after Christianity came from underneath the aegis of Judaism, it must have taken the government somewhat by surprise as a new and unlicensed religion which had grown strong under a misnomer. It was the newest and latest religion of the empire; it came Occidental, as it was, where the stage was not. It was not apparent to the Rom mind that Christianity had been spreading for a generation under the tolerance granted to Judaism (sub umbraclu licitae), and the thought in which the Jews were "protected by its antiquity," as Tacitus said. The Romans were of a conservative nature and disliked innovations. The greatest statesman of the Augustan era, Maecenas, advised the emperor to extend no tolerance to new religions as "subversive of monarchy" (Dio Cassius lli.36). A new faith appearing suddenly with a large clientele might be dangerous to the public peace (multilatu ingenii; Tac. Ann. xvi.44; ἀννο διδόμεν Κελλιμ. Rom.; Cor I 6).

(d) Intolerance and exclusiveness of Christian religion and society: the marked way the new faith was to react against the tolerant eclec spirit of the empire—the intolerance and absoluteness of their religion and the exclusiveness of their society. All other religions of the empire admitted compromise and eclecticisms, were willing to dwell rather on the points of contact with their neighbors than on the contrast. But Christianity admitted no compromise, was intolerant to all other systems, must be admitted that in this way it was rather unfair to other cults which offered comfort and spiritual support to thousands. The Christians disdained the society of Christianity. But we shall not blame, when we recognize that for their own life and purpose, they felt it necessary to show itself at first intolerant. Many heathen would gladly accept Christ along with Mithra and Isis and Ceres and all the other deities. But Christianity demanded separation. The Jesus cults could tolerate no rival; it claimed exclusiveness and absoluteness. It was driven from the world. The Christian church was absolute in its demands; it would not rank with, but above, all worship. This was the day of Christ so far as concerns the day which enabled rival cults to co-exist with the greatest indifference. Add to this the exclusive state of Christian society. No piues heathen who had purified his soul by asceticism and the sacraments of antiquity could be admitted into membership unless he renounced things dear to him and of some spiritual value. In every detail of public life this exclusive spirit made itself felt. Christians met at night and held secret assemblies in which they were reputed to perpetrate the most scandalous crimes. Theseytism indicates the conditions of incest, child murder, were among the charges provoked by their exclusiveness.

(e) Obstinacy: Add to this also the sullen obstinacy with which Christians met the demands of imperial power—a feature very offensive to Rom governors. Their religion would be left them undisturbed if they would only render formal obedience to the religion of the state. Rome was lax and flexible before Christian obstinacy. The martyr's courage appeared as sheer fanaticism. The pious Aurelius refers but once to Christianity, and in the words μὴ παρατηρεῖ, πατὶ παρανοίαν, "sheer obstinacy," and Aristides apparently refers to it as a "false religion, absurdities, stubbornness." See Persecutions, 18.

(f) Aggressiveness against pagan faith: But the Christians were not content with an uncompromising withdrawal from the practices of heathen worship: they also actively assailed the pagan cults. To the Christians they became doctrines of demons.
The imperial cult and worship of the Genius of the emperor were very unholy in their sight. Hence they will consider the charges of disloyalty to the emperor and might be proved guilty of majestas. They held in contempt the doctrine that the greatness of Rome was due to her reverence for the gods; the Christians were atheists from the pagan point of view. And as religion was a political concern for the welfare of the state, atheism was likely to call down the wrath of divinity to the subversion of the state.

(g) Christians ad bonos: Very soon when disasters began to fall thickly upon the Roman empire, the blame was laid upon the Christians. In early days Rome had often sought to appease the gods by introducing external cults; at other times oriental cults were expelled in the interests of public morality. Now in times of disaster Christians became the scapegoats. If famine, drought, pestilence, earthquake or any other public calamity threatened, the cry was raised “the Christians to the lions!” (see Nero; Persecutions, 12). This view of Christianity as subversive of the empire survived the fall of Rome before Alaric. The heathen forgot—as the apologists showed—that Rome had been visited by the greatest calamities before the Christian era and that the Christians were the most self-sacrificing in periods of public distress, lending succor to pagan and Christian alike.

(b) Odium generis humani: All prejudices against Christianity were summed up in odium generis humani, “hatred for the human race” or society, which was reciprocated by “hatred of the human race toward them.” The Christians were bitterly hated, not only by the populace, but by the upper educated classes. Most of the early adherents belonged to the slave, freedman and artisan classes; “not many wise, not many noble.” Few were Rom citizens. We have mentioned the crimes which popular prejudice attributed to this hated sect. They were in mockery styled Christiani by the Antiochians (a name which they at first rejected), and Nazarenes by the Jews. No nicknames were too vile to attach to them—Aristaeus (the sect that worshipped the ass’s head), Sarmentici or Semazit. Roman writers cannot find epithets strong enough. Tacitus reckons the Christian faith among the “atrocious and abominable things” (atrocia aut pudenda) which doomed Rome, and further designates it superstes sub exitibus (“baneful superstition,” Ann. xvi 44), Suetonius (Ner. 16) as novel and malefic (novus ac maleficus), and the gentle Pliny (Ep. 97) as vile and indecent (prava immodica). Well might Justus say the Christians were “hated and reviled by the whole human race.” This opprobrium was accentuated by the attacks of philosophy upon Christianity. When the attention of philosophers was drawn to the new religion, it was only to scorn it. This attitude of heathen philosophy is best understood in reading Celsus and the Christian apologists. It was maintained that Celsus, a Graeco-Roman, was the last to enter the kingdom of God. When later Christianity had established itself as a permanent force in human thought, philosophy designed to consider its claims. But it was too late; the new faith was already on the offensive. Philosophy discovered its own weakness and began to reform itself by aiming at being both a philosophy and a religion. This is particularly the case in Platonicism (in Plotinus) in which reason breaks down before revelation and mysticism. Another force disturbing the peace of the Christian church was the enemy within the fold. Large numbers of heathen had entered the ecclesia bringing with them their oriental or Gr ideas, just as Jewish Christians brought their Judaism with them. This led to grave heresies, each system of thought distorting in its own way the orthodox faith. Later another party joined the forces against Christianity—reformed paganism led by an injured priesthood. At first the cause of Christianity was greatly aided by the fact that there was no exclusive and jealous priesthood at the head of the Gr-Rom religion, as in the Jewish and oriental religions. There was thus no dogma and no class interested in maintaining a dogma. Religious persecution is invariably instituted by the priesthood, but in the Rom world it was not till late in the day when the temples and sacrifices were falling into desuetude that we find a priesthood as a body in opposition. Thus the Rom imperial power stood not alone in antagonism to Christianity, but was abetted and often provoked to action by (a) popular hate, (b) philosophy, (c) pagan priesthood, (d) heresies within the church.

IV. Relations between the Roman Empire and Christianity. We have here to explain how the attitude of the Rom empire, at first friendly or indifferent, developed into one of fierce conflict, the different stages in the policy—if we can speak of any uniform policy—of the Rom government toward Christianity, the charges or mode of procedure on which Christians were condemned, and when and how the profession of Christianity was again made a crime in the Rom empire progressively weakening and Christianity gaining ground. For the sake of clearness we shall divide the Rom empire into six periods, the first from the commencement of the Christian era till the last of the Julio-Claudian dynasty.

At first the presence of the Christian faith was unknown to Rom authorities. It appeared first merely as a reformed and more spiritual Judaism; its earliest preachers were expelled from the synagogue severing from the synagogue. Christiani were only another of the Jewish sects to which a Jew might belong while adhering to Mosaic and Judaist. But soon this friendly relation became strained on account of the expanding views of some of the Christian preachers, and from the introduction of gentile proselytes. The first persecutions for the infant church came entirely from Jewish Christians, and it was the Jews who first accused Christians before the Rom courts. Even so, the Rom government not only refused to turn persecutor, but even protected the new faith both against Jewish accusations and against the violence of the populace (Acts 21 31). And the Christian missionaries recognized in the Rom empire an ally and a power for good. Writing
to the Romans Paul counsels them to submit in obedience to the powers that be, as "ordained of God." His favorable impression must have been greatly enhanced by his mild captivity at Rome and his friendly relations with the procurator. The latter had come to his rescue in Jesus to save his life from the fanaticism of his own coreligionists. The Romans persist in looking upon Christians as a sect of delirous Jews on the first opportunity, in formulating a charge of disloyalty (begun before Pilate) against the new sect as acting "contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another king, one Jesus" (Acts 17, 7; cf. 25, 8). Christianity was disowned thus early by Judaism and cast upon its own resources. The increasing numbers of Christians would confirm to the Roman government the independence of Christianity. And the trial of a Roman citizen, Paul, at Rome would further establish the sect as a distinct people.

The first heathen persecution of Christianity resulted from no definite policy, no apprehension of danger to the body politic, and no definite charges, but from an accidental spark which kindled the conflagration. This was due to this fact: no emperor had taken much notice of Christianity. It was only in the middle of the reign of Augustus that Jesus was born. In the reign of Tiberius, belonging to Jesus' public ministry, crucifixion and resur- rection of Christ is closed too. (37 AD) He allows no participation to the new faith, though this emperor was credited with proposing to the senate a decree to receive Christ into the Roman pantheon—a legend of course. Under the brief principate of the mad Gaius (37-41 AD) the "new way" was not yet divorced from the parent faith. Gaius caused a diversion in favor of the Christians by his persecution of the Jews and the command to set up his own statue in the temple. In the next reign (Claudius, 41-54 AD) the Jews were again harshly treated, and thousands were banished from Rome (Judaeos impulsa cronte assidue tumultuantres Roma expulit; Suet. Claud., 25). Some would see in this an action against the Christians by interpretation of similar persecutions in Roman history and by a. "new way" of Christians in the reign of Vespasian, in consequence of which some Christians were banished as Jews, but Dio Cassius (l,6) implies that it was a police regulation to restrain the spread of Jewish worship. It was in the reign of Nero, after the fire of 64 AD, that the first hostile step was taken by the government against the Christians, earliest account of which is given by Tacitus (Ann. xv.44). Nero's reckless career had given rise to the rumor that he was the incendiary, to see the burning of the city bathed in order to rebuild it on more magnificent plans. See Nero. Though he did everything possible to arrest the flames, even exposing his own life, took every means of alleviating the destitution of the sufferers, and ordered such religious rites as might appease the wrath of the gods, the suspicion still clung to him.

"Accordingly in order to dissuade the rumor, he put forward as guilty [suidbid reo] and inflicted the most cruel punishments for the abominations [Augita] and called Christians by the populace. The originator of that name, Christus, had been put to death by the procurator Pontius Pilatus in the reign of Tiberius, and the baneful superstition [eritribis superstition] put down for the time being brook'd out again, not only throughout Judaea, the home of this evil, but also in the City [Rome] where all atrocious and shameful [gea] things were committed. Those therefore who confessed [i.e. being Christians] were first arrested, and then by the information gained from them a large number [multido ingens] were implicated [conuiciat] in the MS reading, not convicti, not so much on the charge of inciting the sedition of mankind [ado humani generis]. The victims perished by various and monstrous tortures here unknown. The skins of wild beasts were torn to pieces by dogs; others impaled on crosses in order to set on fire to afford light after death. How again, [after these cruelties] commiseration began to be felt for those thus guilty, though they were criminals, is well known. The worst penalties [quamquam adversus sectes et nostros exemplum merito], for men felt their destruction was not undeserved. But from consideration of the sect's moral character, its cruelty of one person [Nero]."

This passage supplies the earliest classical account of the crucifixion and the only mention of Pilate in a heathen author—offers some difficulties which require to be balanced at. It is held by some who have no faith in himself by writing sudditus rea at the beginning and sectes at the end, but the latter is another derivation. Another derivative from the point of view of the populace and deserving severe punishment for other supposed augmentations. Tacitus regards the Christians as innocent, though he had not the slightest kindly feeling towards them. Qui infidebantur means "those who confessed to being Christians," though Arnold argues that "confessers" were the word for profes- sors of a religion. But this would contradict both the sense and other evidence of the context. For the word confessus, meaning "confessed to arson," therefore the whole body of Christians should have been arrested, and, further, this would have been supported by the evidence not the case according to Tacitus. Some Christians were boldly asserting their religion, or they were taken in Bitinia, recanted before tribulation. By indicio curum Ramsay (Christianity in the Roman Empire, 233) understands that the information of the i.e. from information gathered by the inquisitors in the house of the procurator. This information implicated a large number of others, hence Pilate prefers the MS reading confesuit to the correction confesus. It is a good order to explain the difficulty by raising, viz. that the noblest Christians who boldly confessed their Christianity would suffer first, and so on. But it is not impossible that some of these bold spirits did condescend to give the names of their coreligionists to the Roman procurator. Hence Harkness and O. J. and Rom. Government, 67 prefers the more usual rendering in indicio curum, "by information." This may have occurred either (1) through torture, or (2) for promised immunity, or (3) on account of local jealousies. The early Christian communities were not perfect; party strife often ran high as at Corinth. And in a church like that of Rome composed of Jewish and pagan elements and undoubtedly more cosmopolitan than Corinth, a bitter sectarian spirit is easy to understand. This is a probable explanation more strength, and rendered almost certain by the words of Clement of Rome, who, writing to the church at Corinth (1 st Chr. 51), demands that they be consorted with the church at Rome only a generation after the persecution, and thus familiar with the internal history of the Roman empire, twice assures the Corinthians of his own and a. "new way" of the "multido ingens" of the Roman Christians suffered his severities (dixit aliquis qui cruento). The most natural and obvious explanation is "mutual or sectarian jealousy."

But those who do not like this fact explain it as the jealousy of the Jews, which was more easily refuted, for had it been the jealousy of the Jews Clement would not have hesitated one moment to assert as much. Those who are familiar with the literature of that age know that the Christians were none too sensitive toward Jewish feelings. But the very fact that it was not the Jews made Clement rather modestly omit details the memory of which was probably still bearing fruit, even in his day. Once more com- mended, usually rendered, "arrested," is taken by Hardy as "put under their trial." One argues that this is more in accordance with the Tacic usage. A. "huge multitude" need not cause us to distracT. It is a relative term. It was a considerable number to be so inhumanly butchered. There is some hesitation as to whether the term multis in T. is objective or subjective and in the first case the hatred of the Christians toward the human race" or hatred of the human race toward the Christians. Grammatically, of course it may be the former, but the latter is the form more or less familiar with the origin of the Christian party. Also Poppaea was at this time mis-
tress of Nero's affections and sufficiently influential with him to stay the cruel persecution against those whom she had a leaning and who claimed her as a protégée. Again, the Jewish faith was certe licita and a recognized worship of the empire.

The next question is, Why were the Christians alone selected for persecution? That they were so singled out we know, but exactly for what reason is hard to say with certainty. A number of reasons no doubt contributed. (1) Farrar (Early Days, etc.) says "in the proselytism of Poppaea, guided by Jewish malice, the only adequate explanation of the first Christian persecution," and Lightfoot is of the same opinion, but this by itself is inadequate, though the Jews would be glad of an opportunity of taking revenge on their aggressive opponents. (2) Christians had already become in the eyes of the Roman authorities a distinct sect, either from the reports of the eastern provincial governors, where Christianity was making most headway, or from the attention attracted by Paul's first trial. They were thus the newest religious sect, and as such would serve as victims to appease deity and the populace. (3) Even if ingens multitudo be rhetorical, the Christians were no doubt considered a Roman pest in Rome, and active proselytism made their numbers even more formidable. (4) They were uncompromising in their expression of their beliefs; they looked for a consummation of the earth by fire and were also eagerly expecting the thousand years of their kingdom to constitute society. These tenets together with their calm faith amid the despair of others would easily cast suspicion upon them. (5) For whatever reason, they had earned the opprobrium of the populace. The hatred for their faith was passed over to hatred for the Christians" (Mommsen). A people whom the populace so detested must have fallen under the surveillance of the city police administration. (6) A large proportion of the Christian community at Rome would be non-Rom and so deserve no recognition of Roman privileges. These reasons together may or may not explain the singling-out of the Christians. At any rate they were chosen as scapegoats to serve Nero and his minion Tigellinus. The origin of the first persecution was thus purely accidental, in order to remove suspicion from Nero. It was not owing to any already formulated policy, neither through apprehension of any danger to the state, nor because the Christians were guilty of any crimes, though it gave an opportunity of investigation and accumulation of evidence. But accidental as this persecution was in origin, its consequences were of far-reaching importance. There are three principal views as to the date of the policy of proscription of the new faith by the Roman government: (1) the old view that persecution for the name, i.e. for the mere profession of Christianity, began under Trajan in 112 AD—a view now almost universally abandoned; (2) that of Ramsay (Christianity in the Roman Empire, 242 ff, and three arts. in Expos, 1893), who holds that the development from punishment for definite crimes (flagitia) to proscription “for the name” took place between 68 and 96 AD, and (3) that of Hardy (Christianity and the Roman Government, 77), Mommsen (Expos, 1893, 1–7) and Soden (ibid., 1895, 1–7) and adopted by the writer of this article—that the trial of the Christians under Nero resulted in the declaration of the mere profession of Christianity as a crime punishable by death. Tacitus apparently represents the persecution of the Christians as accidental and isolated and of brief duration (i.e.), while Suetonius (Ner. 16) mentions the punishment of Christians in a list of permanent police regulations for the maintenance of good order, into which it would be inconsistent to introduce an isolated case of procedure against the “baneful superstition” (Ramsay, op. cit., p. 230). But these two accounts are not contradictory. Tacitus giving the initial stage and Suetonius “a brief statement of the punishment of a principle into which Nero’s action ultimately resolved itself” (ib, 232). Nero’s police administration, then, pursued as a permanent policy what was begun merely to avert suspicion from Nero. But as yet, according to Ramsay, Christians were not condemned as Christians, but on account of certain flagitia to apprehending the profession and because the Roman police authorities had learned enough about the Christians to regard them as hostile to society. A trial must still be held and condemnation proclaimed. Nero’s act was no more but of serious offences naturally connected with the name,” viz., first incendiarism, which broke down, and secondly hostility to civilized society and charges of magic. The others agree so far with Ramsay as describing the first stages, but assert that adum humanum generis was not of the nature of a definite charge, but dissimulation to the social and political arrangements of the empire. At the outset a trial was needed, but soon as a consequence of this many of the Christians were recognized as a society whose principle might be summarized as adum generis humani.” A trial became unnecessary; the religion itself involved the crimes, and as a religion it was henceforth preserved and permitted. While their punishment was left to the police administration which could step in at any time with severe measures or remain remiss, according as exigencies demanded. Christianity was henceforth a religio liciter. The Roman government was never a systematic persecutor. The persecution or non-persecution of Christianity depended henceforth on the mood of the reigning emperor, the character of his administration, the activity of provincial governors, the state of popular feeling against the new faith, and other local circumstances. There is no early evidence that the Neronian persecution extended beyond Rome, though of course the “example set by the emperor necessarily guided the action of all Roman officials.” The stormy close of Nero’s reign and the tumultuous days till the accession of Vespasian created a diversion in favor of Christianity. Orosius (Hist. vii.7) is too late an authority for a general persecution (per omnes provincias pari persecutione excitata imperator op. [sic] stirpere conatus . . . ). Besides, Paul, after his acquittal seems to have prosecuted his missionary activity without any extraordinary hindrances, till he came to Rome the second time. This Neronian persecution is important for the history of Christianity: Nero commenced the principle of persecuting Christians, and thus made a precedent for future rulers. Trouble first began in the world-capital; the next stage will be found in the East; and another in Africa and the West. But this was only local. Nero was the first of the Roman persecutors who, like Herod Agrippa, came to a miserable end—a fact much dwelt upon by Lacinius and other Christian writers.

In the Flavian period no uniform imperial policy against Christianity was developed. According to Ramsay the Flavius developed the practice set by Nero from punishment of Christians for definite crimes to proscription of the name. But, as we have seen, the Neronian persecution set the future attitude of the Roman state toward the new faith. The Flavius could not avoid following the precedent set by Nero. Christianity was spreading—esp. in the East and at Rome. We have no account of any persecution under Vespasian (though Hillary erroneously speaks
of him as a persecutor along with Nero and Decius) and Titus, but it does not follow that none such took place. As the whole matter was left to the police administration, severity would be spasmodic and called for circumstances. The fate of Jesus must have had profound influence both on Judaism and on Christianity. For the former it did what the fall of Rome under Goths, Vandals, and Germans did for the old Roman religion—it weakened the idea of a national God bound up with a political religion. The clef between Judaism and its rival would now become greater. Christianity was relieved from the overpowering influence of a national center, and those Jews who now recognized the futility of political dreams would more readily join the Christian faith. Not only the distinction but the opposition and hostility would now be more apparent to outsiders, though Vespasian imposed the poll-tax on Jewish Christians and Jews alike. No memory of harshness against Christianity under Vespasian has survived. Ramsay (op. cit., 257) would interpret a mutilated passage of Suetonius (Vesp. 15) as implying Vespasian's reluctance to carry out justa supplicia against Christians.

Titus, "the darling of the human race," is not mentioned as his successor of Judaism and Christianity as stated in the council of war before Jesus in 70 AD and recorded by Sulpicius Severus (Chron. ii.30, 6) is interesting as an approval of the policy adopted by Nero. Severus' authority is undoubtedly only Probabilis (Burmans and Monmonier). The authenticity of the speech as contradicting the account of Jos has been impugned; at any rate it represents the point of view of Tacitus. Titus then advocates the destruction of the Temple in order that the religion of the Jews and the Christians may be more thoroughly exterminated (quo plenius Judaeorum et Christianorum religio tolleretur), since these religions though opposed to each other were of the same origin, the Christians having sprung from the Jews. If the root was removed the stem would readily perish (radix subulta, stirpem facile perituram). We know, however, of no active measures of Titus against either party, his short reign perhaps allowing no time for it.

It is Domitian who stands out prominently as the persecutor of this period, as Nero of the first period. His procedure against Christians was not an isolated act, but part of a general policy under which he was more or less defending this very ancient principles. He attempted to reform morals, suppress luxury and vice, banish immoral oriental rites, actors, astrologers and philosophers. It was in his attempt to revive the national religion that he came in conflict with the universal religion. His own cousin, Flavius Clemens, was condemned apparently for Christianity (atheism), and his wife, Domitilla, was banished. The profession of Christianity was not sufficient for the condemnation of Rom citizens of high standing; hence the charges of atheism or majestas were put forward. Refusal to comply with the religion of the national gods could be brought under the latter. But for ordinary Rom citizens and for provincials the profession of Christianity merited death. No definite edict or general proscription was enacted; only the principle instituted by Nero was allowed to be carried out. There was, as Mommers remarks, a standing proscription of Christians as of brigands, but harsh persecution with this exception on the caprice or character of provincial governors. Domitian took one definite step against Christianity in establishing an easy test by which to detect those who were Christians and so facilitate inquiries. This test was the demand to worship the Genius of the emperor. This too was only part of Domitian's general policy of asserting his own dominus et deus title and emphasizing the imperial cult as a bond of political union. The Apocalypse reflects the sufferings of the church in this reign.

(1) Nerva and Trajan. On the death of Domitian peace was restored to the Christian church which lasted throughout the brief reign of Nerva (96–98) and the first 13 years of the Antonine Period, 96–192 AD (see Nerva, Trajan, Marcus Aurelius, and Dioecletian) were harsh to the Christians, while some of the worst (as Commodus, Caracalla, Helogabalus) left them in peace (see Persecution, 17). Christianity had been rapidly spreading as it became governor of Bithynia in 111 AD and found, esp. in the eastern part of his province, the temples almost deserted. Some Christians were brought before him and on established precedents were ordered to be executed for their religion. But Pliny soon discovered that many of both sexes and all ages, provincials and Rom citizens, were involved. The Roman citizens he sent to Rome for trial; but being of a humane disposition he shrank from carrying out the wholesale execution required by a consistent policy.

He wrote to Trajan telling him what he had already done, rather covertly suggesting tolerant measures. Should no distinction be made between old and young? Should pardons be extended to provincials, who worshiped the emperor's image and cursed Christ? Should mere profession (deaum spars) be a capital offence if no crimes could be proven, or should the crimes rather be punished that were associated with the faith (si quid dea plurima nomen?...). He explained his procedure: he gave those who were accused an abundant opportunity to renounce their faith; and if this were not done, their faith was executed. He considered their "stubbornness and inflexible obstinacy" (pertinacia corte et obduratam, etc.) as his justification for punitive measures. But the administration having once interfered found plenty to do. An anonymous list of many names was handed in, most of whom, however, denied being Christians. Informers then put forward others who likewise denied belonging to the faith. Pliny was convinced their meetings were harmless, and on examination of two deaconesses under torture discovered nothing but a perverse extravagant superstition (sup. parr. immolament). Trajan replied that no universal and final rule could be laid down for testing the correctness of Pliny's action and perhaps disapproving him not yielding to tolerance in various situations. Nevertheless, the emperor made three important concessions: (1) the Christians were not to be sought out by the police authorities, but to be suspected and convicted they must be punished; (2) anonymous accusations of superstition are not to be acted up, even those suspected of fuga in the past were to be pardoned on proving they were not Christians or on renouncing their Christianity; Some of the friends of Trajan as the first official and legal authorization to persecute Christianity, but we have already seen that Christianity as such was proscribed as a result of the Neronian investigations. Besides, there is not the slightest trace of any new principle of severity, either in the letters of Pliny or in the rescript of Trajan. The persecution of Christianity had been "permanent," like the edicts of highwaymen, but not systematic or general. Neither was Trajan's rescript an edict of toleration, though on the whole it was favorable to the Christians in minimizing the dangers to which they were exposed. The question was as yet purely one of administration.

Trajan initiated no procedure against Christians—in fact rather discouraged any, asking his lieutenants to deal leniently with those suspected. It resulted in the hope of obtaining milder treatment for the Christians by putting in question form what he really wished to be approved. Trajan's rescript marks the end of the old system of uncompro- mising hostility and persecution. It had been a period of toleration for the Christians. He was no bigot, but tolerant and eclectical, inquiring into all religions and initiated into several mysteries and willing to leave religion an open question. In Asia, where Christianity was making most progress,
a state of terrorism was imminent if delatores were encouraged against Christians making a profession of delatio (giving information). As we saw in the last chapter, Pliny, every non-Christian was accused, and any Christian found guilty was threatened by these informers in order to secure a bribe for proceeding no farther. Licinius Silvanus Graianus, like Pliny, found himself involved in difficulties and wrote to Hadrian for advice. Hadrian determined to send a rescript to all the proconsuls in Asia, and to some extent to provide protection against proceedings of any sort against Christians, by the law against the Jews. In the rescript, Antinianus, Hadrian's successor, Minucius Fundanus, the proconsul of Asia, about 124 AD. The genuineness of this important document, though impugned by Overbeck, Keim and Lipsius, is vouched for by Monnensen, Hardy, Lightfoot and Ramsay. Indeed, it is more easily accounted for as authentic than as a forgery, for who but the broad-minded Hadrian could have written such a rescript? Apparently the questions put by the proconsul must have been of a similar nature to those raised by Pliny. The aim of Hadrian is a decided step in favor of Christianity and goes beyond that of Trajan: (1) information is not to be passed over (a) lest the innocent suffer (as was the case under Pliny), and (b) lest informers should make a trade of lodging accusations; (2) protection is granted to Christians when accused, that the accused have committed something illegal; (3) mere petitions and acclamations against the Christians are not to be admitted; (4) a prosecutor on failing to make good his case is to be punished. These terms would greatly increase the risk for informers and lessen the dangers for Christians. That the name is a crime is not admitted, neither is this established principle rescinded. It is quite possible that Hadrian's rescript "gave a certain status to the employment of the more definite and regular legal procedure."

(3) Antoninus Pius (138-61).—The liberal policy of Trajan and Hadrian was continued by Antoninus, though persecution occurred in his reign in which Ptolemaeus and Lucina were executed at Rome and Polycarp at Smyrna. But he decidedly confirmed Hadrian's policy of protecting the Christians uncondemned against mob violence in his letters to Larisaeus, Athens, Theassalonica and to "all the churches," in which he states that the Church was in advance of public feeling," and so was disregarded.

Anonymous delation was also repressed. (4) Marcus Aurelius (161-80).—Under Aurelius a strong reaction set in affecting the Christians, caused partly by the persecution in the public buildings and partly by Aurelius' policy of returning to ancient principles and reviving the Roman national religion. In this reign we find persecution extending to the West (Gaul) and to Africa—a step toward the general persecutions of the next century. Though no actual change was made by Aurelius, the lassitude of the last three reigns is evident. No general edict or definite rescript of persecution was issued; the numerous martyrs recorded in this reign are partly due to the fact that the rise of Christianity and the Schism of Constantine and the persecution of the Emperors of the East. Christianity in itself still constituted a crime, and the obstinacy (paradoxit, paradixis) of Christians in itself deserved punishment. Aurelius seems to have actually rebuked the severity of the Roman government at Aquileia and to have further discouraged the trade of informers against Christians. Tertullian actually styles him as debellator Christianorum ("protector of Christians"). We find as yet therefore no systematic or serious attempt to extirpate the new faith. The central motive was the want of all time without a permanent or steady policy toward the Christians. It had not yet made up its mind" (Hardy).

Under the rule of Commodus (180-92) Christians again enjoyed a respite. The net result of the collisions between the new faith and the government in this period is somewhat differently estimated by Ramsay and by Lightfoot ("Christianity in the Empire, i. f") that Ramsay "has to some extent anticipated the existence of anything approaching a persecution," due to antedating the time when Christianity was regarded as a serious political danger. Hardy thinks that the Christian organization was not more than an abstract danger during the first two centuries. Hadrian took the view that its organization was a real danger and an imperium in imperio, she must have started a systematic exterminating policy during a period when Christianity could have least withstood it. When the empire did—as in the last days of the 3rd cent.—spread the first rash measures, the most general measures, Christianity was already too strong to be harmed, and we shall find the empire henceforth only networked around and warning off.

In the next period the insecurity of the throne, when in less than 100 years about a score of candidates were the purple and almost each new emperor began a new dynasty, enabled Christianity to spread practically untroubled. Further divisions in its favor were created by those fierce barbarian wars and by the necessity of renewed vigilance at the frontier posts. The Christians' aloofness from political strife and their acquiescence in each new dynasty brought them generally into agreement with the government. Further, the fact that many of these emperors were non-Rom provincials, or foreigners who had no special attachment to the old Roman faith, and were ecclesiastical in their religious views, was of much importance to the new eastern faith. Moreover, some of the emperors proved not only not hostile to Christianity, but positively friendly. In this period we find no severe (except perhaps that of Decius) and certainly no protracted persecution. The Christian Church herself was by the principle of the imperial government, and made herself thus strong and united, so that when the storm did come she remained unshaken. In 202 Severus started a cruel persecution in Africa and Egypt, but peace was restored by the savage Caracalla (lactio Christiano educatus: Tert.). Heligabalus assisted Christianity indirectly (1) by the degradation of Roman religion, and (2) by tolerance. According to one writer he proposed to fuse Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, and Zoroastrianism into one religion. Alexander Severus was equally tolerant and syncretic, setting up in his private chapel images of Orpheus, Apollo, Moses, Abraham, and Christ, and engraving the golden rule on his palace walls and publishing letters to the public on the intention of erecting a temple to Christ. Local persecution broke out under Maximin the Thracian. The first general persecution was that of Decius, in which two features deserve notice: (1) that death was not the immediate result of Christian profession, but every means was employed to induce Christians to recant; (2) Roman authorities already cognizant of the dangers of Christian organization directed their efforts esp. against the officers of the church. Gallus continued this policy, and Valerian, after first stopping persecution, tried to check the spread of the worship by banishing bishops and closing churches, and later enacted the death penalty. Gallienus promulgated what was virtually the first edict of toleration, forbade persecution and restored the Christians to public employment. Christianity now entered upon a period of 40 years' tranquillity: as outward dangers decreased, less desirable converts came within her gates and her adherents were taken in a flood of worldliness, stayed only by the perils of the province. Like some other persecutors, Diocletian was one of the ablest Roman rulers. He was not disposed to proceed against the Christians, but was finally driven to harsh measures by his son-in-law Galerius. The first edict, February 21, 303, was not intended
to exterminate Christianity, but to check its growth and weaken its political influence, and was directed principally against. Bibbes, Christian assemblies and churches. The second was against church organization. A decree was granted freedom to those who recanted, but sought to compel the submission of recalcitrants by tortures — a partial confession of failure on the part of the imperial government. Persecution was avoided and the death penalty omitted. But a fourth edict issued by Maximin prescribed the death penalty and required the act of sacrifice to the gods. In the same year (304) Diocletian, convinced of the uselessness of these measures, stayed the death penalty. The change of policy on the part of the emperor and his abdication next year were virtually a confession that the Galilean had conquered. After the persecution had raged 8 years (or 10, if we include local persecutions after 311), Galerius, overthrown by a loathsome disease, issued from Nicomedia with Constantine and Licinius the first general edict of toleration, April 30, 311. Christianity had thus in this period proved a state within a state; it was finally acknowledged as a religio licite, though not yet on equality with paganism.

In the next period the first religious wars began, and Christianity was first placed on an equal footing with its rival, then above it, and finally it became the state religion of both West and East. As soon as Christianity had gained tolerance it immediately became an intolerant, bitter persecutor, both of its old rival and of heresy. Constantine, having destroyed paganism, and the Milvian Bridge (October 27, 312), became sole ruler of the West, and, in conjunction with his eastern colleague Licinius, issued the famous edict of toleration from Milan, March 30, 313, by which all religions were granted equal tolerance, and Christianity was thus placed on an equal footing with heathenism. Constantine’s favors toward the Christian faith were largely political; he wished simply to be on the winning side. With each fresh success he moved more toward Christianity, though his whole life was a compromise. His dream was to weld pagan and Christian into one society under the same laws; he in no way prohibited paganism. With the founding of Constantinople Christianity became practically the state religion—an alliance with baneful consequences for Christianity. It now began to stifle the liberty of conscience for which it had suffered so much, and orthodoxy began its long reign of intolerance. The sons of Constantine inherited their father’s cruel nature with his nominal Christianity. Constantine had left the old and the new religions on equal footing: his sons began the work of exterminating paganism by violence. Constantius, when sole emperor, inherited not his father’s compromise or caution, and prompted by women and bishops, published edicts demanding the closing of the temples and prohibiting sacrifices. Wise provincial administrators hesitated to carry out these premature measures. Christianity was now in the ascendency and on the aggressive. It not only persecuted paganism, but the dominant Christian party proscribed its rival—this time heterodoxy banishing orthodoxy. The violence and intolerance of the sons of Constantine justified the civil reaction under Julian the Apostate—the most humane member of the Constantine family. He made a ‘romantic’ effort to re-establish the old religion, and while proclaiming tolerance for Christianity, he endeavored to weaken it by heaping ridicule upon its doctrines, rescinding the privileges of the clergy, prohibiting the church from receiving many bequests, removing Christians from public positions and forbidding the teaching of classics in Christian schools lest Christian tongues should become better fitted to meet heathen arguments, and lastly by adding removed splendor to pagan service as a counter-attraction. But the moral power of Christianity triumphed. Dying on a battle-field, where he fought the Persians, he is said (but not on good authority) to have exclaimed, ‘Thou hast conquered, O Galilean’ (pericopas pales, nevikthi vallate). For a brief period after his death there was religious neutrality. Gratian— at the instigation of Ambrose—depended from this neutrality, removed the statue of Victory from the senate-house, refused the title and robes of pontifex maximus, prohibited bloody sacrifices, and dealt a severe blow to the old faith by withdrawing some of the treasury grants, thereby making it dependent on the voluntary system. Theodosius I, or the Great, adopted a strenuous religious policy against both heresy and paganism. His intolerance must be attributed to Ambrose—a bigot in whose eyes Jews, heretics and pagans alike had no rights. Systematic proscription of paganism began. In 381 Theodosius denied the right of making a will to apostates from Christianity, in 391 he granted to pagans and Christians alike the freedom of worship. In 394 Constantius II passed a law that no one should support a Roman officer who professed Christianity. This law was nullified by Gratian. In 395, Gratian issued a constitution, which in the next period the first religious wars began, and Christianity was first placed on an equal footing with its rival, then above it, and finally it became the state religion of both West and East. As soon as Christianity had gained tolerance it immediately became an intolerant, bitter persecutor, both of its old rival and of heresy. Constantine, having destroyed paganism, and the Milvian Bridge (October 27, 312), became sole ruler of the West, and, in conjunction with his eastern colleague Licinius, issued the famous edict of toleration from Milan, March 30, 313, by which all religions were granted equal tolerance, and Christianity was thus placed on an equal footing with heathenism. Constantine’s favors toward the Christian faith were largely political; he wished simply to be on the winning side. With each fresh success he moved more toward Christianity, though his whole life was a compromise. His dream was to weld pagan and Christian into one society under the same laws; he in no way prohibited paganism. With the founding of Constantinople Christianity became practically the state religion—an alliance with baneful consequences for Christianity. It now began to stifle the liberty of conscience for which it had suffered so much, and orthodoxy began its long reign of intolerance. The sons of Constantine inherited their father’s cruel nature with his nominal Christianity. Constantine had left the old and the new religions on equal footing: his sons began the work of exterminating paganism by violence. Constantius, when sole emperor, inherited not his father’s compromise or caution, and prompted by women and bishops, published edicts demanding the closing of the temples and prohibiting sacrifices. Wise provincial administrators hesitated to carry out these premature measures. Christianity was now in the ascendency and on the aggressive. It not only persecuted paganism, but the dominant Christian party proscribed its rival—this time heterodoxy banishing orthodoxy. The violence and intolerance of the sons of Constantine justified the civil reaction under Julian the Apostate—the most humane member of the Constantine family. He made a ‘romantic’ effort to re-establish the old religion, and while proclaiming tolerance for Christianity, he endeavored to weaken it by heaping ridicule upon its doctrines, rescinding the privileges of the clergy, prohibiting the church from receiving many bequests, removing Christians from public positions and forbidding the teaching of classics in Christian schools lest Christian tongues should become better fitted to meet heathen arguments, and lastly by adding removed splendor to pagan service as a counter-attraction. But the moral power of Christianity triumphed. Dying on a battle-field, where he fought the Persians, he is said (but not on good authority) to have exclaimed, ‘Thou hast conquered, O Galilean’ (pericopas pales, nevikthi vallate). For a brief period after his death there was religious neutrality. Gratian— at the instigation of Ambrose—depended from this neutrality, removed the statue of Victory from the senate-house, refused the title and robes of pontifex maximus, prohibited bloody sacrifices, and dealt a severe blow to the old faith by withdrawing some of the treasury grants, thereby making it dependent on the voluntary system. Theodosius I, or the Great, adopted a strenuous religious policy against both heresy and paganism. His intolerance must be attributed to Ambrose—a bigot in whose eyes Jews, heretics and pagans alike had no rights. Systematic proscription of paganism began. In 381 Theodosius denied the right of making a will to apostates from Christianity, in 391 he granted to pagans and Christians alike the freedom of worship. In 394 Constantius II passed a law that no one should support a Roman officer who professed Christianity. This law was nullified by Gratian. In 395, Gratian issued a constitution, which in 396 was revoked by Theodosius II. After the death of Theodosius I the western empire was divided into two parts. Theodosius II was a weak and vacillating emperor, and the Christian church suffered greatly. It was not until the reign of Valentinian III that paganism was finally suppressed. In 401 Honorius in the West excluded (408 AD) pagans from civil and military offices; in a later edict (423) the very existence of paganism is doubted (paganos quemquam iam nullus esse credamus). That heathenism was still an attraction is proved by the repeated laws against apostasy. Under Valentinian III (423-55) and Theodosius II, laws were enacted for the destruction of temples or their conversion into Christian churches. In the western empire heathenism was persecuted with greater severity. Its final overthrow was hastened by the extinction of the western empire (476). In the East Justinian closed the heathen schools of philosophy at Athens (529 AD), and in a despotic spirit prohibited even heathen worship in private under pain of death.

V. Victory of Christianity and Conversion of the Roman Empire. — Christianity was now acknowledged as the religion of both East and West. It had also grown strong enough to convert the barbarians who overran the West. It restrained and educated them under the lead of the papacy, so that its conquests now extended beyond the Roman empire.

Mervale (preface to Conversion of Rom Emp) attributes the conversion of the Roman empire to four causes: (1) the external evidence of apparent fulfillment of prophecy and the evidence of miracles, (2) internal evidence as satisfying the spiritual wants of the empire and offering a higher morality, (3) the lives and heroic deaths of the early Christians, and (4) the success which attended the Christian cause under Constantine. Gibbon (ch xiv of Decline and Fall) seeks to account for the phenomenal success of Christianity in the empire. The offers of the goal and methods of Christians, (2) the belief in Christianity in immortality with both resurrection and punishment, the belief in the existence of the two worlds, (3) the belief in the miracles, (4) the high ethical code and pure morals of professing Christians, and (5) strong ecclesiastical organization on imperial lines, and the explanation of causes seems to account satisfactorily for the progress and success of the religion of Jesus. This was due in the first place to negative causes
—the moral and spiritual bankruptcy of the antique world, the internal rottenness and decay of heathen systems. All ancient national religions had failed and were abandoned alike by philosophers and masses, and no universal religion for humanity was offered except by Christianity. Worship had degenerated into pure formalism which brought no comfort to the heart. An imperious demand for reality was upraised which no philosophy or natural religion could satisfy.

But it was to positive causes chiefly that the success of the new religion was due, among which were the zeal, enthusiasm, and moral earnestness of the Christian faith. Its sterling qualities were best shown in persecution and the heroic deaths of its adherents. Paganism, even with the alliance of the civil power and the prestige of its romantic past, could not withstand persecution. And when heathenism was thrown back on the voluntary system, it could not prosper as Christianity did with its ideals of self-sacrifice. The earnestness of early Christianity was raised to its highest power by its belief in a near second coming of the Lord and the idea that the means of propagation greatly helped the spread of Christianity, the principal means being the exemplary lives of its professors. It opposed moral and spiritual power to political. Besides, Christianity when once studied by the thinkers of the ancient world was found to be in accord with the highest principles of reason and Nature. But "the chief cause of its success was the congruity of its teaching with the spiritual nature of mankind" (Lecky). There was a deep-seated universalism in a large section of the ancient world to whom Christianity offered the peace, comfort and strength desired. It was possessed also of an immense advantage over all competing religions of the Roman empire in being adapted to all classes and conditions and to all changes. There was nothing local or national about it; it gave the grandest expression to the contemporary ideal of brotherhood. Its respect for woman and its attraction for this sex gained it many converts who brought home about it; it was far superior to its greatest rival, Mithraism. In an age of vast social change and much social distress it appealed to the suffering by its active self-denial for the happiness of others. As an ethical code it was equal to, if not superior to, the most complete and perfect systems. One inculcable advantage it could show above all religions and philosophies—the charm and power of an ideal perfect life, in which the highest manhood was held forth as an incentive to noble living. The person of Jesus was an ideal and moral dynamite for both philosopher and the common man, far above any abstract virtue. "It was because it was true to the moral sentiments of the age, because it represented faithfully the supreme type of excellence to which men were then tending, because it corresponded with their religious wants, aims and emotions, because the whole spiritual being could then expand and expatiate under its influence that it planted its roots so deeply in the hearts of men" (Lecky, Hist. of European Morals, ch iii). Add to all this the favorable circumstances mentioned under "Preparation for Christianity," above (II), and we can understand how the Roman empire became the kingdom of Christ.

LITERATURE.—Ancient sources include Tertullian, Statius, Censorinus, Eusebius, and La Grotte's Dict. des Annces. (in Hardy's ed). Dio Cassius (in Xiphiilin), the apologists, Church Fathers, Inscriptions, etc. The latter are too numerous to mention in full, but those most helpful to the student are: Gibbon, Droysen, and Overbeck. Also see: Harnack, die Christen in der Romischen Welt, 1885; Conversion of the Roman Empire, 1895; Milman, Hist of Christianity; Hist of Lat Christianity; and Timsay, The Church in the First Three Centuries. Edinburgh, 1891; J. J. Blunt, A Hist of the Christian Church during the First Three Centuries, 1881; Harnack, Mission and Expansion of Christianity, 1907; Steinbacher, Der Religionsfrevel nach röm. Recht., in Hist. Zeit, 1890, LXXIV (improperly reviewed in Provinces of Empire, 1893, pp. 6 ff.; G. Boissier, La religion romaine d'Auguste aux Antonins; La fin du paganisme; Wissowa, Religion u. Kultur der Romanen, 2d ed.); A. Huber, Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism, ET by Smyth and Ropes. 1879; B. Aubé, Histoire des Institutions de l'église chrétienne de la fin des Antonins, 1875; Schaff, Hist of the Christian Church (with useful bibliographies of both ancient and modern authorities); O. Röhr, Moralw. und Verhältn. d. Kirche in der Kaiserzeit, 1907; Ramsay, Theories and Evidences of Christian Origin; Westcott, The Early Church, in comm. to Epp. of St. John, 250–82; Friedländer, Sittengechichte Rom; Lightfoot, Apostolic Fathers; Lecky, Hist of European Morals, ch iii. "The Conversion of Rome." S. ANGUS.

ROMAN LAW:

I. ROMAN PRIVATE LAW

1. The Twelve Tables
2. Civil Law
3. Jus honorarium
4. The Lex peregrina
5. Imperial Ordinances
6. Golden Age of Juridic Literature
7. Codification in the Later Empire

II. ROMAN CRIMINAL LAW

1. The Twelve Emperors
2. The Right of Appeal (1) Penalties
(2) Tenderclaw
3. Popular Jurisdiction Curtailed
4. Jurors
5. Disappearance of Criminal Courts
6. Right of Trial at Rome

LITERATURE

In the present art., we shall treat (1) Rom. Private Law and (2) Criminal Law only, reserving a consideration of the development of the principles of constitutional law for the art. on Rome, since it is so closely interwoven with the political history of the state.

It will be necessary to confine the discussion of private law to its external history, without attempting to deal with the substance of the law itself. In the treatment of criminal law attention will be directed chiefly to the constitutional guarantees which were intended to protect Roman citizens against arbitrary and unjust punishments, these being one of the most important privileges of Roman citizenship (see CIVIZENSHIP).

Rom. law found its original source in the family as a corporation. The proprietary rights of the poter familias as representative of the unitive unit of organization are a fundamental element in private law, and the scope of the criminal jurisdiction of the state was limited by the power of life and death which was exercised by the head of the family over those who were under his authority, death of which the transgressions were tried before the domestic tribunal.

It is likewise of fundamental importance to recall the fact that before the earliest period in the history of Rom. law of which we have positive information, a large number of different classes of crime were punished by the priests as sacrilege, in accordance with divine law (fas), by putting the offender to death as a sacrifice to the offended deity, while restitution for private wrongs or injury was left to private initiative to seek. For a law of the Twelve Tables that the person guilty of cutting another's grain by night should be hanged, as an offering to Ceres, is a survival of the older religious character of condemnation to death, and the right from the ancient tribal thief, the night right in the act may be cited as survivals of primitive private ven-
The secular conception of crime as an offence against the welfare of the state gradually superseded the older conception, while private law arose when the community did away with the dictates of legal usage and was left free to legislate to secure justice, by insisting that the parties to a disagreement should submit their claims to an arbitrator.

1. Roman Private Law.—Rom private law was at first a body of unwritten usages handed down by tradition in the patrician families.

2. Civil Procedure

The praetor, or magistrate, listened to the claims of the litigants and prepared a formulary, which was submitted to the judex, or arbitrator, a jury, as it were, consisting of one man, who decided the questions of fact involved in the case. Neither praetor nor judex had special legal training. The court had recourse, therefore, for legal enlightenment to those who had gained distinction as authorities on the law, and the opinions, or responsa, of these scholars (jurisprudentes) formed a valuable commentary on the legal institutions of the time.

3. Jus honorarium

This was the name of the institution which rested upon the authority of the praetor or the judex, or arbitrator. It was composed of orders issued for the purpose of affording relief in cases for which the existing law did not make adequate provision. This second agency for legal expansion may be compared with English equity. These orders issued by the praetors had legal force during the tenure of their office only; but those the expedicency of which had been established by this period of trial were generally reissued by succeeding magistrates from year to year, so that in time a large, but uniform body of rules, subject to annual renewal, formed the greater part of the edict which was issued by the praetors before entering upon their term of office. By these means Rom law maintained a proper balance between elasticity and rigidity.

4. The praetor peregrinus

This was the name of the institution which rested upon the authority of the praetor or the judex, or arbitrator. It was composed of orders issued for the purpose of affording relief in cases for which the existing law did not make adequate provision. This second agency for legal expansion may be compared with English equity. These orders issued by the praetors had legal force during the tenure of their office only; but those the expedicency of which had been established by this period of trial were generally reissued by succeeding magistrates from year to year, so that in time a large, but uniform body of rules, subject to annual renewal, formed the greater part of the edict which was issued by the praetors before entering upon their term of office. By these means Rom law maintained a proper balance between elasticity and rigidity.

The praetor peregrinus was a body of unwritten usages handed down by tradition in the patrician families.

5. Imperial Ordinances

The Roman Empire was divided into provinces, each of which was governed by a governor, who was appointed by the emperor. The governor was responsible for the administration of justice in his province, and was also responsible for the maintenance of order and security. He was aided in his work by a team of subordinate officials, who were appointed by the governor and were responsible to him.

The laws of the Roman Empire were divided into two main categories: public law and private law. Public law dealt with matters that affected the entire body of the empire, such as taxation, the minting of coins, and the maintenance of order and security. Private law dealt with matters that affected individuals, such as marriage, divorce, and inheritance.

The legal system of the Roman Empire was characterized by a high degree of flexibility. The laws were not rigidly fixed, but were capable of being adapted to new situations. This was achieved by the use of legislation, which was the primary source of law in the Roman Empire. Legislation was issued by the emperor or the Senate, and was binding on all citizens.

The legal system of the Roman Empire was also characterized by a high degree of coherence. The laws were not scattered and incoherent, but were arranged in a logical order. This was achieved by the use of a system of classification, which was based on a hierarchy of laws. The highest law was the constitution, which was the fundamental law of the empire. Below the constitution were the laws of the Twelve Tables, the laws of the Twelve Tables included, among other things, the protection of property, the regulation of criminal law, and the provision of public offices.

The legal system of the Roman Empire was also characterized by a high degree of predictability. The laws were not arbitrary, but were based on the principles of justice and equity. This was achieved by the use of a system of interpretation, which was based on the principles of reason and logic. The interpreter of the law was expected to apply the law to the facts of the case, and to take into account all relevant circumstances.

The legal system of the Roman Empire was also characterized by a high degree of accessibility. The laws were not inaccessible, but were available to all citizens. This was achieved by the use of a system of publication, which was based on the principle of transparency. The laws were published in books, which were available to all citizens.

The legal system of the Roman Empire was also characterized by a high degree of enforcement. The laws were not ignored, but were enforced by the authorities. This was achieved by the use of a system of punishment, which was based on the principle of deterrence. The authorities were authorized to impose punishments on those who violated the laws.

The legal system of the Roman Empire was also characterized by a high degree of accountability. The authorities were not allowed to act arbitrarily, but were subject to the control of the authorities. This was achieved by the use of a system of review, which was based on the principle of oversight. The authorities were subject to review by the authorities, who were authorized to investigate and punish abuse of power.

The legal system of the Roman Empire was also characterized by a high degree of participation. The citizens were not passive observers, but were active participants in the legal system. This was achieved by the use of a system of democracy, which was based on the principle of popular sovereignty. The citizens were entitled to participate in the decision-making process, and to elect the authorities.
the alternative of voluntary exile. The Romans rarely employed imprisonment as a punishment. The imposition of fines above a certain amount was made subject to the right of appeal. At first the dictator possessed absolute power of life and death over the citizens, but this authority was limited, probably about 300 BC (Livy xxxvii, 4, 5), by being made subject to the right of appeal. (3) The Punic law.—The right of appeal to the people was valid within the city and as far as the first milestone; and although it was never extended beyond this limit, yet its protection was virtually secured for all Rom citizens, wherever they might be, by the provision of the Punic law (of unknown date), which established their right to trial at Rome. In consequence of this a distinction of great importance was created in criminal procedure in the provinces, since Rom citizens were sent to Rome, whereas others were subject to the criminal jurisdiction of the municipalities, except when the governor summoned them before his own tribunal.

The exercise of popular jurisdiction in criminal matters was gradually curtailed by the establishment of permanent courts (questiones perpetuae) by virtue of laws by which the people delegated their authority to judge certain classes of cases. The first of these courts was authorized in 149 BC for the trial of charges of extortion brought against provincial governors. Compensation was the main purpose of accusers in bringing charges before this and later permanent courts, and for this reason, perhaps, the procedure was similar to that which was employed in civil cases. A praetor presided over the tribunal; a number of judices took the place of the single juror. The laws by which Sulla reorganized the systems of criminal jurisdiction provided for seven courts dealing individually with extortion, treason, peculation, corrupt electioneering practices, murder, fraud, and assault.

The judices, or jurors, were originally chosen from the senate. A law preserved by C. Gracchus transferred membership in all the juries to the equestrian class for trial in all serious cases, while other persons were subject to the criminal jurisdiction of the municipalities, except when the governor summoned them before his own tribunal. But a judicial law senate stood in somewhat the same relation to the presiding consul as the jurors in the permanent courts to the praetor. But the emperor and imperial officials decided criminal cases, without the help of a jury, so that the competence of the senate was gradually lost, trial by jury ceased to exist. An important innovation in the judicial system of the empire was the principle of appeal from the decision of lower courts to higher tribunals. For the emperors and eventually their delegates, chiefly the praefectus urbi and praefectus praetorio, heard appeals from Rom and Italian magistrates and provincial governors.

Under the early empire, provincial governors were generally under obligation to grant the demand of Rom citizens for the privilege of trial at Rome (Digest xlvi.6, 7). Although there appear to have been some exceptions to this rule (Pliny, Epist. ii.11; Digest xlvi.8, 16). Lysias, tribune of the cohort at Jerus, sent St. Paul as prisoner to Caesarea, the capital of the province,
so that Felix the procurator might determine what was to be done in his case, inasmuch as he was a Roman citizen (Acts 23:27), and two years later St. Paul asserted his privilege of being tried at Rome by the emperor for the same reason (25:11). In both cases it was evident that Rome might be brought either before the senate or emperor, but cognizance of these cases by the imperial tribunal was more usual, and finally supplanted entirely that of the senate, the formula of appeal becoming proverbial:  cives Romanus sum, proco elo Caesarem (Kaisara epikolosaimai: Acts 25:11).

As Roman citizenship became more and more widely extended throughout the empire the relative value diminished, and it is obvious that many of the special privileges, such as the right of trial at Rome, which were attached to it in the earlier period must have been gradually lost. It became customary for the emperors to delegate their power of final jurisdiction over the lives of citizens (ius gladii) to the provincial governors, and finally, after Roman citizenship had been conferred upon the inhabitants of the empire generally by Caracalla, the right of appeal to Rome remained the privilege of certain classes only, such as senators, municipal decurions (Diope xii.309) or Roman centurions of equestrian rank in the army, and centurions (Dio Cassius lii.22,33).
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This is the greatest, in every sense, of the apostolic letters of St. Paul; in scale, in scope, and in its wonderful combination of doctrinal, ethical and administrative wisdom and power. In some respects the later Epp., Eph and Col, lead us to even higher and deeper areas of revelation, and they, like Rom, combine with the exposition of truth a luminous doctrine of duty. But the range of Rom is larger in both directions, and presents us also with noble and fascinating discussions of Christian charity, instructions in spiritual utterance and the like, to which those Epp. present no parallel, and which only the Corinthian Epp. rival.

No suspicion on the head of the genuineness of the Ep. exists which needs serious consideration. Signs of the influence of the Ep. can be traced, at least very probably, in the NT itself; in 1 Peter, and, as some think, in Jas. But in our opinion Jas was the earlier writing, and Lightfoot has given strong grounds for the belief that the paragraph on faith and justification (Jas 2) has no reference to perversions of Pauline teaching, but deals with rabbinism. Clement of Rome repeatedly quotes Rom, and so do Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin. Marcion includes it in his list of Pauline Epp., and it is safe to say in general Rom "has been recognized in the Christian church as long as any collection of St. Paul's Epp. has been extant" (A. Robertson, in HDB, s.v.). But above all other evidences it testifies to itself. The fabrication of such a writing, with its clear references to itself, to the often marked originality of treatment, its noble morale, and its spiritual elevation and ardor, is nothing short of a moral impossibility. A mighty mind and equally great heart live in every page, and a soul exquisitely sensitive and always intent upon truth and holiness. Literary personation is an art which has come to anything like maturity only in modern times, certainly not before the Renaissance. In a fully developed form it is hardly earlier than the 19th cent. And even now who can point to a consciously personated authorship going along with high moral principle and purpose?

The question remains, however, whether, accepting the Ep. in block as Pauline, we have it, as to its details, just as it left the author's hand.

2. Integrity hands. Particularly, some phenomena of the text of the last two chapters invite the inquiry. We may—in our opinion we must—grant those chapters to be Pauline. They breathe the St. Paul, and read precisely like a part of a letter to Rome? For example, we have a series of names (16:1—15), representing a large circle of personally known and loved friends of the writer, a much longer list than any other in the Epp., and all presumably—on the theory that the passage is integral to the Ep.—residents at Rome. May not such a paragraph have somehow crept in, after date, from another writing? Might not a message to Philippian, Thessalonian or Ephesian friends, dwellers in places where St. Paul had already established many intimacies, have fallen out of its place and found lodgment by mistake at the close of this letter to Rome? It seems enough to reply by one brief statement of fact. We possess some 300 MSS. of Rom, and not one of these, so far as it is uninjured, fails to give the Ep. complete, all the chapters as we have them, and in the present order (with one exception, that of the final doxology). It is observable meanwhile that the difficulties in supposing St. Paul, a large group of friends living at Rome, before his own arrival there, is not serious. To and from Rome, through the whole empire, there was a perpetual circulation of population. Suppose Aquila and Priscilla (18:2) to Rome from Ephesus, and suppose similar migrations from Greece or from Asia Minor to have taken place within recent years; we can then readily account for the greetings of Rom 16.

Lightfoot has brought it out in an interesting way (see his Philippians, on 4:22) that many of the names (e.g. Amplias, Urbanus, Tryphena) in Rom 16 are found at Rome, in inscriptions of the early imperial age, in cemeteries where members of the widely scattered "household of Caesar" were interred. This at least suggests the improbability that the converts and friends belonging to the "household" who, a few years later, perhaps not more than three, were around him at Rome when he wrote to Philipp (Phil 4:22), and sent their special greeting ("specially they") to the Philippians, were formerly residents at Philippi, or elsewhere in Macedonia, and had moved thence to the capital not long before the apostle wrote to the Romans. A. Robertson (ut supra) comes to the conclusion, after careful consideration, that "the case for transferring this section . . . from its actual connection to a lost Ep. to Ephesus is not made out."

Two points of detail in the criticism of the text of Rom may be noted. One is that the words "at
Rome" (1 7.15) are omitted in a very few MSS, in a way to remind us of the interesting phenomenon of the omission of "at Ephesus" (Eph 1 1 m). But the evidence for this omission being original is entirely inadequate. The fact may perhaps be accounted for by a possible circulation of Rom among other mission churches as an Ep. of universal interest. This would be the more likely if the MSS and other authorities in which the last two chapters are missing were identical with those which omit "at Rome," but this is not the case.

The other and larger detail is that the great final doxology (12 9-13) is placed by many editors in the end, which 14 13 is omitted entirely by three MSS and by Marcion. The leading uncials and a large preponderance of ancient evidence place it where we have it. It is quite possible that St. Paul may have revisited Rome after a time, and may only then have added the doxology, which has a certain resemblance in manner to his later (captivity) style. But it is at least likely that dogmatic objections led Marcion to delete it, and that his action accounts for the other phenomena which stand against the place and position of this final doxology.

It is worth noting that Hort, a singularly fearless, while sober student, defends without reserve the entire of the Ep. as we have it, or practically so. See his essay printed in Lightfoot's Bib. Studies.

We can fix the proximate date with fair certainty within reasonable limits. We get this from 15 19 that St. Paul, when he wrote, was in the act of closing his work in the East and was looking definitely westward.

But he was first about (15 25 26) to revisit Jerusalem with his collection only made in Macedonia and Achaia, for the "poor saints." Placing these allusions side by side with the references in 1 and 2 Cor to the collection and its conveyance, and again with the narrative of Acts, we may date Rom very nearly at the same time as 2 Cor, just before the visit to Jerusalem narrated in Acts 20, etc. The year may be fixed with great probability as 56 AD. This estimate follows the lines of Lightfoot's chronology, which Robertson (with dissent) has thought "ingenious." More recent schemes would move the date back to 56 AD.

"The reader's attention is invited to this date. Broadly speaking, it was about 30 years at the most after the Crucifixion. Let anyone in mid-life think of the frequency of events, whether public or private, which 30 years ago made any marked impression on his mind. Consider how the people and places still are the prominent personages of 30 years ago, many of whom are still with us. And let him transfer his thought to the 1st cent., and to the time of our Ep. Let him remember that we have at least this one great Christian writing composed, for certain, within such easy reach of the very lifetime of Jesus Christ when His contemporary friends were still in numbers, alive and active. Then let him open the Ep., again, and read, as if for the first time, its estimate of Jesus Christ—a Figure then of no legendary past, with its halo, but of the all but present day. Let him note that this transcendent estimate comes to us conveyed in the vivid and fruitful words of this Epistle, which is a sort of public, or, better, a sort of private, oratory, and admirably practical wisdom, tolerant and comprehensive. And we think that the reader will feel that the result of his meditations on date and circumstances is reassuring as to the solidity of the historical basis of the Christian Faith: (from the present writer's introduction to the Ep. in the Temple Bible; see also his Light from the First Days: Short Sketches).

With confidence we may name Corinth as the place of writing. St. Paul was at the time in some "city" (16 23). He was staying with one Gaius, or Caius (ib), and we find Writing in 1 Cor 1 14 a Gaius, closely connected with St. Paul. He commends to the Romans the deaconess Phoebe, attached to "the church at Cenchreae" (16 1), presumably a place near that from which he was writing; and Cenchreae was the southern part of Corinthus.

The first advent of Christianity to Rome is unrecorded, and we know very little of its early progress. Visiting Romans (συνήχοις τοῦ πάσης ἔρημου, epi-

démonestai), both Jews and proselytes, appear at Pentepeost (Acts 4 10), and no doubt some of these returned home believers. In Acts 18 2 we have Aquila and Pris-cilla, Jews, evidently Christians, "latey come from Italy," and probably from Rome. But we know practically nothing else of the story previous to this Ep., which is in itself relatively so important and already spiritually advanced. On the other hand (a curious paradox in view of the historical development of Rom Christianity), there is no allusion in the Ep. to church organization. The Christian ministry (apart from St. Paul's own apostleship) is not even mentioned. It may fairly be said to be incredible that if the legend of St. Peter's long episcopate were historical, no allusion whatever to his work, influence and authority should be missing. It is at least extremely difficult to prove that he was even present in Rome till shortly before his martyrdom, and the very ancient belief that Peter and Paul founded the Rom church is more likely to have had its origin in their martyrdoms there, and that the office of a Bishop was shared in the early evangelization of the city.

As to Rome itself, we may picture it at the date of the Ep. as containing, with its suburbs, a closely massed population of perhaps 800,000 people; a motley host of many races, with a strong oriental element, among which the Jews were present as a marked influence, despised and sometimes dreaded, but always attracting curiosity.

The Ep. was written in Gr, the "common dialect," the Gr of universal intercourse of that age. One naturally asks, why not in Lat, when the message was addressed to the supreme Lat city? The large majority of Christian converts beyond doubt came from the lower middle and lowest classes, not least from the slave class. These strata of society were supplied greatly from immigrants, much as in parts of East London now aliens make the main population. Not Lat but Gr, the then lingua franca of the Mediterranean, would be the usual speech of the people, the political and religious upper classes, and the Latin Rom bishops bear Gr names. And some 40 years after the date of this Ep. we find Clemens of Rome writing in Gr to the Corinthians, and later, again, early in the 2d cent., Ignatius writing in Gr to the Romans.

We cannot specify the occasion of writing for certain. No hint appears of any acute crisis in the mission (as when 1 Cor, 2 Cor, Gal, or Phil). But the personal reminiscences influence the writer, for he had not yet seen Rome. We can only suggest some possibilities as follows:

(1) A good opportunity for safe communication was offered by the deaconess Phoebe's proposed visit to the metropolis. She doubtless asked St. Paul for a commendatory letter, and this may have suggested an extended message to the church.

(2) St. Paul's thoughts had long gone toward Rome. See Acts 19 21: "I must see Rome," words which seem perhaps to have some Divine over-riding significance. And his own life-course would fall in with such a supernatural call. He had always aimed at large centers; and now his great work in the West and Middle East was closing; he had worked at Ephesus, Thessa-

lonica, Corinth. He was in actual fact at the largest of all. Rome must always have had a dominant interest for the "Apostle of the Nations," and any suggestion that he had some new thing to say to the Roman church would intensify it to the highest degree.

(3) The form of the Ep. may throw further light on the occasion. The document falls, on the whole, into three parts. First we have chs 1-8 inclusive, a prolonged
exposition of the contrasted and related phenomena of sin and salvation, with special initial references to the cases of Jew and non-Jew respectively. Then come chapters 15-18. Some account of the writer's plans, and his salutations to friends, requests for prayer, etc., form the conclusion of the epistle. But it is mainly a treatise on Christian duty in common life, personal, civil, religious. Under the latter head we have a noble treatment by way of exposition, particularly on religious observances, among the converts, Jew and Gentile.

Such phenomena cast a possible light on the occasion of writing. The Roman mission was, redeemer, one side, by its locality and surroundings, eminently Gentile. On the other, there was, as we have seen, a strong Judaic element in Roman life, particularly in its lower strata, and no doubt around the Jewish community proper there had grown up a large community of "worshippers" or, as we commonly call them, "proselytes" "adherents," in the language of modern missionary enterprise, people who, without receiving circumcision, attended Jewish worship and shared largely in Jewish beliefs and ideals. Among these proselytes, we may believe, the earliest evangelists at Rome found a favorable field, and the mission church as St. Paul knew of it contained accordingly not only two denominations, but the pagans who had converted from native Judaism, but very many in whose minds both traditions were working at once. To such converts the problems raised by Judaism, both without and within the church, would come home with a peculiar vividness and force, and their case may well have been present in a special degree in the apostle's mind alike in the early passages (chs 1-3) of the Ep. and in such later parts as chs 2-11, 14, 15. On the one hand they would greatly need guidance in bearing the weight of the past of Israel and on the destiny of the chosen race in the future. Moreover, discussions in such circles over the way of salvation would suggest to the great missionary his exposition of man's reconciliation with a holy God and of His secrets for purity and obedience in an unworldly and yet the world. And meanwhile the ever-recurring problems raised by ceremonial rules in common daily life—problems of days and seasons, and of forbidden food—would for such demands of the consecrated and equitably for all, a middle stage between the two. The result was a writing which shows everywhere his sense of the presence of the Judaic problem. He here meets it by a statement, massive and tender, of "heaven's easy, artless, unencumbered plan" of redemption, grace, and glory, a plan which on its other side is the very mystery of the love of God, which statement is now and forever a primary treasure of the Christian faith. And then again he lays down for the too eager champions of the new "liberty" a law of loving tolerance toward slower and narrower views which is equally our permanent spiritual possession, bearing a significance far-reaching and benign.

(5) It has been held by some great students, notably Lightfoot and Hort, that the main purpose of Rom was to reconcile the opposing "scole or party" in the church, and that its exposition of the salvation of the individual is secondary only. The present writer cannot take this view. Read the Ep. from its spiritual center so to speak, and is not the perspective very different? The present writer cannot take this view. Read the Ep. from its spiritual center so to speak, and is not the perspective very different? Then the "sense of the collective aspect of the Christian life, an aspect vital to its full health. But is he not giving his deepest thought, animated by his own experience of conviction and conversion, to the sinful man's relation to eternal law, to redeeming grace, and personal salvation which with St. Paul seems to us to live and move always in the depth of his argument, even when Christian polity and policy is the immediate theme?

8. Some Character-istics of the Teachings

...(Continued...)

9. Main Teachings

limine, it is not set before us as a complete system either of theology or of morals, to obtain a full view of a Pauline dogma and ethics we must certainly place Eph and Col, not to speak of passages from Thess, beside Rom. But it makes by far the nearest approach to doctrinal completeness among the Epistles.
(2) The doctrine of God.—True to the revelation of the OT, St. Paul presents God as absolute in will and power, so that He is not only the sole author of the covenants, but particularly the only sole cause of goodness in man. To Him in the last resort all is due, not only the provision of atonement but the power and will to embrace it. The great passages which set before us a "fore-thinging" (προοψάθην, "predestination") and election of the saints are all evidently inspired by this motive, the jealous resolve to trace to the one true Cause all motions and actions of good. The apostle seems e.g. almost to risk affirming a sovereign causation of the opposite, of unbelief and its sequel. But patience and wisdom required that the case should be made to appear as if God is not only "fit for ruin" the "vessels of wrath." Their woeful end is overruled to His glory, but nowhere is it taken to be caused by Him. All along the writer's intense purpose is to constrain the actual believer to see the whole causation of his salvation in the will and power of Him whose inmost character is revealed in the supreme fact that, "for us all," "he spared not his Son."

(3) The doctrine of the Son of God.—The Ep. and message are marked by a magnificently large Christology. The relation of the Son to creation is indeed not expounded in terms (as in Col), but it is implied in the language of ch 8, where the interrelation of our redemption and the transfiguration of Christ is kept for the "fitting up of God's new world" fully recognized, while His Godhead (as we read in 9:5; so too Robertson, ut supra) is stated in terms, and it is most certainly implied in the language and tone of e.g. the close of ch 8. Who but a being begotten from a supreme nature could satisfy the conception indicated in such words as those of 8:23-35-39, coming as they do from a Heb monothest of intense convictions? Meantime this transcendent Person has so put Himself in relation with us, as the willing worker of the Father's purpose of love, that He is the sacrifice of peace for us (ch 3), our "propitiatory" (ὁσιαστήρ, ἐξαγωγία, is now known to be an adj.), such that (whatever the mystery, which leaves the fact no less certain) the man who believes on Him, i.e. (as ch 4 fully demonstrates) trusts in Him, gives himself over to His mercy, is not only forgiven but "justified," "justified by faith." And "justification" is more than forgiveness; it is not merely the remission of a penalty but a welcome to the offender, pronounced to be lawfully in the eternal union with the eternally blessed and loved. See Justification; Propitiation.

In closest connection with this message of justification is the teaching regarding union with the Christ who has procured the justification. This is rather assumed than expounded in Rom (we have the exposition more explicitly in Eph, Col, and Gal), but the assumption is present wherever the pregnant phrase "in Christ" is used. Union is, for St. Paul, the central doctrine of all, giving life and relation to the whole range. As Lightfoot has well said (Sermons in St. Paul's, no. 16), he is the apostle not primarily of justification, or of liberty, great as these truths are with him, but of union with Christ. It is through union that justification is ours; the merits of the Head are for the member. But had we not the fact that spiritual liberty and power are ours; the Spirit of life is from the Head to the member. Held by grace in this profound and multiplex connection, where life, love and law are interlaced, the Christian is entitled to an assurance full of joy, that the Head shall adorn him, soul and (limply) body, from his once sacrificed and now triumphant Lord.

(4) The doctrine of the Spirit of God.—No writing of the NT but St. John's Gospel is so full upon this great theme as Rom. Ch 8 may be said to be the locus classicus in the Ep. for the work of the Holy Ghost in the believer. By implication it reveals personality as well as power (see esp. ver 26). Note the great general truths in which revelation and profoundest conditions run into each other. It follows ch 7, in which the apostle depicts, in terms of his own profound and typical experience, the struggles of conscience and will over the awful problem of the "bondage" of indwelling sin. If we interpret the passage aright the case supposed is that of a regenerate man, who, however, attempts the struggle against inward evil armed, as to consciousness, with his own faculties merely, and finds the struggle insupportable. Then comes the promised deliverance, the promised union of Spirit of life and liberty, welcomed and put into use by the man who has found his own resources vain. "In Christ Jesus," in union with Him, he "by the Spirit does to death the practices of the body," and rises through conscious liberty into an exulting hope of "the liberty of the glory of the sons of God"—not so, however, as to know nothing of "groaning within himself," while yet in the body; but it is a groan which leaves intact the sense of relation and union with the One love, and the expectation of a final completeness of redemption.

(5) The doctrine of duty.—While the Ep. is eminently a message of salvation, it is also, in vital connection with this, a treasury of principle and practice. It developing the sovereignty of God, the sovereign freedom of our acceptance for Christ's sake alone, and so absolutely that (6:1.2.15) the writer anticipates the inference (by foes, or by mistaken friends), "Let us continue in sin." But the answer comes out of the very doctrine of union. Our pardon is not an isolated fact. Secured only by Christ's sacrifice, received only by the faith which receives Him as our all, it is ipso facto never received alone but with all His other gifts, for it becomes ours as we receive, not merely one truth about Him, but Him. Therefore, we receive His Life as our true life; and it is morally unthinkable that we can receive this and express it in sin. This assumed, the Ep. (ch 12 and onward) lays down with much detail and admirable application large ranges of the law of duty, civil, social, personal, embracing duties to the state, loyalty to its laws, payment of its taxes, recognition of the sacredness of political order, even ministered by pax Romana, laws; also duties to church, including a large and loving tolerance even in religious matters, and a response to every call of the law of unselsh love. However we can or cannot adjust mentally the two sides, that of a supremely free salvation and that of ineradicable responsibility, here the two sides are, in the Pauline message. And reason and faith combine to assure us that both sides are eternally true, "antinomies" whose harmony will be explained hereafter in a higher life, but which are to be lived out here concurrently by the true disciple, assured of their ultimate oneness of source in the eternal love.

(6) The doctrine of Israel.—Very briefly we touch on this department of the message of Rom, mainly to point out that the problem of Israel's unbelief nowhere else in St. Paul appears as so heavy a load on his heart, and that on the other hand we nowhere else have anything like the light he claims to throw (ch 11) on Israel's future. Here, if anywhere, he appears as the predictive prophet, charged with the mission of a 'prophet and a priest' and with the announcement of its issues. The promises to Israel have never failed, nor are they canceled. At the worst, they have always been inherited by a chosen remnant, Israel within Israel. And a time is coming when, in a profound connection with Messianic blessing on the Gentiles, "all Israel shall be saved."
with a salvation which shall in turn be new life to the world outside Israel. Throughout the passage St. Paul speaks, not as one who “will not give up a hope,” but as having had revealed to him a vast and definite prospect, in the Divine purpose.

If any thing in our present work will cause the reader to work out other lines of the message of Rom. Perhaps enough has been done to stimulate the reader's own inquiries.

LITERATURE.—Of the Fathers, Chrysostom and Augustine were the foremost as interpreters of Rom. Chrysostom in his expository Homilies, models of eloquence and illumination, discoursed in terms of “sanctifying common sense,” while not perfectly appreciative of the most doctrinal characteristics; Augustine, not in any constant habit of study in his important Pelagian writings, which show the sympathetic intensity of his study of the doctrine of the Ep., not so much on justification as on grace and the will. Of the Reformers, Calvin is eminently the great commentator, almost modern in his constant aim to ascertain the sacred writer’s meaning by opened inference direct from the words.

On Rom he is at his best; and it is remarkable that on certain leading passages where grace is the theme he is much less rigidly "Calvinistic" than some of his followers. In modern times, the not learned but masterly exposition of Robert Haldane (c 1830) claims mention, and is suggestive and helpful. The very suggestive expository lectures (about the same date) of Thomas Chalmers. H. A. W. Meyer (5th ed., 1857, ET 1873-74) among the German writers, preserves hardness and insight; Geddes (1879, ET 1881) equally so among French-writing divines; of late years, L. Isherwood (offices, etc., in the “Expositor’s Greek Testament,” published in revised form in the “Speaker’s Commentary,” 1899, 1913, 1928, now separately) claim particular mention. J. Sanday writes on Rom in The Expositor’s Greek Testament. (1909).

Luther’s lectures on Rom, delivered in 1516-17 and later revised, have been published. Among modern German commentaries, that of Justus Ebermayer in the revised series of the Meyer (9th ed., 1890), while a very elaborate comm., has produced by Zahn in his last series. Prior to all these, the works of Lipsius (Hand-Kommentar, 2d ed., 1892, very scholarly and suggestive), Lipsius (Handbuch zum ersten christlichen system in der deutschen sprache, linguistic), and Jülicher (in J. Weiss, Schriften des NT, 2d ed., 1906, an intensely able piece of popular exposition).

A. E. Garvie has written a brilliant little comm. in the "New Century" series (no date); that of R. St. John Parry in the Cambridge OT Text, 1913, is more popular, despite its use of the g-text. F. W. Westcott’s St. Paul and Justification, 1915, contains a close grammatical study with an excellent paraphrase.

The preeminence of theJakob van maerlant’s comm. (1879) in the Cambridge Bible for Schools and a companion one, in a more homiletic style, in the Expositor’s Bible, 1904.
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LITERATURE

Rome (Lat. Ital. Romo; Ρώμη, Ῥώμη): The capital of the Roman republic and empire, later the center of Lat Christendom, and since 1871 capital of the kingdom of Italy, is situated mainly on the left bank of the Tiber about 15 miles from the Adriatic Sea in 41° 53’ 54” N. lat. and 12° 0’ 12” long. E. of Greenwich. It would be impossible in the limited space assigned to this article to give even a comprehensive outline of the ancient history of the Eternal City. It will suit the general purpose of the work to consider the relations of the Roman government and society with the Jews and Christians, and, in addition, to present a rapid survey of the earlier development of Rom institutions and power, so as to provide the necessary historical setting for the appreciation of what was essentially the Christian element.

I. DEVELOPMENT OF THE REPUBLICAN CONSTITUTION.

—The traditional chronology for the earliest period of Rom history is altogether unreliable.

1. Original able, partly because the Gauls, in invading the city in 390 BC, destroyed the monuments which might have offered faithful testimony of the earlier period (Livy vi.1). It is known that there was a settlement on the site of Rome before the traditional date of the founding (753 BC). The original Rom state was the product of the coalition of a number of adjacent clan-communities, whose names were perpetuated in the Rom gentes, or groups of imaginary kindred, a historical survival which had lost all significance in the period of authentic history. The chieftains of the associated clans composed the primitive senate or council of elders, which exercised sovereign authority. But as is customary in the development of human society, a military or monarchical form of government was necessary to control the looser patriarchal or sacertextual organs of authority. This second stage may be identified with the legendary rule of the Tarquins, which was probably a period of Etruscan domination. The confederation of clans was welded into a homogeneous political entity, and society was organized for civic ends, upon a timocratic basis. The forum was drained and became a social, industrial and political center, and the Capitolium temple of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva (Etruscan pseudo-Hellenic deities) was erected as a public shrine, the first temple, of which all above the Romans are indebted to these foreign kings for a training in discipline and obedience which was exemplified in the later conception of magisterial authority signified by the term imperium.

The prerogatives of the kings passed over to the consuls. The reduction of the tenure of power to a single year and the institution of the principle of轮替制度—every earl had to put himself to death by a magistrate without being allowed the right of appeal to the decision of the assembly of the people.

A period of more than 150 years after the establishment of the republic was consumed chiefly by the struggle between the two classes or orders, the patricians and plebeians. The former were the descendants of the original clans and constituted the patricus, or body-politic, in a more particular sense. The plebeians were descendants of former slaves and dependents, or of strangers who had been attracted to Rome by the obvious advantages for industry and trade. They enjoyed the franchise as members of the military assembly (comitia centuriata), but had no share in the magistracies or other civic honors and emoluments, and were excluded from the knowledge of the civil law which was handed down in the patrician families as an oral tradition.

The first step in the progress of the plebeians toward political equality was taken when they were granted the privilege of choosing representatives from among themselves, the tribunes, whose function of bearing aid to oppressed plebeians was rendered effective by the right of veto (intercessio), by virtue of which any act of a magistrate could be arrested. The codification of
the law in the Twelve Tables was a distinct advantage to the lower classes, because the evils which they had suffered were largely due to a harsh and abusive codification of legal institutions, the nature of which had remained secret (see Roman Law). The abrogation, directly thereafter, of the prohibition of intermarriage between the classes resulted in their gradual intermingling.

The kings had reduced the senate to the position of a mere advisory body. But under the republican régime it recovered in fact the authority of which it was deprived in theory. The controlling power of the Senate, the Senate was the most significant feature of the republican government, although it was recognized by no statute or other constitutional document. It was due in part to the diminution of the power of the magistrates, and in part to the manner in which the senators were chosen. The lessening of the authority of the magistrates was the result of the increase in their number, which led not only to the curtailment of the actual prerogative of each, but also to the contraction of their aggregate independent influence. The augmented number of the magistrates was made necessary by the territorial expansion of the state and the elaboration of administration. But it was partly the result of plebeian agitation. The events of 367 BC may serve as a suitable example to illustrate the influence of these influences. For when the plebeians carried by storm the citadel of patrician exclusiveness in gaining admission to the consulship, the highest regular magistracy, the necessity for another magistrate with general competency afforded an opportunity for making a compensating concession to the plebeian demand. The praetorship was created, to which at first members of the old aristocracy were alone eligible. Under the fully developed constitution the regular magistracies were five in number, consulship, praetorship, aedileship, tribune, and quaestorship, all of which were filled by annual elections.

Mention has been made of the manner of choosing the members of the senate as a factor in the development of the authority of the supreme council. At first the executive officers of the state exercised the right of selecting new members to maintain the senators at the normal number of three hundred. Later this function was transferred to the censors who were elected at intervals of five years. The list of those who had proved the most distinguished citizens should be chosen, and in the Roman community the highest standard of distinction was service to the state, in other words, the holding of public magistracies. It followed, therefore, that the senate was in reality an assembly of all living ex-magistrates. The senate included, moreover, all the political wisdom and experience of the community, and so great was its prestige for these reasons, that, although the expression of its opinion (senatus consultum) was endorsed by law with no compelling force, it inevitably guided the conduct of the consulting magistrate, who was practically its minister, rather than its president.

When the plebeians gained admission to the magistracies the patriciate lost its political significance. But only the wealthier plebeian families were able to profit by this extension of privilege, inasmuch as a political career required freedom from gainful pursuits and also personal influence which had previously been closely connected with the patricians and formed a new aristocracy, which is called the nobilitas for the sake of distinction. It rested ultimately upon the foundation of wealth. The dignity conferred by the holding of public magistracies was its title to distinction. The senate was its organ. Rome was never a true democracy except in theory. During the whole period embraced between the final levelling of the old distinctions based upon blood (387 BC) and the beginning of the period of revolution (133 BC) the populace occupied almost exclusively by the representatives of the comparatively limited number of families which constituted the aristocracy. These alone entered the senate through the doorway of the magistracies, and the data would almost justify us in asserting that the republican and senatorial government were substantially and chronologically identical.

The seeds of the political and social revolution were sown during the Second Punic War, the period which followed it. The prerogation of military authority established a dangerous precedent in violation of the spirit of the republic, so that Pub. Cornelius Scipio was really the forerunner of Marius, Julius Caesar, and Augustus. The stream of gold which found its way from the provinces to Rome was a bait to attract the cupidity of the less scrupulous senators, and led to the growth of the worst kind of professionalism in politics. The middle class of small farmers decayed for this reason; the former rich but effete countries of the Orient attracted many. The cheapness of slaves made independent farming unprofitable and led to the increase in large estates; the cultivation of grain was partly displaced by that of the olive and wine, which were less suitable to the habits and ability of the older class of farmers.

The more immediate cause of the revolution was the inability of the senate as a whole to control the conduct of its more radical or violent members. For as political ambition became more and more an article of faith with the increase in the material prizes to be gained, aspiring leaders turned their attention to the people, and sought to attain the fulfilment of their purposes by popular legislation setting at nought the concurrence of the senate, which custom had consecrated as a requisite preliminary for popular action. The loss of initiative by the senate meant the subversion of senatorial government. The senate possessed in the veto power of the tribunes a weapon for controlling unreasonably popular measures. If one of the ten tribunes could always be induced to interpose his veto to prohibit the passage of popular legislation. But this weapon was broken when Tit. Gracchus declared in 133 BC that a tribune who opposed the wishes of the people had lost his representative, and sustained this assertion.

It would be foreign to the purpose of the present article to trace the vicissitudes of the civil strife of the last century of the republic. A few words will suffice to suggest the underlying general principles which lay beneath these events.

4. Under- the few words will suffice to suggest the general Principles the surface of political and social phenomena. Attention has been called to the ominous development of the influence of military commanders and the increasing emphasis of popular favor. These were the most important tendencies throughout this period, and the coalition of the two was fatal to the supremacy of the senatorial government. Marius, after winning unparalleled military glory formed a political alliance with Caepio and Saturninus, the leaders of the popular faction in the city in BC. This was a turning-point in the course of the revolution. But the importance of the sword soon outweighed that of the pen. These principles were thus constituted. In the civil wars of Marius and Sulla constitutional questions were decided for the first time by superiority of military strength exclusively. Repeated appeals to brute force dulled the violation for constitutional restrictions and the rights of minorities. The senatorial...
played signs of partial paralysis at the time of the Gracchi. How rapidly its debility must have increased as the sword cut off its most stalwart members! Its power expired in the proscriptions, or organized murder of political opponents. The popular party was nominally triumphant, but in theory the Roman state was still an urban commonwealth with a single political center. The franchise could be exercised only at Rome. It followed from this that the actual political assemblies were made up largely of the worthless element which so numerous in the city, whose irrational instincts were guided and controlled by shrewd political leaders, particularly those who united in themselves military ability and the wiles of the demagogue. Sulla, Crassus, Julius Caesar, Antony, and lastly Octavian were in effect the ancient counterpart of the modern political "boss." When such men realized their ultimate power and inevitable rivalry, the ensuing struggle for supremacy and for the survival of the fittest formed the necessary process of elimination leading naturally to the establishment of the monarchy, which was in this case the rule of the last survivor. When Octavian received the title Augustus and the proconsular power (27 BC), the transformation was accomplished.

LITERATURE.—The standard work on Roman political institutions is Mommsen and Marquardt, Handbuch der öffentlichen Rechtsgeschichte (4th ed.); Ettinghausen, Architektur, Berlin and Leipzig, 1892-98; E. Lounghis, London, 1871-82; Mommsen, Geschichte Roms, 1881; G. Dickens, New York, 1874; Niebuhr, Geschichte Roms, ET by Hare and Thrillworth, Cambridge, 1831-82; Paris, Storia di Roma, Turin, 1898-99; Ferrero, Greatness and Decline of Rome, ET by Zimmerman, New York, 1909.

II. Extension of Roman Sovereignty.—See Roman Empire, CHRISTIANITY, I.

III. The Imperial Government.—Augustus displayed considerable tact in blending his own mastery in the state with the old institutions (1) Augustus projectum pro consule) and the proconsular prerogative (imperium proconsulare), conferred in 27 BC. By virtue of the first he was empowered to summon the senate or assemblies and could veto the action of almost any magistrate. The second title of authority conferred upon him the command of the military forces of the state and consequently the administration of the provinces where troops were stationed, besides a general supervision over the government of the other provinces. It follows that a distinction was made (27 BC) between the imperial provinces which were administered by the emperor's representatives (legati Augusti pro praetore) and the senatorial provinces where the republican machinery of government was retained. The governors of the latter were called generally proconsuls (see Province). Mention is made of two proconsuls in the NT: Gallio in Asia Minor (Acts 18 12) and Sergius Paulus in Cyprus (13 7). It is instructive to compare the lenient and common-sense attitude of these trained Roman aristocrats with that of the turbulent local mobs who dealt with St. Paul in Asia Minor, Judea, or Greece (Tucker, Life in the Rom World of St. Paul, 1831; New York, 1895).

Rom citizens were still divided into three classes socially, senatorial, equestrian, and plebeian, and the whole system of government harmonized with this triple division. The senatorial class was composed of descendants of senators and those upon whom the emperors conferred the latus clavis, or privilege of wearing the toga with broad purple border, the sign of membership in this order. The quaestorship was still the door of admission to the senate. The qualifications for membership in the senate were the possession of senatorial rank and property of the value of not less than 1,000,000 sesterces ($45,000; £9,000). Tiberius transferred the election of magistrates from the people to the senate, which was already practically a closed body. Under the empire senatus consultus received the force of law. Likewise the senate acquired judicial functions, sitting as a court of justice for trying important criminal cases and hearing appeals in civil cases from the senatorial provinces. The equestrian class was made up of those who possessed property of the value of 400,000 sesterces or more, and the privilege of wearing the narrow purple band on the toga. With the knights the emperors filled many important financial and administrative positions in Italy and the provinces which were under their control.

IV. Roman Religion.—(1) The Roman religion was originally more consistent than the Gr, because the deities as conceived by the uneducated Lat people were without human character. They were the influences or forces which directed the visible phenomena of the physical world, whose favor was necessary to the material prosperity of mankind. It would be incongruous to assume the existence of a system of theological doctrines in the primitive period. Ethical considerations entered to only a limited extent into the attitude of the Romans toward their gods. Religion partook of the nature of a contract by which men pledged themselves to the scrupulous observance of certain sacrifices and other ceremonies, and in return deemed themselves entitled to expect the active support of the gods in bringing their projects to a fortunate conclusion. The Romans were naturally polytheists as a result of their conception of divinity. Since before the dawn of science there was no semblance of unity in the natural world, there could be no unity in heaven. There must be a controlling spirit over every important event, be it personal or public, be it person, and every process of nature. The gods, therefore, were more numerous than mankind itself.

(2) At an early period the government became distinctly secular. The priests were the servants of the community for preserving the venerable traditions. They performed the formalism and ceremonies, many of which lost at an early period such spirit as they once possessed. The magistrates were the true representatives of the community in its relationship with the deities both in seeking the divine will in the auspices and in performing the more important sacrifices.

(3) The Romans at first did not make statues of their gods. This was partly due to lack of skill, but mainly to the vagueness of their conceptions of the highest beings. Symbols of the gods were usually the existence, a spear, for instance, standing for Mars. The process of reducing the gods to human form was inaugurated when they came into contact with the Etruscans and Greeks. The Tarquins summoned Etruscan artisans and artists to Rome, who made them terra-cotta religious statues and a pediment group for the Capitoline temple.

The types of the Gr deities had already been definitely established when the Hellenic influence in molding Roman culture arrived. Greek gods were entirely the Gr gods became familiar to the Romans in works of sculpture, they gradually supplanted those Rom deities with which they had not nominally a real or fanciful resemblance. See GREECE, RELIGION IN.

(4) The importation of new gods was a comparatively
easy matter. Polytheism is by its nature tolerant because of its indefiniteness. The Romans could no more presume to have exhaustive knowledge of the gods than they could pretend to possess a comprehensive acquaintance with the universe and its gods. The increased necessity as human consciousness of natural phenomena expanded. Besides, it was customary to invite the gods of conquered cities to transfer their abode to Rome and favor the Romans in their undertakings. But the most productive source for religious expansion was the Sibyline Books. See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE. This oracular work was brought to Rome from Cumae, a center of the cult of Apollo. It was consulted at times of crisis with a view to discover what special ceremony would secure adequate divine aid. The forms of worship recommended by the Sibyline Books were exclusively Gr. As early as the 5th cent. BC the cult of Apollo was introduced at Rome. Heracles and the Dioscuri found their way thither about the same time. Later Italian Divas were merged with Artemis, and the group of Ceres, Liber, and Libera were identified with foreign Demeter, Dionysus, and Persephone. Thus Rom religion became progressively Hellenized. By the close of the Second Punic War the greater gods of Greece had all found a home by the Tiber, and the myriad of petty local deities who found no counterpart in the celestial beings of Mt. Olympus fell into oblivion. Their memory was retained by the antiquarian lore of the priests alone (see Roman Empire and Christianity, III, 1).

Rom religion received with the engrafted branches of Gr religion the germs of rapid decay, for its Hellenization made Rom religion peculiarly susceptible to the attack of philosophy. The cultivated class in Gr society was already permeated with skepticism. The philosophers made the gods appear ridiculous. Gr philosophy gained a firm foothold in Rome in the 2d cent. BC, and it became customary a little later to look upon Athens as a sort of university town where the sons of the aristocracy should be sent for the completion of their education in the schools of the philosophers. Thus at the termination of the republican era religious faith had departed from the upper classes largely, and during the turmoil of the civil wars even the external ceremonies were often abandoned and many temples fell into ruins. There had never been any intimate connection between formal religion and conduct, except when the faith of the gods was invoked to secure the fulfillment of sworn promises.

Augustus tried in every way to restore the old religion, rebuilding no fewer than 82 temples which lay in ruins at Rome. A revival of religious faith did occur under the empire, although its spirit was largely antithetical to that which had been displayed in the performance of the official cult. The people remained superstitious, even when the cultivated classes adopted a skeptical philosophy. The formal religion of the state no longer appealed to them, since it offered nothing to the emotions or hopes. On the other hand the sacramental, mysterious character of oriental religions inevitably attracted them. This is the reason why the religions of Egypt and Syria spread over the empire and exercised an insurmountable influence over the life of the people. The partial success of Judaism and the ultimate triumph of Christianity may be ascribed in part to the same causes.

In concluding we should bear in mind that the state dictated no system of theology, that the empire in the beginning presented a spectacle of a sort of religious chaos where all national cults were guaranteed protection, that Rom polytheism was naturally tolerant, and that only the form of religion which the state could not endure was one which was equivalent to an attack upon the foundations of polytheism as a whole, since this would imperil the welfare of the community by depriving the deities of the offerings and other services in return for which their favor could be expected.

V. Rome and the Jews.—Judea became a part of the province of Syria in 63 BC (Jos, BJ, vii, 7), and Hyrcanus, brother of the last king, remained as high priest (archieræus kai attharchès; Jos, Ant, XIV, iv, 4) invested with judicial as well as religious functions. But Antony and Octavius gave Pal (46 BC) as a kingdom to Herod, surnamed the Great, although his rule did not become effective until 3 years later. His sovereignty was upheld by a Rom legion stationed at Jersus (Jos, Ant, XV, iii, 7), and he was obliged to pay tribute to the Rom government and provide auxiliaries for the Rom army (Appian, Bell. Civ, v, 75). Herod built a temple in honor of Augustus (Jos, Ant, XV, ix, 6), and the Rom procurators later made it the seat of government. At his death in 4 BC the kingdom was divided between his three surviving sons, the largest portion falling to Archelaus, who ruled Judea, Samaria and Idumaea with the title attharchès (Jos, Ant, XVII, xi, 4) until 6 AD, when he was deposed and his realm reduced to the position of a province. The administration by Rom procurators (see Procurator), which was now established, was interrupted during the reign of Augustus, when royal authority was exercised by Herod Agrippa, grandson of Herod the Great, over the lands which had been embraced in the kingdom of his grandfather (Jos, Ant, XIX, viii, 2), and, after 53 AD, Agrippa II ruled a considerable part of Pal (Jos, Ant, XX, vii, 1, viii, 4).

After the fall of Jersus and the termination of the great revolt in 70 AD, Pal remained a separate province. Henceforth a legion (legio X Fretensis) was added to the military forces stationed in the land, which was encamped at the ruins of Jersus. Consequently, imperial governors of praetorian rank (legati Augusti pro praetore) took the place of the former procurators (Jos, BJ, VII, i, 2, 3; Dio Cassius IV, 23).

Several treaties are recorded between the Romans and Jews as early as the time of the Maccabees (Jos, Ant, XII, x, 6; XIII, ix, 2; viii, 5), and Jews are known to have been at Rome as early as 138 BC. They became very numerous in the capital after the return of Pomp. who brought back many captives (see Libertines). Cicero speaks of multitudes of Jews at Rome in 58 BC (Pro Flacco 28), and Caesar was very friendly toward them (Suetonius Caesar 84). Held in favor by Augustus, they recovered the privilege of collecting sums to send to the temple (Pisto Legatio ad Casum 40). Agrippa
offered 100 oxen in the temple when visiting Herod (Jos. Ant. XVI. i. 1), and Augustus established a daily offering of a bull and two lambs. Upon the whole the Roman government displayed noticeable consideration for the religious scruples of the Jews. They were exempted from military service and the duty of appearing in court on the Sabbath. Yet Tiberius repulsed Jewish riot in Rome in 19 AD (Suetonius Tiberius 36) and Claudius expelled the Jews from the city in 49 AD (Suetonius Claudius 25); but in both instances repression was not of long duration.

The Jews made themselves notorious in Rome in propagating their religion by means of proselytizing (Horace Satires i. 4, 142; i. 9, 2. Jewish 69; Juvenal xiv. 96; Tacitus Hist. Proselytism v. 5), and the literature of the Augustan age contains several references to the observation of the Sabbath (Thibalus 13; Ovid Ars amatoria 675, 415; Remedium amoris 219). Proselytes from among the Gentiles were not always required to observe all the prescriptions of the Law. The proselytes of the Gate (sedebona), as they were called, could not fully identify with the Jewish public worship, and abstained from the blood and meat of sacrificed animals. Among such proselytes may be included the centurion of Capernaum (Lk 7 5), the centurion Cornelius (Acts 10 1), and the emperor Poppaea (Jos. Ant. XIX. vii. 11; Tacitus Ann. xv. 6). On "proselytes of the Gate," G. IV. III. 177, very properly corrects the error in H. P. "These "Gate" people were not proselytes at all: the first step that carried them into Judaism—viz. circumcision (Ramsay, Expos. 1809, p. 200; Harnack, Expansion of Christianity, I. 11; see Devices—Proselytes). Notwithstanding the diffusion of Judaism by means of proselytism, the Jews themselves lived for the most part in isolation in the poorest parts of the city or suburbs, across the Tiber, near the Circus Maximus, or outside the Porta Capena, except with its synagogue and council of elders presided over by a gerusier. Five cemeteries have been discovered with many Gr. few Lat, but no Heb inscriptions.

LITERATURE.—Ewald, The Hist of Israel, ET by Smith, Creation 1856; Renan, Hist of the People of Israel, ET. Boston, 1889; Schürer, The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, ET. Boston, 1897.

VI. Rome and the Christians.—The date of the introduction of Christianity into Rome cannot be determined. A Christian community 1. Intro- existed at the time of the arrival of St. duction of Paul (Acts 28 15), to which he had Christianity addressed his Ep. a few years before (58 AD). It is commonly thought that the statement regarding the expulsion of the Jews from Rome under Claudius on account of the commotion excited among them by the agitation of Chrestus (Suetonius Claudius 25; Iunius impul- sivus—Castris actedi tunc hulcrodas Roma expulsi, probably in 49 AD), is proof of the diffusion of Chris- tian teaching in Rome, on the ground that Chrestus is a colloquial, or mistaken, form of Christus. It has been suggested that the Christian faith was brought to Rome by some of the Romans who were converted at the time of Pentecost (Acts 2 10. 41). It would be out of place to discuss here the grounds for the traditional belief that St. Peter was twice in Rome, once before 50 AD and again subsequent to the arrival of St. Paul, and that together the two apostles established the church there. Our present concern is with the attitude of the government and society toward Christianity, when once established. It may suf- fice, therefore, to remind the reader that St. Paul was permitted to preach freely while nominally in custody (Phil 1 13), and that as early as 64 AD the Christians were very numerous (Tacitus Ann. xv. 44: autotud ingens). 

At first the Christians were not distinguished from the Jews, but shared in the toleration, or even protection, which was usually conceded to the aliens. The application of the term "Christian" to one of the peoples embraced within the empire. Christianity was not legally proscribed until after its dis- tinction from Judaism was clearly perceived. Two questions demand our attention: (1) When was Christianity recognized as a sect of Judaism? (2) When was the profession of Christianity declared a crime? These problems are of fundamental im- portance in the history of the church under the Roman empire.

1. If we may accept the passage in Suetonius cited above (Claudius 25) as testimony on the victories of Christianity, we infer that at that time the Christians were confused with the Jews. The employing Pontius Pilate, who was committed to the jurisdiction of her husband (Tacitus Ann. xiii. 32) for adherence to a foreign belief (sapiens de religione) with a view to securing proof that as early as 57 AD Christianity had secured a covert in the provinces, as well as in the empire. Evidence in this case by the contemporary authority from whom Tacitus has gleaned this incident would supply an opportunity to the author of Tacitus to throw light on several oriental religions from the point of view of Romans of that period; for Pompilia, his amatae, would have been of another manner since 44 AD. Since there is some other evidence that Pompilia was a Christian, the indefinite account of the accusation against her as mentioned by Tacitus is partial proof that Christianity had not as yet been considered as a sect of Judaism. This is the recognition of the distinctive character of Christianity from Judaism already taken by the author of this history. It was probably due in large measure to the circumstances of St. Paul's sojourn and trial in Rome and to the unexpected number of converts made at that time. The emperor Poppaea, who was probably an adherent of Judaism (Jos. Ant. XIX. viii), may have enlightened the imperial court regarding the heresy of the Christians and their separation from the parent stock.

2. In attempting to determine approximately the time at which Christianity was placed under the official ban of the imperial government, the convenient date to adopt as starting-points certain incontestable dates between which the act of proscription must be issued. It is clear that at the time of the great confirma- tion (64 AD), the profession of Christianity was not a ground for any imperial action. Oppian writes that Nero at liberty by decree of the imperial court (of 2 Tim 4 17). Moreover, there is a charge against the Christians was a plot to burn the city, not adherence to a proscribed religion, and they were condemned, as it appears, for an attitude of hostility toward the human race (Tacitus Ann. xvi. 44). While governor of Bithynia (c. 112 AD), Pliny the younger addressed Trajan in a celebrated letter (x. 96) asking advice to guide his conduct in the trial of many persons who were accused as Christians, and inquiring particularly whether Christianity in itself was culpable, or only the faults which usually accompanied adherence to the new faith. The reply of the emperor makes quite plain the fundamental guilt at that time of adherence to Christianity, and it supposes a law already existing against it (x. 96. 2). It follows, therefore, that the law against Christianity was the legal basis for the persecution mentioned by the emperor. But the evidence of the confirmation in 64 AD and Pliny's administration of Bithynia. We cannot define the time of this important act of legislation more closely with absolute certainty, although evidence is not wanting for the support of theories of more or less modernity. Tradition ascribes a general persecution to the reign of Domitian, which would imply that Christianity had acquired the status of a forbidden religion at that time. Allusions in Rev. (6. 9), the references to recent calamities in Rome by St. Clement in his first letter to the Corinthians (A.D. 55), the condemnation of Aelius Glabrio (Dio Cassius lxvii. 13), a man of consular rank, together with the emperor's cousin Flavius Clemens (Dio Cassius, xii, 8) and Flavia Domitilla and many others on the charge of atheism and Jewish customs (2 Mitre 30, A.D.), are close aids to the persecution. The fact that a number of persons in Bithynia abandoned Christianity many years before the judicial investigation of Pliny (Pliny x. 96) is an important as corroborative evidence.
But there are grounds worthy of consideration for carrying the point of departure back of Domitian. The letter of St. Peter to the Babylonians (Rom. 1:9) and the Christians in Asia Minor implies an impending persecution (Rev. 13:9). This was probably in the closing years of the reign of Nero, Allard previously observes (Histoire des persécutions, 61) that the mention of the persecution of the Christians apart from the description of the great fire in the work of Suetonius (Ner. 16), amid a number of acts of legislation, is evidence of a general enactment. These have been adopted at the time of, or soon after, the proceedings which led to the issue of the edict of Domitian. Upon the whole the theory that the policy of the imperial government was definitely established under Nero carries with it considerable probability (cf. Sulpicius Severus, Chron. ii. 41).

Although the original enactment has not been lost the correspondence of Pliny and Trajan enables us to formulate the imperial policy in dealing with the Christian question. Adherence to Christianity was in itself culpable. But the proceedings were not to be undertaken by magistrates on their own initiative; they were to proceed only from charges brought by voluntary denunciations, after careful consideration of the proofs of their assertions. Informal and anonymous information must be rejected. Penitence shown in abandoning Christianity absolved the accused from the legal penalty of former guilt. The act of adoring the gods and the celebration of the festival rites were more than sufficient proof of non-adherence to Christianity or of repentance.

The attitude of the imperial authorities in the 3d cent. was more complex. The problem became more complicated as Christianity grew. Persecution was directed more esp. against the church as an organization, since it was now an established power. About 202 AD, Septimius Severus issued a decree forbidding specific activities and respecting Judaism or Christianity (Suetonius, Severus, 17), in which he departed from the method of procedure prescribed by Trajan. Nevertheless, the persecution was continued without any specific edict, and the Jews and Christians were put in the same category as any other religious establishment. Although a few edicts were directed against the Jewish community, there is no positive evidence that Christianity was ever regarded as a danger to the state or that it was the subject of a special edict. The practice of the emperors was more general. The pagans were to be dealt with by the usual procedure of the state, and the Christians were to be treated on the same basis as their actions were proved to be contrary to the laws of the state.

Under Valerian (253 AD) the Christian organizations were to be suppressed and the churches were to be destroyed. But an edict in 260 AD restored this property (Eusebius, VII. 15). A short persecution under Aurélion (274 AD) broke the long period of calm which extended to the first edict of persecution of Diocletian (February 24, 303). The edict of Valerian was merely a reissue of the same law, proclaiming the same modal claim to exist, for Diocletian did not at first consider them a guilty capital crime. His successors, borne down by the many incursions of the tribes, by the onrush of the barbarians, and by the increasing destruction of churches and sacred books, and an habitual governmental and social decadence (Lactantius, De Morti Persecutorum, x. 11, 12, 13; Eusebius, VIII. 1, 2, 10), issued a series of edicts, under which the sacrists were arrested for the public and imperial edicts. They were not put to death until they renounced the faith (Eusebius, VIII. 6). Finally, the requirement of an act of conformity in sacrificing to the gods was made general. This final persecution, continuing in an irregular way with varying degrees of severity, terminated with the defeat of Maxentius by Constantine (October 29, 312). The Edict of Milan issued by Constantine and Licinius the following year established toleration, the restoration of ecclesiastical property and the peace of the church. See Roman Empire and Christianity.


Rome

ROSE, ROY. See rose.

ROSE-CHAMBER. See House.

ROOM, ROOM. See House.

ROOT, ROOT (ר', סֵּנָךְ, shèresh; πέρα, rhiza): Frequently mentioned in the OT and NT, but almost always in a figurative sense, e.g. "root of the righteous" (Prov 12: 312); "root that heareth gall" (Dt 29: 18); "Their root shall be as roteness" (Is 5: 24); "root of bitterness" (He 12: 15). Also of peoples: "they whose root is in Amalek" (Jgs 5: 14); of Assyria (Ezk 31: 7); "Ephraim is smitten, their root is dried up" (Hos 9: 16); "Judah shall again take root" (Isa 60: 21). The root of Jesse (Isa 11: 10; Rom 15: 12); root of David (Rev 5: 5; 22: 16).

ROOT OF DAVID. See David, Root of.

ROOT OF JESUS (יהוּדָּא, יְהוּדָּא, shèresh yishav; יְשֵׁרְתָּא, yeshret; רֵיחַ יְשֵׁשָׂל, rhiza toh Jesal; Rom 12: 16): The Heb and Gr words are practically the same in meaning. "Root" means descendant, branch of the family or stock. The Messianic king was to be the family of Jesse the father of David. In Rom 16: 12 Paul quotes the LXX of Isa. 11: 10. Jesus is a branch or descendant of the family of Jesse, as well as of David. See also David, Root of.

ROPE, ROPE (רֶפֶף, ῥῆφα, רֵחָב; רֵיחָל, ῥηχάλ; ῥῆβι, ῥηβί, רָב הָן, hēbel, "that which binds" (2 S 17: 13, etc); for ῥῆβι, "hbhôth, "that which is won" (Jgs 15: 13, etc). In neither word is any specified thickness or strength connoted, and ῥῆβι is in equally well by "line" (2 S 8: 2, etc) or "cord" (Josh 2: 15, etc), and ῥῆβι by "cord" (Ps 118: 27, etc), as best suits the context. Similarly in the NT the word ῥῆιος, σαχονίον, ῥῆχος, ῥῆιος, ῥαιρίον, "made of rushes," can mean the rope by which a boat is fastened (Acts 27: 32) or small cords suitable for a whip (Jn 2: 15). The usual material for ropes was certainly flax (hemp), but the Egyptians, and so possibly the Hebrews, at times made ropes of leathern thongs. See Cord; Line; Ships and Boats; III, 2.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

ROSE, ROSE (1) (רְפֶּסָא, ῥῆθος, ῥῆθος, "a flower" [Cant 2: 1], ρῆος, κρινον, "a lily" [Isa 35: 1]): By general consent EV is wrong: in Cant 2: 1 reads "Heb hawahzeloth, the autumn flowers," and in Isa 35: 1, to reads "or autumn crocus." This is the Colchicum autumnale (N.O. Liliaceae). A Tg on Cant 2: 1 explains the Heb word as "narcissus," a very common plant in the plains and mountains of Pal and a great favorite with the ancients. Two species, N. N. and scabiosa (N.O. Amaranthaceae), occur, the latter being the finer; they are autumn plants. All authorities agree that the so-called "rose" was some kind of bulbous plant. (2) ῥῆος, ρῆος, "the rose," mentioned in Ecles 24: 14; 39: 13; 50: 8; Wis 2: 8; 2 Esd 2: 19: There is no reason why the rose, of which several varieties are common in Pal, should not be meant. Tristan favors the rhododromon. The expression, "rose plants in Jericho," in Ecles 24: 14 has nothing whatever to do with what is now sold there as a "rose of Jericho," a dwarf annual plant, Aruncus hierochuntina (N.O. Cruciferae), which dries up and can be made to reexpand by placing the root in water.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

ROSH, Rosh: A son or grandson of Benjamin (Gen 46: 21).

ROSH (רְשָׁה, רְשָׁה; 'Pös, Rhos, var. [Q'w] ḫiphōn, ḫophote; Vulg capit) (capi): This name occurs in the prophecies against Gog in Ezek 38: 19; 39: 1, where AV has "Gog, the chief prince of Renderings Meshech and Tubal." This is due to "rbsh" being the common Heb word for "head" or "chief" (cf. Gr varient and the Vulg), and is regarded as incorrect, that of the RV,
“Gog, of the land of Magog, the prince of Rosh, Meshech and Tubal,” being preferred.

The identification of Rosh is not without its difficulties. Gesenius regarded it as indicating the Russians, who are mentioned in Byzantine writers of the 10th cent. under the name of Rosh. He adds that they are also noticed by Ibn Foselan (same period), under the name of Râs, as a people dwelling on the river Rha (Volga). Apart from the improbability that the dominion of Gog extended to this district, it would be needful to know at what date the Râs of the Volga arrived there.

Notwithstanding objections on account of its eastern position, in all probability Fried. Delitzsch’s identification of Rosh with the mât Râbî, “land of Râbî” of the Assyrian inscriptions, is the best. Sargon of Assyria (c 710 BC) conquered the countries “from the land of Râbî on the border of Elam as far as the river of Rha,” and this country is further described in his Khorsabad Inscription, 18, as “the land of Râsû, the boundary of Elam, which is beside the Tigris.” Assyria having disappeared from among the nations when Ezekiel wrote his prophecies, Babylonia was probably the kingdom with power which “Gog of the land of Magog” would have had to reckon, but it may well be doubted whether the Bab king would have allowed him to exercise power in the district of Râsû, except as a very faithful vassal. It may here be noted that the Hebrew spelling of Rosh presupposes an earlier pronunciation as Râsh, a form agreeing closely with that used by the Assyrians. See Fried. Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies?* 522.

**ROT, rot, ROTTENNESS, rotteness.** rot. *roth,* root, rootnote, rootnote (vbs. *râbâh,* râbî, roth, râbâh, rotheh. noun roâdâh (roâdâhâh), Job 41 27), with *âb, mak,* “decay” (Isa 5 24), and *âbâsh,* “shriveil” (so Joel 1 17 RVm): “Rotteness of the bones” (Prov 12 4; 14 30; Hab 3 16) is ulceration (caries) of the bones, used as an example of an intensely painful disease. AV, in addition, has “rot” in Nu 5 21.22.27 where RV has “fall away” (âbî, râb, but a euphemistic phrase is in point (see the note in the A.V.). In Jer 11.12 AV has “old rotten rags” for *abî, melah,* “rag” (RV “worn-out garments,” a tr that specializes too far).

**ROKE, rôt:** RVm gives “learned by rote” in Isa 29 13 for “taught,” which indicates that the service of Jeh was merely formal.

**ROWER, rër,** ROWING, rîing. See SHIPS and BOATS, III, 1.

**ROYAL, rojâl:** Either belonging to a king (kingdom) or having kingly power, dignity, authority, etc., in Heb, the word is expressed by using different nouns in the gen. case (the “construct state”), e.g., *melâkh,* “king;” *Âsher,* “Asher:” they shall yield royal dainties,” lit. choice morsels of the king, meaning fit for a king (Gen 49 20): “besides that which Solomon gave her of his royal bounty,” lit. which he gave her according to the hand (the wealth) of King Solomon (1 K 10 13; cf RVm): “a royal statute,” lit. statute of a *malâkh,* which is the emphatic Aram. term for *melâkh,* “king” (Dnli 6 7): (2) *mammalâkhah,* “the power and dignity of a king,” “Gibeah, one of the royal cities,” lit. a capital city with a king of her own (Josh 10 2; cf 1 S 27 5): “all the seed royal,” lit. the seed of the kingdom (2 K 11 1; cf 2 Ch 22 10); (3) *malakhuth,* “kinghood,” “kingdom”: “royal majesty,” lit. majesty of kingdom (1 Ch 29 25): quite frequently in the Book of Est; royal wine (1 7): crown (1 11; cf 2 17; 6 8); commandment (1 19); “her royal estate,” lit. her kingdom (1 19); house royal (2 16; cf 5 1); royal apparel (6 1; cf 6 8, 15); throne (5 1); “mighty powers, kingdom;” “kingly power and majesty;” “royal city,” lit. the city of the kingdom, meaning here that part of the city (Rabbah) in which the royal palace was situated (2 S 12 26); “royal diadem,” lit. turban of kingdom (Isa 62 3); (5) in Jer 43 10 we find the word *shaphrît;* its meaning is uncertain: “royal pavilion” (RV and AV), “glittering” (RVm), “scepter,” “a carpet covering a throne.”

The NT uses the word for *basileus,* “belonging to a king;” “royal apparel” (Acts 12 21); “the royal law,” something like “the golden rule,” being foremost because including all others (Jas 2 5), and for *basileus* (being vested with kingly power and honor) “royal priesthood,” the Heb rendering would be *mamlekth eth kôhânim,* “a kingdom of priests,” i.e., a kingdom whose citizens are priests, emphasizing the two facts that the true Christians have free access to the grace of God and that they enjoy the liberties and privileges of His kingdom (1 Pet 2 9).

**ROYAL CITY.** See Royal, (2), (4).

**RUBY, rô'bi.** See STONES, Precious.

**RUDDER, rud'ër, RUDDER-BANDS.** See SHIPS and BOATS, III, 2, (3).

**RUDDY, rû'dî.** See RUDY, RUDER-BANDS.

**RUDY, rû'dî.** See RUDY, RUDER-BANDS. See SHIPS and BOATS, III, 2, (3).

**RUDY, rû'dî.** See RUDY, RUDER-BANDS. See SHIPS and BOATS, III, 2, (3).

**RUDY, rû'dî.** See RUDY, RUDER-BANDS. See SHIPS and BOATS, III, 2, (3).

**RUDY, rû'dî.** See RUDY, RUDER-BANDS. See SHIPS and BOATS, III, 2, (3).

**RUDY, rû'dî.** See RUDY, RUDER-BANDS. See SHIPS and BOATS, III, 2, (3).

**RUDY, rû'dî.** See RUDY, RUDER-BANDS. See SHIPS and BOATS, III, 2, (3).

**RUDY, rû'dî.** See RUDY, RUDER-BANDS. See SHIPS and BOATS, III, 2, (3).

**RUDY, rû'dî.** See RUDY, RUDER-BANDS. See SHIPS and BOATS, III, 2, (3).

**RUDER, rud'ër, RUDDER-BANDS.** See SHIPS and BOATS, III, 2, (3).

**RUDICENTS, ro'di-men'ts (stô'thîk'â, stokheia, pl. of stô'this, stokheion, Gal 4 3 9; Col 2 20; He 5 12; 2 Pet 3 10 12)).** This word occurs 7 times in the NT, and AV translates it in three different ways. In the two passages in Gal, and in the two in 2 Pet, it is rendered “elements.” In the two passages in Col, it is tr “rudiments.” In He it is rendered “first principles.”

The etymological meaning of the word is, that which belongs to a stage or rank, hence any first thing, an element, first principle. It denotes, specially (1) the letters of the logical alphabet, the spoken sounds, as the elements of speech; (2) the material elements of the universe, the physical atoms of which the world is composed; (3) the heavenly bodies; (4) the elements, rudiments, fundamental principles of any art, science or discipline; of the phrase, “the a, b, c,” etc. (1) The NT use of the word, where it always occurs in the pl., is as follows: In 2 Pet 3 10 12, “The elements shall be dissolved with fervent heat,” that is, the physical elements of the world and of the heavens are to be consumed, or subjected to change,
by means of fire. In Hc 5 12, AV "Ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God." This means that the Heb Christians had not advanced to the advance expected, in Gal 4 3.9 AV Paul writes, "When we were children, [we] were in bondage under the elements of the world"; "How turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereinunto ye desire again to be in bondage?" The apostle here means the ceremonial precepts of the worship of the Jews. These requirements involved much and protracted difficulty in their observance; they were "a yoke . . . which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear" (Acts 15 10). Yet the Galatian converts were turning back again to these legal ordinances, and desired to be in bondage to them. These elements were "of the world," they had reference to material and not to spiritual things, they were formal and sensuous. They were "weak," for they had no power to rescue man from condemnation, and they could not save him from sin. They were "beggarly," for they brought no endowment of the heavenly riches. By these epithets Paul signifies that rites, ordinances, sacrifices, observance of days and seasons belonged to the elementary stages of the Jewish religion, which had not attained its end and purpose in the coming of Christ and His work. These things were necessary at the time they were Divinely instituted, but the time had come when they were no longer required. They contained and enclosed an essential of the new knowledge, were root knowledge, from the first, to lead to an advance in the moral and spiritual life, which is now revealed in Christ.

It has been thought by some that what is meant by "elements" or "rudiments" in Gal and Col is the physical elements, preceived over by angels, and that this is in some way connected with the worship of angels, to which Paul refers in Col 2 18. The Jews believed that there were angels of fire and of the wind, and of the other physical elements. The apostle therefore wished to show that the worship of angels and of the heavenly bodies which they were supposed to control, this latter meaning of the term is a possible, but not a probable one. The interpretation, already first given, with understanding of the "elements" to mean the ordinances of Jewish legalism, is most in harmony with the gospel and the purpose of the apostle. For Paul, "the rudiments" are probably the correct interpretation, both as simpler in itself and as suiting the context better. St. Paul seems to be dwelling still on the previous chapter, or rather characterizing the law, as fitted to "serve for an earlier stage in the world's history" (Lightfoot, Comm. on Gal, 167).

In Col 2 5 AV Paul writes, "Beware lest any man spoil you, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ"; and in ver 20, AV "Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why . . . are ye subject to ordinances?" The meaning of the term here is the elements of religious training, the ceremonial precepts of the Jewish Law. In Col and Gal the meaning is that the systems of the false teachers, both in Colossae and in Galatia, laid stress on Jewish ritual, ceremonial law and ascetic observances—things of this world, belonging to the visible sphere, things external, and intended, as being the Jewish Law is concerned, simply as a preparation for the coming of Christ. Such were the rudiments of the world, so far as their source was Jewish. On their heathen side they were still more decidedly anti-Christian. Both of these tendencies, Jewish and heathen, were "not according to Christ," 2 Cor 3 6. For Christ Himself who atoned for sin, and who now lives and reigns, delivers believers from all such methods, as well as from the need of them. — John Rutterford

RUE, רווה (רְיוֹחַ, ōyôkh; Rapha);: One of the plants mentioned in Lk 11 42 as subject to tithe: in the passage, Mt 23 23, anise and cummin are mentioned. Rueda (N.O. Rutaceae) is the official rue, and a very similar species, R. chalepensis, is indigenous. Rue is a small shrub growing 2 to 4 ft. high with a heavy odor, disagreeable to Westerners, but a favorite with Orientals. A sprig of rue is often fixed on a child's cap or clothes as a kind of charm.

RUFUS, רְפּוּס (רֵפּוּס, Raphos);: The name is mentioned twice: (1) Simon of Cyrene, who was compelled to bear the cross of Jesus, is "the father of Alexander and Rufus" (Mk 15 21); (2) Paul sends greetings to Rom Christians, "Rufus the chosen, and his mother and mine" (Rom 16 13). Rufus was well known among those for whom Mark primarily wrote his Gospel, and according to tradition this was the Christian community at Rome. There seems no reason to doubt, therefore, that the Rufus of Mark and the Rufus of Paul are the same person. The name, meaning "red," "reddish," was, however, one of the commonest of slave names; the identification of these two is therefore merely a conjecture. The Rufus whom Paul greets is "the chosen in the Lord," i.e. "that choice Christian" (Demisy). Since all Christians are "chosen," this title must express some distinction. The mother of Rufus had played the mother's part to Paul on some occasion of which we are ignorant, hence the phrase "his mother and mine" (cf Mk 10 30).

RUG, ṛug, ṛug: Alternative rendering of a word (רְגוּשׁ, ṛug, or ṛug, "horrible"); in Jgs 4 18 RV, "mantle" AV. The tr is doubtful; OHL gives "rug or thick coverlet"? [1]

RUHAMAH, רְחָמָה, ṛahâmâ: See Lo-Ruhamah, the symbolic name of Hosea's daughter (Hos 1 6 8).

RUIN, ṛūin (רְיוּן, ṛūin, "ruin"); the tr of ṛēthā, ṛūin, ṛēthā; "Ruin," the tr of ṛēthā (Am 9 11; cf Acts 15 16, where RV Gr text, ἀπὸ ὀρείσκεσθαι, and of a number of other Heb words: in Lk 6 49 ῥήγμα, "breakage," is used both in a literal sense (Isa 23 13; 25 2, of fallen buildings; Ezk 27 27; 31 13, of a state or people; Lk 6 49, of a house, etc) and with a moral significance (Proverbs 26 28). RV correctly renders mikheĥel in Ezk 18 30 "stumblingblock" (AV "ruin"), and RV in 21 15 "stumbling" (AV "ruins"). RV has "ruins" for AV "desolation" in Ezr 9 9, m "waste places"; Ps 74 3; in "their ruins" for "with their mantles" (2 Ch 34 8, m "with their axes. The Heb is obscure"; "midst of the ruin" for "desolation" (Job 10 13); "their ruin" for "their wickedness" (Proverbs 21 12). "Ruinous" is the tr of map- ēgalāh (Isa 17 1) and of ūnāh (2 K 19 25; Isa 37 26).

RULER, ṛōler;: (1) מַשָּׁה, Ma-shah, "ruler," "ruler," "prince," "master" (tirant), applied to Joseph in Egypt (Gen 45 8; cf Ps 105 21); to the Philis (Jgs 16 11); to David's descendants, the future kings of Israel (2 Ch 7...
1; cf Jer 33 26); to Pharaoh (Ps 105 20); to a wicked prince, a tyrant (Prov 28 15; cf Isa 14 5; 49 7); to the theocratic king, 1. In the the Messiah (Mic 5 2); it is often OT of the general (Gen 36 7; 23 1; 29 12; Eccl 10 4; Isa 16 1, etc.).

(2) ἀρχή, archē, "leader," "noble" (nobles), "prince." In a number of instances RV renders it "prince," where AV has ruler (1 S 25 30; 2 S 6 21; 1 K 1 35, etc.). It is used of Azikriam having charge of the palace of King Ahaz (2 Ch 22 7; governor) of Judah (Seraiah, Neh 11 11), who is called the "ruler of the house of God" (1 Ch 9 11; cf 2 Ch 31 13); he was the leader of a division or group of priests. In 2 Ch 36 28 the names of three others are given (Hilkiah, Zechariah and Jahiel).

(3) συμβολή, συμβολή, "prince" (so Nu 13 2; AV "ruler"); generally speaking, the συμβολή is one of the public authorities (Ex 22 28); the rulers of the congregation (Ex 16 22; cf 34 31); "The rulers brought the onyx stones" (Ex 35 27), as it was to be of the sons of men of the highest standing and financial ability: "when a ruler [the head of a tribe or tribal division] sinneth" (Lev 4 22).

(4) δικαίωσιν, ἰσότητα, "judge" or "magistrate;" (Isa 1 10; 3 6 7; 22 3; Mic 3 19); "a military chief" (Josh 10 24).

(5) ἰσότητα, ἰσότητα, one having dominion: "There is little Benjamin their ruler" (Ps 68 27); the meaning is obscure; still we may point to the facts that Saul, the first one to conquer the heathen (1 S 14 47), came of this the smallest of all the tribes, and that within its boundaries the temple of Jeh was erected.

(6) θυσία, ἱδρυ, a "dignitary," "a prince." "The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against Jeh (Ps 2 2); in the NT the word rendered archontes (Acts 4 26).

(7) σωρός, σωρός, "chief," "head"; prince, king. A nobleman having judicial or other power; a royal officer. RV renders it frequently "prince": "rulers over my cattle" ("head-shepherds," Gen 47 6); "rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds," etc (Ex 18 21); they had to be men of good character because they were endowed with judicial power (ver 22); in Dt 1 15 the rendering of EV is "captains," etc; they were military leaders. "Zebul the ruler of the city" (of Shechem, Jgs 9 30); meaning "governor" (of 1 K 22 26; 2 K 23 8); "rulers [or captains; of 1 K 16 9] of his [Solomon's] chariots" (1 K 9 22); the rulers of Jezreel (2 K 10 1) were, presumably, the ruler of the palace of the king and the ruler of the city of Samaria (cf ver 5). It is difficult to explain why they should be called the rulers of Jezreel; both the LXX and RV omit the word; "the rulers of the substance which was king David's" (1 Ch 27 31) overseers of the royal domain; "The rulers were behind all the house of Judah" (Neh 4 16), the officers were ready to assemble in case of an attack.

(9), (10) στρατηγός, στρατηγός, "a commander," "an officer": "the rulers of the provinces" (Dnl 3 25); στρατηγός, "a person in power," "a potentate" (Dnl 2 10); there seems to be little doubt that the

Aram. term is used as an adj. (cf RVm); in Dnl 5 7 occurs the vb. στρατατεύομαι, "to have dominion," "he shall rule as the third in rank" (cf vs 16 29).

(11) σαμάν, nāḥām, "shielid;" "Her rulers [shields] dearly love shame" (Hos 4 18). Perhaps we ought to read (with LXX) māgyō nāmām, "their glory," and to translate "they love shame more than their glory;" they would rather have a good (!) time than a good name.

(1) ἀρχῶν, archōn, used of the "rulers" of the Spartans (1 Mac 14 20) and, in a general sense, of the "rulers" of the Jews (Mic 5 5) (cf 2 K 24 6); has the word also in a general sense in Sir 53 18 (RV "ruler").

2. In the Apoc (2) οὐρανός, οὐρανός, "one leading the way." A quite general term, Sir 10 2 (ruler of a city); 17 17 (of gentile nations); 46 18 (of the Jews). Also 2 17 AV (RV "he that ruleth"); and 3 20 AV (a "ruler").

(3) οἱ μεγαντάται, μεγαντάται, a rare word found only in the pl., for "rulers of the congregation," (Sir 33 18) the same word in Mic 6 24 is called "lords;" (4) 2 Mac 4 27 AV for εἰρήνης, εἰρήνης (RV "governor").

(5) AV inserts the word without Gr equivalent in 1 Mac 6 14: 11 57; 1 Mac 13 2.

(1) ἀρχών, archōn, "a person in authority," "a magistrate," "a judge," "a prince;" a councillor, a member of the upper council of the Jews; a man of influence. "There NT came a ruler" (Mt 9 18), meaning a ruler of the synagogue (cf Mk 5 22; Lk 8 41); see (2) below; "one of the rulers of the Pharisees" (Lk 14 1), perhaps a member of the Jewish council belonging, at the same time, to the Pharisees, or, more probably, one of the leading Pharisees; "the chief priests and the rulers" (Lk 23 13 35; 24 20; of Jn 3 17; 7 26 48; 12 42; Acts 3 17; 4 5 8; 13 27 50); they were, with the chief priests and the scribes, members of the Sanhedrin, either of two councils of the Jews (the Great and the Lesser); they were lay-members (elders); before the rulers (Acts 16 19), the police magistrates (prœtorii, AV "masters") of the city of Philippi; "Thou shalt not speak evil of a ruler of thy people" (Acts 23 5; ex 22 28, nāth; see, 1, 3], above), a magistrate, a person in authority (of Acts 27 35; Rom 13 3, the public authorities; "the executors of this world" (Col 2 8); persons being mentally superior to their fellow-men, and so having great influence in shaping their opinions and directing their actions.

(2) ἀρχισύνεχος, archisynégōs, "ruler of the synagogue.

There was the president of the board, a board of elders, who had charge of the synagogue. Sometimes they, also, were given the same name (of "one of the rulers of the synagogue," Mk 5 22 55; Lk 8 41 49; in Mt 9 18 Jairus is simply called archēn; the ruler mentioned in Lk 13 14 was, of course, the president of the board (cf Acts 18 17, Sosthenes), while in Acts 13 15 the phrase "rulers of the synagogue" simply signifies the board. It was a deliberative body, but at the same time responsible for the maintenance of good order in the synagogue and the observance of its members; having, therefore, disciplinary power, they were authorized to reprimand, and even to excommuni-cate, the guilty ones (cf Jn 9 22; 12 45; 16 2).

(3) ἀρχισύνεχος, archisynégōs, "ruler of the synagogue" (of the feast (Jn 2 8 9). See separate article.

(4) κοσμοκράτωρ, kosmokrátōr, a "world-ruler" (Eph 6 12). The angels of the devil (Mt 26 41; 12 45) or Satan, the prince of this world (Jn 12 31), participate in this power; they are his tools, their sphere of action being "this darkness," i.e. the morally corrupt state of our present existence.

(5) παράκιερος, politarchēs; the prefect of a city (Acts 17 6 8). Luke being the only one of the BB authors to hand down to us this word, it is a
noteworthy fact that, in relatively modern times, a Gr inscription was discovered containing this very word and, moreover, having reference to the city of Thessalonica (77 Th). Here it was where Paul and Silas preached the gospel so successfully that the Jews, "being moved with jealousy," caused Jason and certain brethren to be dragged before the rulers of the city ("epi tois politar-choi"). These magistrates suffered themselves to be made the tools of the unscrupulous Jews by demanding and getting security from Jason and the rest.

WILLIAM BAUR

RULER OF THE FEAST (ἀρχηγός τοῦ συναγο-γοῦ; AV governor): The word occurs in the NT in the account of the wedding feast in Cana of Galilee (Jn 2:8-9). According to Eclesius (32:1) it was customary to appoint a "master of the ceremonies" from among the invited guests. It was his duty to determine the places of the guests, to see that the ordinary rules of etiquette were observed, etc., and generally to supervise the arrangements. RVm "steward" is possible if the "governor of the feast" meant the "head waiter" (Merx renders "head servant of the feast"), and not one of the guests appointed for a special purpose. But the context is in favor of the view that the person in question was one of the prominent guests—an intimate friend or relative of the host. See Ruler, 2, (2). T. LEWIS

RULER OF THE SYNAGOUGE. See Ruler, 3, (1), (2).

RULERS OF THE CITY. See Ruler, 1, (8), 2, (2), 3, (5).

RUMAH, ῥοῦμα (ῥοῦμα, ῥαμᾶ; B, Ρουμᾶ, Rhound, A, Ροῦμα, Rhound): To this place belonged Pecahiah whose daughter Zebudah (RV "Zebahdah") entered the harem of Josiah, king of Judah, and became the mother of Jehoiakim (2 K 23:36). Jos (Ant, x, v, 2) calls the place Abouma, but this is an obvious clerical error for Arouma. This suggests a possible identification with Arumah (Jgs 9:41), which lay not far from Shechem. Another possible identification is with the Rumah mentioned by Jos (BJ, III, vii, 21) in Galilee (cf Neubauer, Geog. du Talm, 203), which may be identical with the modern Kerit Râma, about 3 miles N. of Saferrâkh. Some, however, would identify Rumah with Dumah of Jos 15:52, where the substitution of r for d is supported by the LXX (Rhou- ma), possibly represented by the modern Dâmeh, about 13 miles S.E. of Beit Jôrbîn. This of course was in the territory of Judah, and no question of jas cannabium is involved, such as might arise in the case of a Galitalic site. W. EWING

RUMP, rump: AV uses this word as tr of ῥυμα, 'alyah (Ex 29:22; Lev 3:9; 7:3; 8:25; 9:19), where RV correctly renders "fat tail." Reference is here had to the broad tail of the Syrian sheep, which occasionally weighs as much as 20 lbs., and is considered one of the daintiest portions of mutton. It was one of those portions of the peace and trespass offering which were not eaten by the priest or the sacrificer, but which with other choice portions were waved before the Lord and wholly burnt on the altar as a sweet savor unto Jeh.

RUNAGATE, run'-a-gat: A runaway: "The runagates continue in scariness" (Ps 68:6, Prayer Book Version, RV "The rebellious dwell in a parched land").

RUNNER, run'-er. See Games.

RUSH: (1) Ναῇ, ñeme; ðπρότ, παπύρα, "bul-rushes," in "papyrus" [Ex 2:3]; "rush," in "papy-

russ" [Job 8:11]; "papyrus," AV "rush" [Isa 18:2]; "rushes" [55:7]: This is almost certainly the famous papyrus, Cyperus papyrus (N.O. Cyper-
ae), known as "papyrus" (Gr papyrus, a word from "papyros"); "rush," "rushes," "papyrus," "papyrus"

rus," "papyrus" (N.O. Cypernae), known as "papyrus" (Gr papyrus, a word from "papyros"); "rush," "rushes," "papyrus," "papyrus"

rus," [Job 8:11]; "papyrus," AV "rush" [Isa 18:2]; "rushes" [55:7]: This is almost certainly the famous papyrus, Cyperus papyrus (N.O. Cyper-

ae), known as "papyrus" (Gr papyrus, a word from "papyros"); "rush," "rushes," "papyrus," "papyrus"

rus," [Job 8:11]; "papyrus," AV "rush" [Isa 18:2]; "rushes" [55:7]: This is almost certainly the famous papyrus, Cyperus papyrus (N.O. Cyper-

ae), known as "papyrus" (Gr papyrus, a word from "papyros"); "rush," "rushes," "papyrus," "papyrus"

rus," [Job 8:11]; "papyrus," AV "rush" [Isa 18:2]; "rushes" [55:7]: This is almost certainly the famous papyrus, Cyperus papyrus (N.O. Cyper-

ae), known as "papyrus" (Gr papyrus, a word from "papyros"); "rush," "rushes," "papyrus," "papyrus"

ae), known as "papyrus" (Gr papyrus, a word from "papyros"); "rush," "rushes," "papyrus," "papyrus"

ae), known as "papyrus" (Gr papyrus, a word from "papyros"); "rush," "rushes," "papyrus," "papyrus"

ae), known as "papyrus" (Gr papyrus, a word from "papyros"); "rush," "rushes," "papyrus," "papyrus"
having married women of Moab, in the course of a further ten years also died, and left Orpah and Ruth widows (1: 5). Naomi then decided to return to Judah, and her two daughters-in-law accompanied her on her journey, and gave her the blessing which turned back and only Ruth remained with Naomi, journeying with her to Bethlehem, where they arrived "in the beginning of barley harvest" (1: 22). The piety and fidelity of Ruth are thus early exhibited in the course of the narrative, in that she refused to abandon her mother-in-law, although thrice exhorted to do so by Naomi herself, on account of her own great age and the better prospects for Ruth in her own country. Orpah yielded to persuasion, and returned to Moab, but Ruth remained with Naomi.

At Bethlehem Ruth employed herself in gleaning in the field during the harvest and was noticed by Boaz, the owner of the field, a near kinsman of her father-in-law Eleimelech. Boaz gave her permission to glean as long as the harvest continued; and told her that he had heard of her filial conduct toward her mother-in-law. Moreover, he directed the reapers to make intentional provision for her by dropping the extra grain in her way (2: 15). She was thus able to return to Naomi in the evening with a whole ephah of barley (ver. 17). In answer to questioning she explained that her success in gleaning was due to the good-will of Boaz, and that she was determined to go to his field and glean there. Naomi, her husband, and her son were all dead, and she had been left to Boaz to recall to him his duty as near kinsman of her late husband Eleimelech (3: 1 f.).

Boaz acknowledged the claim and promised to take Ruth in marriage, fulfilling all the legal requirements of marriage. He gave her a Levitical inheritance and sent her to Boaz to recall to him his duty as near kinsman of her late husband Eleimelech (3: 8-13). Naomi was confident that Boaz would fulfill his promise, and advised Ruth to wait in patience.

Boaz then adopted the customary and legal measures to secure a decision. He summoned the near kinsman before ten elders at the gate of the city, related to him the circumstances of Naomi's return, with her desire that Ruth should be married and settled with her father-in-law's land as her marriageportion, promising to acquit himself of his legal obligations. The near kinsman, whose name and degree of relationship are not stated, declared his inability to undertake the charge, which he renounced in legal form in favor of Boaz according to ancient custom in Israel (4: 6 f.). Boaz accepted the charge thus transferred to him, the elders and bystanders bearing witness and pronouncing a formal blessing upon the union of Boaz and Ruth (4: 9-12). Upon the birth of a son in due course the women of the city congratulated Naomi, saying that "A new name is come upon Israel; and the young man is dead, and the woman is alive again, and the house is restored as before" (4: 11). Naomi said to her husband, "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, who spake with his lips! Even I said it, and lo, it is come to pass!" (4: 13).

Thus the life and history of Ruth are important in the eyes of the narrator because she forms a link in the ancestry of the greatest king of Israel. From a more modern point of view the book exhibits an idyllic history, showing how the faithful loving service of Ruth to her mother-in-law met with its due reward in the restored happiness of a peaceful and prosperous home-life for herself. Incidentally are illustrated also ancient marriage customs of Israel, which in the time of the writer had long since become obsolete. The narrative is brief and told without affectation of style, and on that account will never lose its interest. It has preserved moreover the memory of an incident, the national significance of which they hold today, but to which value will always be attached for its simplicity and natural grace.

For the literature, see Ruth, Book of.

2. Authorship and Importance of the Narrative

RUTH, BOOK OF: The place which the Book of Ruth occupies in the order of the books of the Eng. Bible is not that of the Heb. Canon. The first book in the order is the famous "Pentateuch," or "five books," comprising the first five books of the Old Testament, and excluding Ruth. The second book in the order is Moses, or the "Book of the Law." Ruth occupies the second position because the book was appointed to be read at the Feast of Weeks which was one of the second of the 5 special days in Heb. MSS. However, the order was considered by the Masors, generally, and in one at least of the Gen. schools (ver. 15). Ruth precedes Cant. and in the former Ecc. is placed before Lam. The "m'ghillah" constitute the second portion of the "m'ghillah" order according to the structure of the books of the Heb. Scriptures. The Talm., however, associates Ruth altogether with the "m'ghillah," and places it first among the Hagiographies, before the Book of Ps. By the Gr. translators the book was removed to the position which it occupies in the Canon, and because it described events contemporaneous with the Judges, was attached as a kind of appendix to the latter work. This sequence was adopted in the Vulg., and so has passed into all modern Bibles.

The book is written without name of author, and there is no direct indication of its date. Its aim is to record an event of interest and importance in the family history of David, and incidentally to illustrate ancient custom and marriage law. There is no ground for supposing, as has been suggested, that the writer had a polemical purpose in view, and desired to show that the strict and stern action taken by Ezra and Nehemiah after the return in forbidding mixed marriages was not justified by precedent. The narrative is simple and direct, and the poignancy of the contrast which it records of the descent of Israel's royal house from a Moabite ancestress is probably due in the first instance to oral communication for some considerable time before it was committed to writing. The writer also has the advantage of an unwritten tradition between David and Moab, when during the period of his outlawry the future king confided his father and mother to the care of the king of Moab (1 & 23: 3 f.), and so fur supports the truth of the tradition which is embodied in the Book of Ruth.

With regard to the date at which the narrative was committed to writing, it is evident from the position of the Book of Ruth in the Heb. Canon that the date of its composition must be assigned to the close of the great period of the "earlier prophets." Otherwise it would have found a natural place, as was assigned to it in the Gr. Bible, together with the Book of Jgs and other historical writings, in the second division of the Heb. Scriptures. In the opening words of the book also, "It came to pass in the days when the judges judged" (Ruth 1: 1), the writer appears to look back to the period of the Judges as to a comparatively distant epoch. The character of the district is pure and畅通, but has been supposed in certain circles to betray the presence of so-called Aramaisms, to betray a late origin. The reference to the observance of marriage customs and their sanctions "in former time in Israel" (4: 7) does not necessarily imply that the composition of Ruth dates from such a time. It is possible that the laws and rights of the succession are enjoined, or
SABACHTHANI, sā-ba-kā-thā-nē. See Eli, Eli, LAMA SABACHTHANI.

SABACO, sab'a-ko, SABAKON, sab'a-kon. See So.

SABAENS, sa-ba'ons (םבאב'ון, sibba'ōnim; Joel 3 8 AV, צבאוים; 'Sabacon, Sabacon, Sabacon, Sabacon in Isa 45 14; צבאות, saba'oth). 1. Forms of read sibba'ōnim but rendered as though the Word from sibba', "to imbibe," hence "drunkards;" ol'ōn'áno, aín'oméni, "wine-drunkens" (Ezk 23 42 AV): "Sabaena" is also the tr. of the name of the country itself (םבאב'ון, sibba'ōn) in Job 3 15; 6 19. This last, which is the root of sibba'ōnim, is regarded by Arabists as coming from that root with the meaning of "to take captive," though sa'ba, "he raided" (cf Job 1 15), has also been suggested. As Sheba is said in Gen 10 7; 10 28; and 25 3 respectively to have been (1) a son of Raamah, the 4th son of Cush; (2) the 10th son of Joktan; son of Eber; (3) the 1st son of Joktan, son of Abraham and Keturah, at least two nationalities of this name are implied. The former were identified by Jos (Ant. II, x, 2) with the tall people of Saba in Upper Egypt, described by him as a city of Ethiopia, which Moses, when in the service of the Egyptians, besieged and captured. It is the Sem Sabaens, however, who are the best known, and the two genealogies attributed to them (Joktan-Eber and Jokhan-Abraham) seem to imply two settlements in the Sabaeans and their land regarded as that of their origin. As Ezechiel (27 23) mentions Haran Commerce (Hirran), Cushen (Kamannah), and Eden as being connected with Sheba, and these three places are known to have been in Southern Arabia, their Sem parentage is undoubted. The Sabaeans are described as being exporters of gold (Isa 60 6; Ps 72 15), precious stones (Ezk 27 28), perfumes (Job 28 20; Isa 28 16; Ezk 27:28), and if the rendering "Sabaens" for Joel 3 (4) 8 be correct, the Sheba, "a nation far off," dealt in slaves. See Seba; Sheba; Table of Nations.
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RUTH SABBATH

SABBANEUS, sab-a-ne'us (B, Sabaeanus, Sabæanclus, Sabæanclus, A, Bavaruos, Babylon; AV Banaan, following the Aldine): One of the sons of Asom who had married "strange wives" (1 Esd 3 33) = "Zabdi" in Ezr 10 33.

SABBANUS, sa-ban'us (Σαβανος, Săbanos; AV Sabban): The father of Moeth, one of the Levites to whom the silver and gold were delivered (1 Esd 8 63). "Moeth the son of Sabanus" stands in the position of "Noadiah the son of Binnui," in Ezr 8 33.

SABAOTH, sab'a-toth, sa-ha'th. See God, Names of, III, 8; LORD OF HOSTS.

SABAT, sab’a'tat: AV = RV Saphath, (2) (q.v.).

SABATEUS, sab-a-te'us (A, Σαβαταίας, Sabataias, B, Αφράδος, Abitaius; AV Sabateas): One of the Levites who "taught the law of the Lord" to the multitude (1 Esd 9 48) = "Shabbeathai" in Neh 8 7.

SABATHUS, sab’a-thus, Σαβαθούς, Săbathos; AV Sabatus): An Israelite who put away his "strange wife" (1 Esd 9 28) = "Zabdi" in Ezr 10 27.

SABATUS, sab’a-tus: AV = RV Sabatius (q.v.).

SABBAN, sab’a’n: AV = RV SABBAN (q.v.).

SABBATEUS, sab-a-te'us (Σαβαταίος, Sabataios; AV SABBATEUS: One of the three (or rather two, for "Levis" = Levite) "assessors" in the investigation held concerning "foreign wives" (1 Esd 9 14) = "Shabbeathai the Levite" in Ezr 10 15. He is probably the "Sabateus," one of the Levites who expounded the Law (1 Esd 9 48), and so = the "Shabbeathai" in Neh 8 7.

SABBATH, sab’ath (שבתח, shaphat, יתשתח, yeshaphath, יתשתתח, yitshaphath), šabata, tā šabata, tā šabbata; the y šabath in Heb means "to desist," "cease," "rest");

I. ORIGIN OF THE SABBATH
1. The Biblical Account
2. Critical Theories
II. History of the Sabbath after Moses

1. In the OT
2. In the Inter-Testamental Period
3. Jews and the Sabbath
4. Paul and the Sabbath

Literature

The Sabbath was the day on which man was to leave off his secular labors and keep a day holy to Jeh. 1. Origin of the Sabbath.—The sketch of creation in Gen 1:1-2:3 closes with an impressive account of the hallowing of the 7th day, but the rather abrupt and obscure form of the statement that God set apart the 7th day for holy purposes in honor of His own rest after six days of creative activity is boldly challenged by many modern scholars as merely the pious fiction of a priestly imagination of a later date. There are only a few hints of a weekly Sabbath before Moses, who is comparatively a modern character, that argumentation is almost excluded, and each student will approach the question with the bias of his own intellectual and spiritual history. There is no distinct mention of the Sabbath in Gen, though a 7-day period is referred to several times (Gen 7:4, 10; 8:10, 12; 29:27). The first express mention of the Sabbath is found in Ex 15:21-22, in connection with the giving of the manna. Jehu taught the people in the wilderness to observe the 7th day as a Sabbath of rest by sending no manna on that day, a double supply being given on the 6th day of the week. Here we have to do with a weekly Sabbath as a day of rest from ordinary secular labor. A little later the Ten Words were spoken by Jeh from Sinai in the hearing of all the people, and were afterward written on the two tables of stone (Ex 20:1-17; 31:18; 34:24-28). The Fourth Commandment enjoins upon Israel the observance of the 7th day as a sabbath week as a sabbath week on which no work shall be done by man or beast. Children and servants are to rest from all work, and even the stranger within the gates is required to keep the day holy. The reason assigned is that Jeh rested on the 7th day and blessed it and hallowed it. There is no hint that the restrictions were meant to guard against the wrath of a jealous and angry deity. The Sabbath was meant to be a blessing to man and not a burden. After the sin in connection with the golden calf Jeh rehearses the chief duties required of Israel, and again announces the law of the Sabbath (Ex 34:21, ascribed to J). In the Levitical legislation there is frequent mention of the Sabbath (Ex 31:13-16; 35:2). In Deut 19:33; 28:25). A willful Sabbath-breaker was to be put to death (Nu 15:32-36). In the Deuteronomical legislation there is equal recognition of the importance and value of the Sabbath (Dt 5:12-15). Here the reason assigned for the observance of the Sabbath is philanthropic and humanitarian: “that thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou.” It is thus manifest that all the Pentateuchal codes, whether proceeding from Moses alone or from many hands in wide-different centuries, equally recognize the Sabbath as one of the characteristic institutions of Israel’s religious and social life. If we cannot point to any observance of the weekly Sabbath prior to Moses, we can at least be sure that this was one of the institutions which he gave to Israel. From the days of Moses until now the holy Sabbath has been kept by devout Israelites. “The older theories of the origin of the Jewish Sabbath (connecting it with Egypt, with the day of Saturn, or in general with the sun) have been entirely abandoned” (see Astronomy, I, 5). The disposition at present is to regard the day as originally a lunar festival, similar to a Bab custom (Schrader, Stud. u. Krit., 1874), and as originally excluded, and its days are finally considered to have contained a term sabattu or sabattum, identical in form and meaning with the Heb word sabbaton.” Thus wrote Professor C. H. Toy in 1899 (JBL, XXVII, 190). In a syllabary (H 112, 16a, b) sabattum is said to be equivalent to the Akk. liddi, the natural tr of which seemed to be “day of rest of the heart.” Schrader, Sayce and others so understood the phrase, and naturally looked upon sabattum as equivalent to the Heb Sabbath. But Jensen and others have shown that the phrase should be rendered “day of the appointment of the mind” (of an offended deity). The reference is to a day of atonement or pacification rather than a day of rest, a day in which one must be careful not to arouse the anger of the god, whereas the Sabbath is observed on that particular day. Now the term sabattum has been found only 5 or 6 times in the Bab inscriptions and in none of them is it connected with the 7th day of a week. There was, however, a sort of institution among the Assyrians and Babylonians which has been compared with the Heb Sabbath. In certain months of the year (Elul, Marcheshvan) the 7th, 14th, 19th, 21st and 25th days were set down as favorable days, or unfavorable days, that is, as days in which the king, the priest and the physician must be careful not to eat the food prepared for them by the cook. On these days the king was not to eat food prepared by fire, not to put on royal dress, not to ride in his chariot, etc. As to the 19th day, it is thought that it was included among the unlucky days because it was the 49th (7 times 7) from the 1st of the preceding month. As there were 30 days in the month, it is evident that we are not dealing with a recurring 7th day in the week, as is the case with the Heb Sabbath. Moreover, no proof has been adduced that the term sabattum ever applied to nefasti or unlucky days. Hence the assertions of some Assyriologists with regard to the Bab origin of the Sabbath must be taken with several grains of salt. Notice must be taken of an ingenious and possible paper by W. C. M. Jastrow, presented before the Eleventh International Congress of Orientalists in Paris in 1897, in which the learned author attempts to show that the Heb Sabbath was originally a day of propitiation like the Bab sabattum (JUT, II, 312-33). He argues that the restrictive measures in the Heb laws for the observance of the Sabbath arose from the original conception of the Sabbath as an unfavorable day, a day in which the anger of Jeh might flash forth against men. Although Jastrow has supported his thesis with many arguments that are cogent, yet the reverent student of the Scriptures will find it difficult to resist the impression that the OT writers without exception thought of the Sabbath as an unfavorable day, which was the day on which Jeh might flash forth against men. Whatever may have been the attitude of the early Hebrews toward the day which was to become a characteristic institution of Judaism in all ages and in all lands, the organs of revelation throughout the OT enforce the observance of the Sabbath by frequent exhortations which lay emphasis upon its beneficial and humanitarian aspects.

We must call attention to Meinhoff’s ingenious hypothesis as to the origin of the Sabbath. In 1894
The wealth of learning and ingenuity expended in the search for the origin of the Sabbath has yet to reach the point of yielding small returns.

II. History of the Sabbath after Moses.—The early prophets and historians occasionally make mention of the Sabbath. It is sometimes named in connection with the festival of the new moon (2 K 4.23; Am 8.5; Hos 2.11; Isa 1.13; Zek 46.3). The prophets found fault with the worship on the Sabbath, because it was not spiritual nor prompted by love and gratitude. The Sabbath is exalted by the great prophets who faced the crisis of the Bab exile as one of the most valuable institutions in Israel's life. Great promises are attached to faithful observance of the holy day, and confession is made of Israel's unfaithfulness in profaning the Sabbath (Jer 17.21-27; Isa 56.2-4; 58.13; Eek 20.12-24). In the Pers period Nehemiah struggled earnestly to make the people of Jerusalem observe the law of the Sabbath (Neh 10.31; 13.15-22).

With the development of the synagogue the Sabbath became a day of worship and of study of the Law, as well as a day of cessation from all secular employment. That the pious in Israel carefully observed the Sabbath is clear from the conduct of the Maccabees and their followers, who at first declined to resist the onslaught made by their enemies on the Sabbath (1 Macc 2.29-38); but necessity drove the faithful to defend themselves against hostile attack on the Sabbath (2 Macc 2.39-41), and Ezra (Ezek 20.12-24) in the Pers period Nehemiah struggled earnestly to make the people of Jerusalem observe the law of the Sabbath (Neh 10.31; 13.15-22).

2. In the Inter-Testa-
mental Period

The subject is touched upon in other parts of the Mosaic code, and in the Gemara there are extended discussions, with citations of the often divergent opinions of the sages. In the Mish (Shabbat, vi.2) there are 39 classes of prohibited actions with regard to the Sabbath, and there is much hair-splitting in working out the details. The beginnings of this elaborate definition of actions permitted and actions forbidden are to be found in the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era. The movement was at flood tide during our Lord's earthly ministry and continued for centuries afterward, in spite of His frequent and vigorous protests. Apart from His claim to be the Messiah, there is no subject on which our Lord came into such sharp controversy with the religious leaders of the Jews as in the matter of Sabbath observance. He set himself squarely against the current rabbinic restric-

tions as contrary to the spirit of the original law of the Sabbath. The rabbis seemed to think that the Sabbath was an end in itself, an institution to which the pious Israelite must not only adhere but extend to all his personal interests; in other words, that man was made for the man-made Sabbath: man might suffer hardship, but the institution must be preserved inviolate. Jesus, on the contrary, taught that the Sabbath was made for man's benefit. If there should arise a conflict between man's needs and the letter of the Law, man's needs must have precedence over the law of the Sabbath (Mt 12.1-14; Mk 2.23-3.6; Lk 6.1-11; also Jn 5.1-18; Lk 13.10-17; 14.1-6). There is no reason to think that Jesus meant to discredit the Sabbath as an institution. It was His custom to attend worship in the synagogue on the Sabbath (Lk 4.16). The humane element in the rest day at the end of every week must have appealed to His sympathetic nature. It was the one precept of the Decalogue that was predominantly ceremonial, though it had distinct sociological and moral significance. As an institution for the benefit of toiling men and animals, Jesus held the Sabbath in high regard. As the Messiah, He was not subject to its restrictions; He could and did on occasion impart His lordship over the Sabbath (Mk 2.28). The institution was not on a par with the great moral precepts, which are unchangeable. It is worthy of note that, while Jesus pushed the moral precepts of the Decalogue into the inner realm of thought and desire, thus making the requirement more difficult and the law more exacting, He fought for a more liberal and lenient interpretation of the law of the Sabbath. Rigorous sabattarians must look elsewhere for a champion of their views.

The early Christians kept the 7th day as a Sabbath, much after the fashion of other Jews. Gradually the 1st day of the week came to be recognized as the day on which the followers of Jesus would meet for worship. The resurrection of our Lord on that day made it for Christians the most joyous day of all the week. When Gentiles were admitted into the church, the question at once arose whether they should be required to keep the Lord's Day as Jesus and His disciples had kept the Sabbath. In the earliest times there was much indecision on the point. The different groups of Christians had different customs (Acts 15.1-21). Paul boldly contended that believers in Jesus, whether Jew or Gentile, were set free from the burdens of the Mosaic Law. Even circumcision counted for nothing, now that men were saved by believing in Jesus (Gal 5.6). Christian liberty as proclaimed by Paul included all days and seasons. A man could observe special days or not, just as his own judgment and conscience might dictate (Rom 14.5 ff); but in all such matters one ought to be careful not to put a stumbling-block in another's way (Rom 14.13 ff). That Paul contended for personal freedom in respect of the Sabbath is made quite clear in Col 2.16 f, where he groups together dietary laws, feast days, new moons and sabbaths. The early Christians brought over into their mode of observing the Lord's Day the best elements of the Jewish Sabbath, without its onerous restrictions. See further Lord's Day; Ethics of Jesus, 1, 3, (1).
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SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST POSITION

The views entertained by Seventh-Day Adventists concerning the nature and obligation of the Sabbath may conveniently be presented under three general heads: (1) what the history says concerning the Sabbath; (2) what history says concerning the Sabbath; (3) the significance of the Sabbath.

(1) OT teaching—In their views concerning the institution and primal obligation of the Sabbath, Seventh-Day Adventists are in harmony with the Bible, the early representatives of nearly all the concerning denominations. The Sabbath is ascribed to the creation of man.

That the Sabbath thus instituted was well known throughout the Patriarchal age is clearly established both by direct evidence and by necessary inference.

(2) OT teaching—"If we had no other passage than this of Gen 2 3, there would be no difficulty in deciding in favor of the seventh-day Sabbath, as being the day consecrated to the Lord for the observance of the Sabbath, from the time that was consecrated to the Lord, and the two Sabbaths, the first and the second, are both to be regarded in the same light" (Lange's Comm. on Ge 2 3, 1871).

"And the day arrived when Moses went to Goshen to see his brethren, that he saw the children of Israel in their hardresses and hard labor, and Moses was grieved on their account. And Moses returned to Egypt and came to the house of Pharaoh; and he saw before the king, and Moses bowed down before the king. And Moses said unto Pharaoh, I pray thee, my lord, I come to shew a small request from thee, turn not away my face empty; and Pharaoh said unto him, Speak. And Moses spake, and said, "Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, 'Let my people go, that they may hold a solemn feast unto me at the sea, and in the wilderness. Then will I make thee free from all the burdens of the Egyptians, that thou mayest be my servant.' And Pharaoh said, Who is the Lord, that I should obey his voice to let Israel go? I know not the Lord, and will neither let Israel go. Get thee from among me, I pray thee, and take thy people, whom thou hast. But Moses said, Nay, Lord, not thus. Only let this people go a little way, that they may hold a solemn feast unto the Lord, and offer burnt offerings and sacrifices unto the Lord. And the Lord said, "Take a lakeside, and let the children go and hold a solemn feast unto the Lord." And Moses said, "Yea, it is well said that the Lord hath spoken.

"Then called Pharaoh to Moses and said, Behold, God hath multiplied thy evil toward me, and toward my people; and it is very grievous to me. Now therefore, forgive me this sin; I pray thee, and take thy people, the sheep and the cattle, and go. And Moses said, "But what shall I do to the people, if they say to me, What is it that thou hast done?" (Book of Joshua 70-71, 51. published by Noah & Gould, New York, 1849).

"Hence you can see that the Sabbath was before the Law of Moses came, and has existed from the beginning of the world. It was the first day of the week, which have preserved the true faith, met together and called upon God on this day. (Apoc. XXXV. p. 25)."

"Why should God begin two thousand years after (the creation of the world) to give men a Sabbath upon the reason of His rest from the creation? He might have called man to that commemoration before? And it is certain that this event was observed in the falling of the manna before the giving of the Law; and let any considering Christian judge . . . . (1) whether the not fastening of the rest of God’s people on the creation was like to be the original reason of the Sabbath; (2) and whether the first, should not have been said. Remember to keep holy the Sabbath day and on six days the manna fell, and not on the seventh; rather it, happened in six days God created heaven and earth, etc., and rested the seventh day." And it is

casually added. Therefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.” Nay, consider whether this annexed reason intimates not that the day on this ground being the true one, he said it was sent not down the manna on that day, and that He prohibited the people from seeking it (Richard Baxter, Practical Theology, VII. 774 ed. 1910; Huldah, Sabbath u. Woche im AT, 1903; Beer, Schabbath, 1908).

That the Sabbath was known to those who came out of Egypt, even before the giving of the Law at Sinai, is shown from the experience with the manna, as recorded in Ex 16 22-30. The double portion on the sixth day, and its preservation, was the constantly recurring miracle which reminded the people of their obligation to observe the Sabbath, and that the Sabbath was a definite day, the seventh day. To the people, first wondering at this remarkable occurrence, Moses said, “This is that which the Lord hath said, To morrow is the rest of the holy sabbath unto the Lord” (ver 25 AV). And to some who went out to gather manna on the seventh day, the Lord administered this rebuke: “How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?” (ver 28). All this shows that the Sabbath law was well understood, and that the failure to observe it rendered the people justly subject to Divine reproof.

At Sinai, the Sabbath was instituted as an institution, and had been observed during the intervening centuries, was enjoined to the Israelites on the statement of man’s duties usually designated as the “Ten Commandments.” It is treated as an institution already well known and the command is, “Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy” (Ex 20 8-11). The 4th commandment therefore states that the Sabbath is revealed. It is a memorial of the Creator’s rest at the close of those six days in which He made “heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them” (Gen 1 26-31). For this reason “Jehovah blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.” This blessing was not placed upon the day at Sinai, but in the beginning, when “God blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it” (Gen 2 3).

From the very nature of the basis of the Sabbath, as set forth in this commandment, both the institution itself and the definite day of the Sabbath are of a permanent nature. So long as it is true that God created heaven and earth, and all things therein, so long will the Sabbath remain a measure of man’s work; and so long as it is true that this creative work was completed in six days, and that God Himself rested on the seventh day, and was refreshed in the enjoyment of His completed work, so long will it be true that the memorial of that work can properly be celebrated only upon the seventh day of the week.

During all the period from the deliverance out of Egypt to the captivity in Babylon, the people of God were distinguished from the nations about them by the worship of the only true God, and the observance of His holy day. The proper observance of the true Sabbath would preserve them from idolatry, being a constant reminder of the one God, the Creator of all things. Even when Jeus was suffering from the attacks of the Babylonians, God assured His people, through the prophet Jeremia, that if they would hallow the Sabbath day, great should be their prosperity, and the city should remain forever (Jer 17 18). This shows that the spiritual observance of the Sabbath was the supreme test of man’s rest in God. He felt necessary to make prophecies of Isaiah, which deal primarily with the restoration from Babylon, remarkable promises were made to those who would observe the Sabbath, as recorded in Isa 56 1-7.

(2) OT teaching—From the record found in the four Gospels we learn that the Jews during all the previous centuries had preserved a knowledge both of the Sabbath institution and of the definite day.
It is equally plain that they had made the Sabbath burdensome by their own rigorous exactions concerning it. And Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath, both by example and by precept, brushed aside those exactions that He might reveal to the people the true Sabbath of the commandment as God gave it—a blessing and not a burden. A careful reading of the testimony of the evangelists will show that Christ taught the observance of the commandments of God, rather than the traditions of men, and that the charge of Sabbath-breaking was put against Him for no other reason than that He refused to allow the requirements of man to change the Sabbath, blessed of God, into a merely human institution, grievous in its nature, and enforced upon the people with many and troublesome restrictions.

All are agreed that Christ and His disciples observed the seventh-day Sabbath previous to the crucifixion. That His followers had received no intimation of any proposed change at His death, is evident from the recorded fact that on the day when He was in the tomb they rested, "on the sabbath...according to the commandment." (Lk 23:56) and that they treated the following day, the first day of the week, the same as of old, is further evidenced upon that day they came unto the sepulcher for the purpose of anointing the body of Jesus. In this, the resurrection of Jesus, there is recorded, in the history of the work of the disciples in proclaiming the gospel of a risen Saviour, no other Sabbath is recognized than the seventh day. Such evidence as is adduced, it would seem, in support of the theory that the seventh-day Sabbath is the proper designation of a well-known institution (Acts 15:1). In our Lord's great prophecy, in which He foretold the experience of the church between the first and the second advent, He declared that the seventh-day Sabbath as an existing institution at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem (70 AD), when He instructed His disciples, "Pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on a sabbath" (Mt 24:20). Such instruction given in these words in an evangel which was committed to the care of men in the extreme, had there been any such thing contemplated as the overthrow of the Sabbath law at the crucifixion, and the substitution of another day upon an entirely different basis.

That the original Sabbath is to be observed, not only during the present order of things, but also after the restoration when, according to the vision of the revelator, a new heaven and a new earth will take the place of the heaven and the earth that now are, is clearly intimated in the words of the Lord through the prophet Isaiah: "For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, and all flesh shall come to worship before me, saith Jeh" (Isa 66:23).

Seventh-Day Adventists regard the effort to establish the observance of another day than the seventh by using such texts as Jn 20:19, 26; Acts 20:7; 1 Cor 16:1, 2; Rev 1 10 as being merely an afterthought, an effort to find warrant for an observance established upon other than Bib. authority. During the last two or three centuries there has been no movement for the restoration of the original seventh-day Sabbath, not as a Jewish, but as a Christian, institution. This work, commenced and carried forward by the Seventh-Day Baptists, has been taken up and pushed with enlarged vigor by the Seventh-Day Adventists during the present generation, and the Bible teaching concerning the true Sabbath is now being presented in nearly every country, both civilized and uncivilized, on the face of the earth.

(1) Josephus.—This summary of history must necessarily be brief, as it will be impossible, for lack of space, to quote authorities. From the testimony of another nation, continued to observe the seventh-day Sabbath until their overthrow, when they were captured by the Romans (70 AD), colonies, and individuals, scattered over the face of the earth, have preserved the secret knowledge of the original Sabbath, and the definite day, until the present time. They constitute a living testimony for the benefit of all who desire to know the truth of this matter.

(2) Church History.—According to church history the seventh-day Sabbath was observed by the early church. And no other Sabbath was observed during the first two or three centuries (see HDB, IV, 322 b).

In the oft-repeated letter of Pliny, the Roman governor of Bithynia, inquiring about the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath at 112 AD, there occurs the expression, "a certain stated day," which was generally assumed to be in reference to this matter W. B. Taylor, in Historical Comm., ch. i, sec. 47, makes the following statement: "As the Sabbath day appears to have been quite as commonly observed at this date as the sun's day (if not even more so), and was referred to in the institution of the day referred to by Pliny was the 7th day as that it was the 1st day; though the latter is generally taken for granted." The seventh day was distinguished as the Sabbath by the circumstances that men did not fast upon it, and that they prayed standing up, and not kneeling, as Christ had now been raised from the dead. The festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance, and it was far from the intentions of the apostles to establish a Divine command in this respect, far from them, and from the early apostolic church, to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday. Perhaps at the end of the 2d cent., a false application of this kind had begun to false placed work. "God saved anything to have considered laboring on Sunday as a sin" (Tertullian De Orat., c. 23). This quotation is taken from his Newer, London, 1831, 1, 395, and is the correct tr.'t from Neander's first Gen. ed., Hamburg, 1826, I, p. 2, p. 339. 4. Neander has another quotation from the traditions of the church, in which he expressly stated that Sunday was only a human ordinance, but he has added nothing to the controversy. The Roman and New Testament evidence of the destruction of the first day of the week, Sunday, as a Sabbath, but as an institution, is too great to study the Word of God together and to celebrate the ordinances one with another: without a shadow of doubt this took place on the seventh-day Sabbath. (Geschichte des Sonntags, 69).

Gradually, however, the first day of the week came into prominence as an added day, but finally by civil and ecclesiastical authority as a required observance. The first legislation of its observance during the 4th or 5th cent., early in the history of the first day of the week by ecclesiastical authority, and in the great apostasy which followed, the civil day obtained the assent of the officials. During this period, however, there were always witnesses for the true Sabbath according to the great prophet, and in various lands, the knowledge of the true Sabbath has been preserved.

In the creation of the heavens and the earth the foundation of the gospel was laid. At the close of the book it is written, "for in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" (Gen 1:1). In the book of Revelation, the church is to be "an equal sign" and "an equal light" as the city of God (Revel 21:10). The Father of all ages has commented that the "word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart" (Heb 4:12). The Word of God is "the beginning of our salvation, and the end of our peace, and of all our good for evermore" (Ps 107:19, 20). The Word of God is "the light that enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world" (John 1:9).

3. The Significance of the Sabbath:

The Sabbath is the sign and the memorial of that creative power which is able to make all things good and perfect in the image of God, lost that image through sin. In the gospel, provision is made for the restoration of the image of God in the soul of man. The Creator is the Redeemer and redemption is the new creation. As the Sabbath was the sign of that creative power which wrought in Christ, the Word, in the making of the heaven and the earth and all things therein, so it is the sign of that same creative power working through the same eternal Word for the restoration of all things. Wherefore man is in a spiritual sense, there is a new creation: the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new" (2 Cor 5 17 m). "For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation" (Gal 6:15). "For he whose work is approved he will be made alive by the Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Cor 3:9).

A concrete illustration of this gospel meaning of the Sabbath is found in the deliverance of Israel from Egypt. The same creative power which was so powerfully exercised in the signs and miracles which preceded their deliverance, and in those miracles, such as the opening of the Red Sea, was used to deliver them. And the waters came to their place from the rock, which attended the journeys of the Israelites. In consequence of these manifestations of creative power in their behalf, the children of Israel were instructed to remember in their observance of the Sabbath "that they were not delivered as other nations were" (Ex 12:49). And therefore, the deliverance from Egypt is the type of every man's deliverance from sin; and the instruction to Israel concerning
the Sabbath shows its true significance in the gospel of salvation from sin, and the new creation in the image of God.

Furthermore, the seventh-day Sabbath is the sign of both the divinity and the deity of Christ. God only can create. He through whom this work is wrought must be one with God. To this the Scriptures testify: “In the beginning was the Word, . . . and the Word was God. . . . All things were made through him; and without him was not anything that was made” (John 1:1-3). But the same Word which was with God, and was God, “became flesh, and dwelt among us” (John 1:14). This is the eternal Son, “in whom we have our redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of his grace” (Ephesians 1:7). To the Christian the Sabbath, which was the sign and memorial of that Divine power which wrought through the eternal Word in the creation of the heaven and the earth, becomes the sign of the same power working through the same eternal Son to accomplish the new creation, and is thus the sign of both the divinity and the deity of Christ.

As much as the redemptive work finds its richest expression in the cross of Christ, the Sabbath, which is in the sign of that redemptive work, becomes the sign of the cross.

Seventh-Day Adventists teach and practise the observance of the Sabbath, not because they believe in salvation through man’s effort to keep the law of God, but because they believe in that salvation which alone can be accomplished by the creative power of God working through the eternal Son to create believers anew in Christ Jesus.

Seventh-Day Adventists believe, and teach, that the observance of any other day than the seventh as Sabbath is the sign of that predicted apostasy in which the man of sin would be revealed who would make himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped.

Seventh-Day Adventists believe, and teach, that the observance of the Sabbath in this generation is a part of that gospel work which is to make ready a people prepared for the Lord.

W. W. Prescott

SABBATH-BREAKING, s-brák'ing. See Crimes; Punishments.

SABBATH, COURT OF THE. See Covered Way.

SABBATH, DAY BEFORE THE. See Day before the Sabbath.

SABBATH DAY’S JOURNEY, jür’ni (σάββατον ὄβος, sabbathon hadès): Used only in Acts 1:12, where it designates the distance from Jerusalem to the Mount of Olives on which Jesus and His disciples on the day of His ascension. The expression comes from rabbinical usage to indicate the distance a Jew might travel on the Sabbath without transgressing the Law, the command against working on that day being interpreted as including travel (see Exodus 16:27–30). The limit set by the rabbis to the Sabbath day’s journey was 2,000 cubits from one’s house or domicile, which was derived from the statement found in Joshua 3:4 that this was the distance between the ark and the people on their march, this being assumed to be the distance between the tents of the people and the tabernacle during the sojourn in the wilderness. Hence it must have been allowable to travel thus far to attend the worship of the tabernacle. We do not know when this assumption in regard to the Sabbath day’s journey was made, but it seems to have been in force in the time of Christ. The distance of the Mount of Olives from Jerusalem is stated in Jos (Ant. XXI. viii. 6) to have been five stadia or furliongs and in Justin, I, xvi. 7, six stadia; the discrepancy being explained by supposing a different point of departure. This would make the distance of the Sabbath day’s journey from 1,000 to 1,200 yds., the first agreeing very closely with the 2,000 cubits. The rabbis, however, invented a way of increasing this distance without technically infringing the Law, by depositing some food at the 2,000-cubit limit, before the Sabbath, and declaring that spot a temporary domicile. They might then proceed 2,000 cubits from this point without transgressing the Law.

And in some cases even this intricacy of preparation was unnecessary. If, for instance, an approach to the Sabbath found one on his journey, the traveler might select some tree or some stone wall at a distance of 2,000 paces and mentally declare this to be his residence for the Sabbath, in which case he was permitted to go the 2,000 paces to the selected tree or wall and also 2,000 paces beyond, but in such a case he must do the work thoroughly and must say: “I will be under the shade of that tree,” for if he merely said: “Let my Sabbath residence be under that tree,” this would not be sufficient, because the expression would be too general and indefinite (Tract. ‘Erubin 4:7).

Other schemes for extending the distance have been devised, such as regarding the quarter of the town in which one dwells, or the whole town itself, as the domicile, thus allowing one to proceed from any part of the town to a point 2,000 cubits beyond its utmost limits. This was most probably the case with walled towns, at least, and boundary stones have been found in the vicinity of Gaza with inscriptions supposed to mark these limits. The 2,000-cubit limits around the Levitical cities ( Numbers 35:5) may have suggested the limit of the Sabbath day’s journey also. The term came to be used as a designation of distance which must have been more or less definite.

H. Porter

SABBATH, MORROW AFTER THE. See Morrow after the Sabbath.

SABBATH, SECOND AFTER THE FIRST (σαββάτων δυτικάπρωτον, sabbaton deutérica-proton; [Lev. 6:1]), lit. “the second-first sabbath,” of RV’s): We will mention only a few of the explanations elicited by this expression. (1) It was the first Sabbath in the second year of a 7-year cycle comprising the period from one Sabbath year to the other; (2) the first Sabbath after the second day of Passover, i.e., the first of the seven Sabbaths the Hebrews were to “count unto” themselves from the “morrow after the sabbath” (the day after Easter) until Pentecost (Leviticus 23:15); (3) the first Sabbath in the Jewish ecclesiastical year (about the middle of March), the first Sabbath in the civil year (about the middle of September) being counted as the “first-first” sabbath; (4) the Sabbath of the second month, which was a monstrous combination of the words deutéros, “second,” and prōtos, “first,” attributable to unskilful attempts at textual emendation on the part of copyists. This supposition would, of course, render unnecessary all other efforts to unravel the knotty problem, and, as a matter of fact, deutério-prōtos is omitted by many MSS (including A and B). To those not feeling inclined to accept this solution we would suggest the first of the above-named explanations as the most natural and probable one.

William R. Baird

SABATHUS, sub-a-th'-us: AV=RV Sabathus (q.v.).

SABBATHS, sabbath’s, OF YEARS (يقين يارب, yârîb yârib; shabbathôn shâbâhôn; ἄναπαύεις ἅτομ, ēnāpāyeis ἅtōm, ἀναπαύομαι eînō), The seven sabbatic years preceding the Year of Jubilee. See SABBATICAL YEAR; Jubilee Year; Astronomy, I, 5.

SABBATICAL, sa-bat’ik-al, Year (יֵשׁשָׂבָת yâshâbâh; כַּאֲשֶׁר שָׂבָתָה, kâasher šâbâthâ; יָשָׂר, šârî; יָשָׂר אֵשֶׁר שָׂבָתָה, šârî eshîr šâbâthâ; יִשָּׂר עֵשֶׁר עֵשֶׁר שָׂבָתָה, šârî u’eser u’eser šâbâthâ; יִשָּׂר עֵשֶׁר יְשָׂר עֵשֶׁר שָׂבָתָה, šârî u’eser yârîb šâbâthâ; יִשָּׂר עֵשֶׁר עֵשֶׁר עֵשֶׁר יִשָּׂר עֵשֶׁר שָׂבָתָה, šârî u’eser u’eser yârîb šâbâthâ), “a year of solemn rest”; or יָשָׂר אֵשֶׁר הִשָּׂר עֵשֶׁר עֵשֶׁר שָׂבָתָה, yârîb hâšâr u’eser u’eser šâbâthâ; shabbathôn shâbâhôn; ráḇbâta ṭâvânuwâs, sabbata anaḥpâusâs, “a sabbath of solemn rest” [Leviticus 25:4];
1. Primary Intention

The Covenant Book (Dt 15:9–32:32) is a complex document, and its final form may well have been created by a redactor who wanted to consolidate the earlier phases of the Covenant. The final form of the book is a patchwork of earlier material, and it is not always clear where the redactor left off and where he began. The book begins with the formula, "This is the law which you shall speak to the children of Israel," and then goes on to describe the ceremonial law. The book ends with the formula, "This is the law which you shall speak to the children of Israel," and then goes on to describe the ceremonial law.

2. Mosaic Legislation

The book begins with the formula, "This is the law which you shall speak to the children of Israel," and then goes on to describe the ceremonial law. The book ends with the formula, "This is the law which you shall speak to the children of Israel," and then goes on to describe the ceremonial law.

3. General Observance of the Feast of Tabernacles (booths) began five days later and it lasted from the 15th day to the 21st of the month (Tisri). In the Sabbatical year, at that time, the Law was read "before all Israel in their hearing," a fact which tends to prove that the Sabbatical year became a matter of general and simultaneous observance (cf Dt 31:10–13). Another lesson may be deduced from this passage: it gives us a hint respecting the use to which the people may have put their leisure time during the 12 months of Sabbatical rest; it may have been a period of religious and probably other instruction.

4. Central Idea

The central thought is brought home to them, viz. God is the owner of the soil, and through His grace only the chosen people have come into its possession. Their time, i.e. they themselves, belong to Him: this is the deepest meaning of the day of rest; their land, i.e. their means of subsistence, belong to Him: this reveals to us the innermost significance of the year of rest. It was Jehovah's pleasure to call the children of Israel into life, and if they live and work and prosper, they are indebted to His unmerited loving-kindness. They should, therefore, put their absolute trust in Him, never doubt His word or His power, always obey Him and so always receive His unbounded blessings.

5. The possibility of observing the precept respecting the Sabbatical year is demonstrated by the post-exilic history of the Jewish people. Nehemiah registers the solemn fact that the reestablished nation entered into a covenant to keep the law and to maintain the temple worship (Neh 9:10; 30:22). In ver 31 of the last-named chapter he alludes to the 7th year, "that we would forego the 7th year, and the exact nature of the short allusion; it may refer to the Sabbatical rest of the land and the suspension of debts.

For a certainty we know that the Sabbatical year was observed by the Jews at the time of Alexander the Great. When he was petitioned by the Samaritans "that he would remit the tribute of the 7th year to them, because they did not sow therein, he asked who they were that made such a petition"; he was told they were Hebrews, etc (Jos, Ant, XI, 8:6).

During Maccabean and Asusmenian times the law regarding the Sabbatical year was strictly observed, although it frequently weakened the cause of the Jews (1 Macc 6:40,55; Jos, Ant, XIII, vii, 1; cf 2 Macc 1, 2, 4; Ant, XIV, v, 6; XIV, 1, 2). Again we may find references to the Sabbatical year in Jos, Ant, XIV, v, 2, etc. Tac. Hist. v, etc, all of which testifies to the observance of the Sabbatical year in the Herodian era. The words of Tacitus show the popular aspect of the Roman's estimate of the Jewish character and customs: "For the 7th day they are said to have prescribed rest because this day ended their labors; then, in addition, being allured by their lack of energy, they also spend the 7th year in laziness. See also Astronom. 1:5, 6; 3:4; Juvid. Year. W. D. Baird
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SABBATH, THE

SABREUS, sa-bri'as (Σαβρεύς, Sabretos): In 1 Esd 9:32, the same as “Shemaijah” in Ex 10:31.

SABI, sâ'bi:
(2) AV = RV Sabie (q.v.).


SABIE, sâ'bi-bel (Σαβίθ, Sabith, or Σαβίθ, Sabit; AV Sabi): In 1 Esd 5:34 both AV and RV, following A, read “the sons of Phaceareth, the sons of Sabie” (AV “Sabith”) for the “Pochereth-hazzaiim” of Ex 2:57; Neh 7:59. B reads correctly as one proper name: “Phaceareth Sabit.”

SABTA, or SABTAH, sab'ta (סבתא, sabbathâ, סבתה, sabbâthâ): Third son of Cush (Gen 10:7 = 1 Ch 1:9). A place Sabita is probably to be looked for in South Arabia. Arab geographers give no exact equivalent of the name. Al Bekri (1685) quotes a line of early poetry in which Dhu ’l Sabta is mentioned, and the context might indicate a situation in Yemenah; but the word is possibly not a proper name. It is usually identified with Sabatha (Ptol., vi.7, 38) or with the Subota of Pliny (vi.32; xii.32), an old mercantile city in South Arabia celebrated for its trade in frankincense and, according to Ptolemy, possessing 60 temples. It is said also to have been the territory of a king Elishars, whose name presents a striking resemblance to Dhu ’l-Asihâr, one of the “Tubbâs” or Himyarite kings of Yemen. Another conjecture is the Saphtha of Ptolemy (vi.7, 30) near the Arabian shore of the Pers Gulf.

A. S. Fulton

SABTECA, sab'te-ka (סבסכה, sabbathykhâ; Σαβσεκά, Sabakathâ, Σαβσεκά, Sabethachâ; AV Sabtechah): The 5th named of the sons of Cush in the genealogy of Gen 10:5-7. In 1 Ch 1:8-9 AV reads “Sabtechah” RV “Sabteca.” Many conjectures have been made as to the place here indicated. Recently Glazer (Skizer, II, 252) has revived the suggestion of Bochart that it is to be identified with Samydeca in Carmania on the E. of the Pers Gulf. This seems to rest on nothing more than superficial resemblance of the names; but the phonetic changes involved are difficult. Others have thought of various places in Arabia, toward the Pers Gulf; but the data necessary for any satisfactory decision are not now available.

W. Ewing

SACAR, sâ'kar (סָכָר, sakhar): (1) Father of Ahiam, a follower of David (1 Ch 11:35, B, ‘Aqâp, Achôr, A, Ξαχρ, Sacar = “Sharar” of 2 S 23:33; Sharar is favored as the original reading).
(2) Eponym of a family of gatekeepers (1 Ch 26:4).

SACKBUT, sak'but. See Music, III, 1, (f).

SACKCLOTH, sak'klôth. See Burial.

SACRAMENTS, sak'ra-ments: The word “sacrament” comes from the Lat sacramentum, which in the classical period of the language was used in two chief senses: (1) as a legal term to denote the sum of money deposited by two parties to a suit which was forfeited by the loser and appropriated to sacred uses; (2) as a military term to designate the oath of obedience taken by newly enlisted soldiers. Whether referring to an oath of obedience or to something similar, there is no room for a separate term. It is evident that sacramentum would readily lend itself to describe such ordinances as Baptism and the Lord’s Supper. In the Gr NT, however, there is no word nor even any general idea corresponding to “sacramentum,” nor does the earliest history of Christianity afford any trace of the application of the term to certain rites of the church. Pliny (c 112 AD) describes the Christians of Bithynia as “binding themselves by a sacramentum to commit no kind of crime” (Epp. x.97), but scholars are now quite generally agreed that Pliny here uses the word in its old Rom sense of an oath or solemn obligation, so that its occurrence in this passage is nothing more than an interesting coincidence.

It is in the writings of Tertullian (end of 2d and beginning of 3d cent.) that we find the first evidence of the adoption of the word as a technical term to designate Baptism, the Eucharist, and other rites of the Christian church. The word sacramentum may have been partly occasioned by the evident analogies which the word suggests with Baptism and the Eucharist; but what appears to have chiefly determined its history in this direction was the fact that in the Old Lat VSS (as afterward in the Vulg) it had been employed to translate the Gr ἱματισμός, ἱματισμός, “a mystery” (e.g. Eph 5:32; 1 Tim 3:16; Rev 1:20; 17:7)—an association of ideas which was greatly fostered in the early church by the rapidly growing tendency to an assimilation of Christian worship with the mystery-practices of the Gr-Rom world.

Though esp. employed to denote Baptism and the Eucharist, the name “sacraments” was for long used so loosely and vaguely that it was applied to facts and doctrines of and Christianity as well as to its symbolic rites. Augustine’s definition of a sacrament as “the visible form of an invisible grace” is far limited by its application by But we see how widely even a definition like this might be stretched when we find Hugo of St. Victor (12th cent.) enumerating as many as 30 sacraments that had been recognized in the church. The Council of Trent was more exact when it decreed that visible forms are sacraments only when they present an invisible grace and become its channels, and when it sought further to delimit the sacramental area by reissuing (1547) a decision of the Council of Florence (1439), in which for the first time the authority of the church was given to a suggestion of Peter Lombard (12th cent.) and other schoolmen that the number of the sacraments should be fixed at seven, viz. Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony—a suggestion which was supported by certain fanciful analogies designed to show that seven was a sacred number.

The divergence of the Protestant churches from this definition and scheme was based on the fact that these proceeded on no settled principles. The notion that there are seven sacraments has no NT authority, and must be described as purely arbitrary; while the definition of a sacrament is still so vague that anything but an arbitrary selection of particular rituals is perfectly arbitrary, for example, to place Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, which were instituted by Christ as ordinances of the church, in the same category with marriage, which rests not on His appointment but on a natural relationship between the sexes that is
as old as the human race. While, therefore, the Reformers retained the term "sacrament" as a convenient one to express the general idea that has to be the object of the church, they found the distinguishing marks of sacraments (1) in their institution by Christ, (2) in their being enjoined by Him upon His followers, (3) in their being bound up with His word and revelation in such a way that they become "the expressions of Divine thoughts, the visible symbols of Divine acts." And as Baptism and the Lord's Supper are the only two rites for which such marks can be claimed, it follows that there are only two NT sacraments. Their unique place in modern Thought may be seen in separating them from all other rites and ceremonies that may have arisen in the history of the church, since it raises them to the dignity of forming an integral part of the historical gospel. A justification for their being classed together under a common name may be found, again, in the way in which they are associated in the NT (Acts 2 41.42; 1 Cor 10 1-4) and also in the analogy which Paul traces between Baptism and the Lord's Supper (1 Cor 11). In addition—those two most distinctive rites of the Old Covenant—on the other (Col 2 11; 1 Cor 5 7; 11 26).

The assumption made above, that both Baptism and the Lord's Supper owe their origin as sacraments of the church to their definite appointment by Christ Himself, has been strongly challenged by some modern critics.

In regard to Baptism it has been argued that as Mk 16 15f occurs in a passage (vs 9-20) which textual criticism has shown to have formed part of the original Gospel, Mt 28 19, standing by itself, is too slender a foundation to support the belief that the ordinance rests upon a infliction of Jesus, more esp. as its statements are inconsistent with the results of historical criticism. These results, it is affirmed, prove that all the narratives of the Forty Days are legendary, that Mt 28 19 in particular only canonizes a later ecclesiastical situation, that Universalism is contrary to the facts of early Christian history, and its Trinitarian formula "foreign to the mouth of Jesus" (see Harnack, History of Dogma, I, 79, and the references there given). It is evident, however, that some of these objections are based upon anti-supernatural pre-suppositions that really beg the question at issue, and others on conclusions for which real premises are wanting. Over against them all we have to set the positive and weighty fact that from the earliest days of Christianity Baptism appears as the rite of initiation into the fellowship of the church (Acts 2 38.41, et passim), and that even Paul, with all his freedom of thought and spiritual interpretation of the gospel, never questioned its necessity (of Rom 6 3ff; 1 Cor 13 14; Eph 4 5). On any other supposition than that of its appointment by Our Lord Himself it is difficult to conceive how within the brief space of years between the death of Jesus and the apostle's earliest references to the subject, the ordinance should not only have originated but have established itself in so absolute a manner for Jewish and gentile Christians alike.

(2) In the case of the Lord's Supper the challenge of its institution by Christ rests mainly upon the fact that the saying, "This do in remembrance of me," is absent from the Mk-Mt text, and is found only in the Supper-narratives of Paul (1 Cor 11 24.25) and his disciple Luke (Lk 22 19). Upon this circumstance large structures of critical hypothesis have been reared. It has been affirmed that in the upper room Jesus was only holding a farewell supper with His disciples, and that it never occurred to Him to institute a feast of commemoration. It has further been maintained that the views of Jesus regarding the speedy consummation of His kingdom make it impossible that He could have dreamed of instituting a sacrament to commemorate His death. The significance of the feast was eschatological merely; it was a pledge of a glorious future hour in the perfected kingdom of God (see Mt 26 and parallels). And the theory has even been advanced that the institution of this sacrament as an ordinance of the church designed to commemorate Christ's death was due to the initiative of Paul, who is supposed to have been influenced in the course of time by what he had seen in Corinth and elsewhere of the mystery-practices of the Greeks. All these hypothetical fabrics fall, of course, to the ground if the underlying assumption that Jesus never said, "This do in remembrance of me," is shown to be unwarrantable. And it is unwarrantable to assume that a saying of Jesus which is vouched for by Paul and Luke cannot be authentic because it does not occur in the corresponding narrative of the Synoptics, which are highly compressed in any case, the first two evangelists seem to have confined themselves to setting down those sayings which formed the essential moments of the Supper and gave its symbolic content. Moreover, they may have regarded as sufficiently embodied and expressed in the universal practice of the church from the earliest days. For as to that practice there is no question (Acts 2 42.46; 20 7; 1 Cor 11 20-26), and just as the church rested upon the belief that Christ had enjoined it. "Every assumption of its having originated in the church from the recollection of intercourse with Jesus at table, and the necessity felt for recalling His death, is precluded" (Weissäcker, Apostolic Age, II, 279). That the simple historical supper of Jesus with His disciples in the upper room was converted by Paul into an institution for the gentle and Jewish churches alike is altogether inconceivable. The primitive church had its bitter controversies, but there is no trace of any controversy as to the origin and institutional character of the Lord's Supper.

In the NT the sacraments are presented as means of grace. Forgiveness (Acts 2 38.41, et passim), spiritual quickening (Col 2 13), is associated with Baptism; the Lord's Supper is declared to be a participation in the body and blood of Christ (1 Cor 10 16). So far all Christians are agreed; but wide divergence shows itself thereafter. According to the doctrine of the Rom church, sacraments are efficacious ex opere operato, i.e. in virtue of a power inherent in themselves as outward acts whereby they communicate saving benefit to those who receive them without opposing any obstacle. The Reformed doctrine, on the other hand, teaches that their efficacy lies not in themselves as outward acts, but in the blessing of Christ and the operation of His Spirit, and that it is conditioned by faith in the recipient. The traditional Lutheran doctrine agrees with the Reformed in affirming that faith is necessary as the condition of saving benefits in the use of the sacraments, but resembles the Rom teaching in ascribing the efficacy of Baptism and the Lord's Supper not to the attendant working of the Holy Spirit, but to a real inherent and objective virtue resident in them—a virtue, however, which does not lie (as the Rom church says) in the mere elements and actions of the sacraments, but in the power of the Divine word which they embody. See Baptism; Lord's Supper.
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LITERATURE
I. TERMS AND DEFINITIONS.

1. zebah, "sacrifice":
   (a) 2638, "burnt offering";
   (b) 495, "sacrifice," "offering";
   (c) 13.18, "sacrifice," "guilt" or "trespass offering";
   (d) 13.18, "shemel," "peace offerings";
   (e) 13.9, "minhah," "offering";
   (f) 13.9, "zebhab shaltim," "sacrifice of peace offerings";
   (g) 13.9, "zebhab ha-todah," "thank offerings";
   (h) 13.9, "zebhab m'dahah," "free-will offerings";
   (i) 13.9, "zebhab netekh," "votive offerings";
   (j) 13.9, "tsnephah," "wave offering";
   (k) 13.9, "tsamah," "heave offering".

2. zebhab, "sacrificing animal."
3. sh'lamim, "burnt offerings," sometimes whole burnt offering.

4. Abel: a "sacrificed animal," a "sacrifice," general term for animals used in sacrifice, including burnt offerings, peace offerings, thank offerings, and all sacrifices offered to the Deity and eaten at the festivals. More particularly it refers to the flesh eaten by the worshippers after the sacrifice had been burnt on the altar, which the priest had received his portion.

5. Afodah: a "burnt offering," sometimes whole burnt offering. Derived from the vb. 'olah, "to go up." It may mean "that which goes up to the altar" (Knobel, Wellhausen. Nowack, etc.), or "that which goes up in smoke to the sky" (Bähr, Delitzsch, Dillmann, etc.).
6. ze'lah: a "peace offering," "transgression offering." Sometimes used synonymously with kal'alah, "compensation," the word applied to beast or fowl when entirely consumed upon the altar, the hide of the beast being taken by the priest. This was perhaps the most solemn of the sacrifices, and symbolized worship in the full sense, i.e. adoration, devotion, dedication and supplication, and at times expiation.

7. hattah: hattah: a "sin offering." A special kind first mentioned in the Mosaic legislation. It is essentially expiatory, intended to restore covenant relations with the Deity. The special features were: (1) the blood must be sprinkled before the sanctuary, put upon the horns of the altar of incense and poured out at the base of the altar of burnt offering; (2) the flesh was holy, not to be touched by worshipper, but eaten by the priest only. The special ritual of the Day of Atonement centers around the sin offering.

8. Shalem, sh'lamim, "peace offering," generally used in the pl., sh'lamim only once shalem (Am 522). These were sacrifices of friendship expressing or procuring peaceful relations with the Deity, and almost invariably accompanied by a meal or feast, an occasion of great joy.

9. Minhah, minhah, "offering," "offering," "trespass offering" (AV: in Isa 5310, AV and RV) "an offering for sin." AV: Minhah, "trespass offering, " sinnah, "sinner." A special kind of sin offering introduced into the Mosaic Law and concerned with offences against God and man that could be estimated by a money value and thus covered by consecration or restitution accompanying the offering. A ram of different degrees of value, equal at least two sheep, calves, was the usual victim, and it must be accompanied by full restitution with an additional fifth of the value of the damage. The leper and Nazirite could offer the "transgression offering," in which case the Deity was expiated by the blood poured out, and the guilt transferred upon the offering, and the leper was cleansed.

10. Ahnon: "gilt offering," "trespass offering." (AV: in Isa 5310, AV and RV) "an offering for sin." AV: Minhah, "trespass offering, " sinnah, "sinner." A special kind of sin offering introduced into the Mosaic Law and concerned with offences against God and man that could be estimated by a money value and thus covered by consecration or restitution accompanying the offering. A ram of different degrees of value, equal at least two sheep, calves, was the usual victim, and it must be accompanied by full restitution with an additional fifth of the value of the damage. The leper and Nazirite could offer the "transgression offering," in which case the Deity was expiated by the blood poured out, and the guilt transferred upon the offering, and the leper was cleansed.
to Deity and given back by Him to the offerer to be used in the priestly service. **Trūnḥah**: "heave offering," something lifted up, or, properly, separated from the rest and given to the service of Deity in the expressing homage or thanksgiving thus separated for the priest. The term is applied to products of the soil, or portion of land separated unto the Divine service, etc.

**Korban**: "an oblation," or "offering"; another generic term for all kinds of offerings, animal, vegetable, or even gold and silver. Derived from the vb. **Kārah**, "to draw near," it signifies what is drawn or brought near and given to God, thus a gift, although in a sort of etherized food.

**Koll**: "whole burnt offering," the entire animal being burned upon the altar. Sometimes used synonymously with "ōde." A technical term among the Cădrăgiuns.

**Kaphra**: a "feast," used metaphorically for a sacrificial feast because the meat of the sacrifices constituted the meat of the feast. "Līẖah**: "frankincense," "incense," used in combination with the meal offerings and burnt offerings and burned also upon the altar in the holy place. See **Incense**.

**Cīreḥ**: "smoke," or "libation," a liquid offering of wine, rarely water, sometimes of oil, and usually accompanying the ṣidq, but often with the peace offerings.

**keleton**: "a feast," used metaphorically for a sacrificial feast because the meat of the sacrifices constituted the meat of the feast. "Līẖah**: "frankincense," "incense," used in combination with the meal offerings and burnt offerings and burned also upon the altar in the holy place. See **Incense**.

**Shemen**: oil, generally olive oil, used with the meal offerings of cakes and wafers, etc.

Sacrifice is thus a complex and comprehensive term. In its simplest form it may be defined as "a gift to God." It is a presentation to Deity of some material object, the possession of the offerer, as an act of worship. It may be to attain, restore, maintain or to celebrate friendly relations with the Deity. It is religion in action—in early times, almost the whole of religion—an inseparable accompaniment to all religious exercises. Few or many motives may actuate it. It may be wholly pietistic and espontaneous, or an offering of food as a gift to God. It may be practically a Briah, or prayer, an expression of dependence, obligation and thanksgiving. It may express repentance, faith,adoration, or all of these combined. It was the one and only way of approach to God. Theophylact defined the sacrifice as "a sacred offering", and need. Hubert and Mauss define it as "a religious act which by the consecration of the victim modifies the moral state of the sacrificer, or of certain material objects which he has in view, i.e., either confers sanctity or removes it and its analogue, impurity."

II. **Origin and Nature of Sacrifices.**—The beginnings of sacrifice are hidden in the mysteries of prehistoric life. The earliest narrative in Gen records the fact, but gives no account of the origin and primary idea. The custom is sanctioned by the sacred writings, and later on the long-established custom was adopted and systematized in the Mosaic Law. The practice was almost universal. The Vedas have their elaborate rituals. Some Semitic peoples, Greeks, Romans, Africans, and Indians of Mexico offered human sacrifices. It is unknown in Australia, but even there something akin to it exists, for some natives offer a portion of a kind of honey, others offer a pebble or a spear to their god. For many years a universal habit of the race, several solutions are offered.

One view maintains that God Himself initiated the rite by Divine order at the beginnings of human history. Such a theory implies a monothestic faith on the part of primitive man. This theory was strongly held by many of the Rabbis. It formed these logians, and was based mainly on the narrative in Gen 4:14. Abel offered an acceptable sacrifice, and, according to He 11:4, this was a strong plea as follows: Since faith was a Divine Revelation what made the sacrifice acceptable to God, this faith must have been based upon a positive enactment of God in the past. Without this Divine positive enactment to guarantee its truthfulness, faith, in Abel, would have been superstition. In other words, faith, in order to be truly based and properly directed, must have a revelation from God, a positive expression of the Divine will. Fairbairn, in his *Typology*, goes further and says that the acts of Abel and Eve were clothed from animals which had been slain in sacrifices. This is entirely without support in the narrative. The theory of a Divine order cannot be maintained on the basis of the Bib. narrative. Moreover, it involves certain assumptions regarding the nature of faith and revelation which are not generally held in this age. A revelation is not necessarily a positive Divine command, an external thing, and faith may be just as real and true without such a revelation. It is possible that there may have been such a revelation cannot be denied, but it is not a necessary or probable explanation.

1. **The gift-theory.**—By this it is held that sacrifices were originally presented to the deity by the offerer for the good received or the good to be expected; thus the sacrifice offered for a harvest or for a child or for a victory or for a crop or for a rain or for a good fortune or for a blessing, etc. The sacrifice sought and expected was the return.
Sacraments, 75) first advocated this, holding that the efficacy of sacrifies is "the fact that eating and drinking were the ordinary symbols of friendship, and the burnt offerings were the usual rites in engaging in covenants and leagues." Thus sacrifies are more than gifts; they are tokens of hospitality, which knit god and worshipper together. W. R. Smith has expounded the idea into the modern economy of sacrifice—what actually the sacrifice partakes of it. Though this view may contain an element of truth in respect to certain Arabian customs, it does not help to account for all sacrifies. A. B. Davidson says, "it falls utterly to account for the burnt offering, which was one of the earliest, most solemn and at times the most important of all the sacrifies."

(4) The sacramental communion theory.—This is a modification of the table-bond theory. The basis of it is the totemistic theory of reverencing an animal which is believed to share with man the Divine nature. On certain solemn occasions this animal would be sacrificed to furnish a feast. At this meal, according to men's savage notions, they literally "ate the god," and thus incorporated into themselves the physical, the intellectual and the moral qualities which characterized the animal. If the Divine life dwelt in certain animals, then a part of that precious life would be distributed among all the people (Rs 5, 313). In some cases the blood is drunk by the worshippers, thus imbibing the life. Sometimes the case of a camel, this was devoured the quivering flesh before the animal was really dead, and the entire carcass was eaten up before morning.

The brilliant work of W. R. Smith has not been universally accepted. L. Marillier has criticized it along several lines. It is by no means certain that totemism prevailed so largely among Semites and there is no evidence of its existence in Israel. Also, if an original bond of friendship existed between the god and the kin, there is no need to maintain it by such sacrificial rites. There is no clear instance of this having been done. If on the other hand there was no common bond between the god and the people but that of a common meal, it does not appear that the god is a totem god. There is no reason why the animal should have been a totem. In any case, this idea of sacrifice could hardly have been anything but a slow growth, and consequently not the origin of sacrifice. Hubert and Mauss, however, put the development theory far from having established the historical or the logical connection between the common meal and the other kinds of sacrifies. Under piacula he confines purification, propitiation and expiations. His attempts to identify piacula with the sacrifice character are late and not sacrificial do not succeed. Smith's theory is mainly the sacramental, though he does recognize the honorific and piacular element. The theory may be applicable to some of the heathen or savage feasts of the Arabs, but not to the practices of the Hebrews (see Enc Brit, XXIII, 951).

(5) The hommage theory.—This has been advocated by Warburton and F. D. Maurice. The idea is that sacrifies were originally an expression of homage and dependence. Man naturally felt impelled to seek closer communion with God, so much from a sense of guilt as from a sense of dependence and a desire to show homage and obedience. In giving expression to this, primitive man had recourse to acts rather than words and thoughts. Thus sacrifice was an acted prayer, rather than a prayer in words. It was an expression of his longings and aspirations, his reverence and submission. There is much truth in this view; the elements of piacular and suppliant-enter with some sacrifies, the burnt offerings in particular; but it does not account for all kinds of offerings.

(6) The piacular theory.—This holds that sacrifies are fundamentally expiatory or atoning, and the death of the beast is a vicarious expiation of the sins of the offerer. Hubert and Mauss admit that in all sacrifies there are some ideas of purchase or substitution, though these may not have issued from some primitive form. The unifying principle in all sacrifies is that the Divine is put in communication with the profane by the intermediary—original victim—which actually the man partake of it. It is thus a messenger, a means of divination, a means of aliminating the eternal life of the species, a source of magical energy which the rite diffuses over objects in its neighborhood. Westermarck (Origin of Moral Ideas) makes the original idea in sacrifice a piacula, a substitute for the offerer.

This view is the most simple, the most natural, and the only one that can explain certain sacrifies. Man felt himself under liability to punishment or death. The animal was his, he had life, it was of value, and perchance the god would accept that life in place of his. He felt that it would be accepted, and thus the animal was sacrificed. The offerer in a sense gives up part of himself. The beast must be his own; no sacrifice can be made of another person's property (2 S 24 24a). The true spirit of sacrifice appears in a willingness to acknowledge God's right to what is best and dearest (Gen 12).

Object of sacrifice is raised to this by A. B. Davidson (OT Theology), who denies that all sacrifies were offered, others, on the ground that such an origin represents a too advanced stage of ethical thought and reflection for primitive man. We question seriously whether this be an advanced stage of moral reflection. On the contrary it represents a very simple, and primitive stage. The feeling that sin of some kind is never absent from human life, and that its true penalty is death, has been inseparable from the human heart's sense of sin. What could be more simple and natural than to take an innocent animal and offer it in place of himself, hoping that the Deity would accept it instead? Nor is there much force in Professor Paterson's objection that sacrifices were preponderantly joyous in character and therefore could not be offered as an expiation. This joyous character belongs to such sacrifies as peace offerings and thank offerings, but does not belong to the 'olah and others. In most cases the joyous feast followed the killing of the animal by which the expiation was accomplished. Smith offers a very simple explanation because atonement had been made. In fact, many sacrifies were of the most solemn character and represented the deepest and most serious emotions of the heart.

(7) Originating in religious instinct.—Neither the theory of an objective Divine revelation, nor of a human origin will account for the universality and variety of sacrifies. The truth lies in a proper combination of the two. The notion of offering a gift to the Deity arose out of the religious instincts of the human heart, which in an early period had a consciousness of something wrong between itself and God, and that this something would mean death sooner or later. Added to these true instincts was the Omn普遍 Spirit to guide men in giving expression. What could be more simple and primitive than to offer something possessing life? Of course the notion originated in simple and childlike ideas of God, and its real motive was not to gratify God by sharing a meal with Him, or to gain His favor by a bribe, but to present Him with something that represented a part of the offerer which might be accepted in his stead. Thus sacrifies became the leading features of the religious life of primitive man. Naturally other ideas would be added, such as a gift of food, to pacify the Deity, the peace offerings, etc, to celebrate the friendly relations with God, the thank offerings, the sin offerings, etc, all of which naturally and logically developed from the primitive idea. It might be expected that there would be many corruptions and
abuses, that the sense of sin would be obscured or lost among some peoples, and the idea of sacrifice correspondingly degraded. Such has been the case, and as well might we try to understand man at his best by studying the aboriginal tribes of Africa and Australia, or in ancient times by the Babylonians and Assyrians, as to attempt to understand the Bible ideas in sacrifices by studying the cults of those heathen and savage tribes of Samites, etc.

III. Classification of Sacrifices.—Maimonides was among the first to classify them, and divided them into two kinds: (1) Those on behalf of the whole congregation, fixed by statute, time, manner, and number, designated in the Pentateuchal Codes as burnt offerings; (2) those intended to establish the bond between the god and his worshippers, as peace offerings. Other sacrifices are divided into two classes, viz.: (1) those which assume that the covenant relation is unaltered, and their offerings would be unchangeable, or to do away with any disturbance in the religious order which had been right, such as burnt, sin, and guilt offerings.

Professor Paterson and others divide them into three: (1) animal sacrifices, burnt offerings; (2) vegetable sacrifices, meal offerings, such as bread, etc.; (3) liquid and incense offerings; wine, oil, water, etc.

H. M. Wiener offers a more suggestive and scientific division (Reuel. Cr. Rel., 200 ff.): (1) customary lay offerings, such as har'ah offerings on route, altars of earth or stone, without priest, used and regulated by Moses and in more recent times, viz., burnt, meal and peace offerings; (2) statutory individual offerings, introduced by Moses, offered by laymen with priestly assistance and at the religious capital, i.e., burnt, peace, meal, sin and guilt offerings; (3) statutory national offerings introduced by Moses and offered by the priest at the religious capital, viz., burnt, meal, peace and sin offerings.

IV. Sacrifices in the Pre-Mosaic Age.—Out of the obscure period of origins emerge the dimly-lighted type of ancient history. Everywhere sacrifices existed and sometimes abounded as an essential part of religion. The space of the archaologist, and the researches of scholars help us understand the pre-Mosaic period.

1. In Egypt—probably from the beginning of the 9th millennium BC there were sacrifices and sacrificial systems. Temples at Abydos, Thebes, On, etc., were great priestly centers with high priests, lower priests, rituals and sacrifices in abundance. Burnt, meal and peace offerings predominated. Oxen, wild goats, pigs, geese were the chief animals offered. Besides these, wine, oil, beer, milk, cakes, grain, olive, flowers, fruit, vegetables were offered, but not human beings. In these offerings there were many resemblances to the Heb. gifts, and many significant exceptions. Moses would be somewhat familiar with these practices though not with the spirit of the ritual. He would appreciate the unifying power of a national religious center. It is inconceivable that in such an age a national leader and officer of the state would not take special care to institute such a system.

In Babylonia, from the year 3000 BC or thereabouts, according to teller (Geschichte des Althems), there were many centers of worship such as Babylon, Assur, Agade, Ur, Nippur, Larsa, Sippur, etc. These and others continued for centuries with elaborate systems of worship, sacrifices of animals, temples, priesthoods, etc. Considerably over 100 temples and sanctuaries are mentioned in the tablets, and several hundred in the stone tablets, so that Babylonia was studded with temples and edifices for the gods. At all these temples constantly offerings—animal, vegetable. A long list of the offerings of King Gudea includes oxen, sheep, goats, lambs, birds, fish, birds (Gen 12: 4). The sacrifices provided an income for the priests, as did the Mosaic system at a later time. It had long passed the stage when it was supposed to furnish a means of atonement for the sins of the god, and no one thought of their own self offered a daily sacrifice, as in the Mosaic law, and likewise of the preliminary sacrifice of offering two cups or wine, one for the priests and one for the will of the gods they served. It seems certain that in some of the larger centers of worship animals were offered up to twice a day. The ordinary and festive sacrificial rites were performed by priests. Special sacrifices on special occasions were offered in Babylonia and Chaldea, on the feast days and festival days, etc., in honor of the Mosaic saints, etc., both as regards the purely legal portions and those sections dealing with religious ritual. Babylonian methods of offering sacrifices were taken into consideration as determining factors.

We do not doubt that Moses made use of many elements found in the Egypt and Bab systems, and added to or subtracted from or parodied as occasion required. As sacrificial systems and ritual had been in use more than a millennium before Moses, there is absolutely no need to suppose that Israel's ritual was a thing simply and suddenly developing, and was completed after the exodus. To do so is to turn history upside down.

Among the Semitic tribes of Arabia and Syria, sacrifices had been common for millenniums before Moses. The word "sacrifice" is found in Babylonian tablets. Many scholars, especially Smith are valuable here, whatever one may think of their theories. The offer- ing of animal to a god as a gift has been noted, sometimes from the spoils taken in war and sometimes as a token to set in a temple. The occasions were many and various, and the ritual was very simple. A rude altar of earth or stone, a hole in the ground, the offerer killing the victim and burning it, or perhaps certain parts, perhaps with bread, wine, or other food of the family, constituted the customary details. Sometimes wild animals were offered, Babylonians, Phoenicians and Arabs offered a wide variety of animals. As to what animals were not, Arabs would sometimes sacrifice a captive youth, while the Carthaginians might present a young man and a virgin for offerings to a god. Assyrians sometimes sacrificed captive kings. The Canaanites and others constantly sacrificed children. The Phoenician word for custom. Cain's offering was cereal and is called mín kâd, "a gift" or "presentation." The same term is applied to Abel's. There is no hint that the bloody sacrifice was in itself better than the unbloody one, but it is shown that a sacrifice without blood is not acceptable to God. This same truth is emphasized by the prophets and others, and is needed in this day as much as then. In this case the altar would be of the common kind and no priest was needed. The sacrifices were an act of worship, adoration, dependence, prayer and possibly propitiation.

The sacrifices of Noah followed and celebrated the epochal awe-inspiring event of the ark and beginning life anew. He offered burnt offerings of all the clean animals (Gen 8: 20 ff. On such a solemn occasion only an 'ôlāh would suffice. The custom of using domestic animals had arisen at this time. The sacrifices expressed adoration, recognition of God's power and sovereignty, and a gift to please Him, for it was said He smelled a sweet savor and was pleased. It was an odor of satisfaction or restfulness. Whether or not the idea of expiation was included is difficult to prove.

Abraham lived at a time when sacrifices and religion were virtually synonymous. As a subordinate mode of his offering at Ur or Harn, but Abraham on his arrival at Shechem he erected an altar (Gen 127). At Beth-el also (verse 8), and on his return from Egypt he worshiped there (Gen 13: 4). Such sacrifices expressed adora-
tion and prayer and probably propitiation. They constituted worship, which is a complex exercise. At Hebron he built an altar (Gen 13:18), officiating always as his own priest. In 16.4ff he offers a ‘covenant’ sacrifice, when the animals were slain, divided the loaves and the fat cut off, prepared for the appearance of the other party to the covenant. The exact idea in the killing of these animals may be difficult to find, but the effect is to give the occasion great solemnity and the highest religious sanction. What was done with the carcases afterward is not told. That animals were slain for food with no thought of sacrifice is shown by the narrative in ch 18, where Abraham had a calf slain for the meal. This is opposed to one of the chief tenets of the Wellhausen school, which maintains that all slaughtering of animals was sacrificial until the 7th cent. BC. In ch 22 Abraham attempts to offer up Isaac as a burnt offering, as was probably the custom of his neighbors. That he attempted it shows that the practice was not shocking to his ethical nature. It tested the strength of his devotion to God, shows the right spirit in sacrifices, and teaches for all time that God does not desire human sacrifice—a beast will do. What God does want is the obedient heart. Abraham continued his worship at Beer-sheba (Gen 21:33).

Whatever may be the date of the writing of the Book of Job, the saint himself is represented as living in the Patriarchal age. He constantly offered sacrifices on behalf of Job of his children (1.5), ‘sanctifying’ them. His purpose no doubt was to atone for possible sin. The sacrifices were mainly expiatory. This is true also of the sacrifices of his friends (42–7–9).

Isaac seems to have had a permanent altar at Beer-sheba and to have regularly offered sacrifices. Adoration, expiation and supplication would constitute his chief motives (Gen 26:26).

Jacob’s first recorded sacrifice was the pouring of the oil upon the stone at Bethel (Gen 28:18).

This was consecration or dedication of the place by the awe-inspiring presence of the Deity. After his covenant with Laban he offered sacrifices (zebhakim) and they ate bread (Gen 31.54). At Shechem, Jacob erected an altar (Gen 33.20). At Bethel (35:7) and at Beer-sheba he offered sacrifices to Isaac’s God (46:1).

While the Israelites were in Egypt they would be accustomed to spring sacrifices and spring feasts, for these had been common among the Arabs and Syrians, etc., for centuries. In Egypt sacrifices have been mentioned (see above). At these spring festivals it was probably customary to offer the firstlings of the flock (cf Ex 13:15). At the harvest festivals sacrificial feasts were celebrated. It was to some such feast Moses said Israel as a people wished to go in the wilderness (Ex 3:18; 5:3ff; 7:16). Pharaoh understood and asked who was to go (Ex 10:8). Moses demanded flocks and herds for the feast (30:9). Pharaoh would keep the flocks, etc (10:24), but Moses said they must offer sacrifices and burnt offerings (10:25f).

The sacrifice of the Passover soon occurs (Ex 12:3–11). That the Hebrews had been accustomed to sacrifice the firstborn, at this season has no support and is altogether improbable (Frazier, Golden Bough, pt. III, 175ff). The whole ceremony is very primitive and has retained its primitive use to the end. The choosing of the lamb or kid, the killing at a certain time, the family gathered in the home, the carcass roasted whole, eaten that night, and the remainder, if any, burned, while the feasters had staff in hand, etc, all this was continued. The blood in this case protected from the Deity, and the whole ceremony was “holy” and only for the circumcised. Frazier in his Golden Bough gives a lengthy treatise.

As a priest of Midian Jethro was an expert in sacrificing. On meeting Moses and the people he offered both ’olah and zebhakim and 11. Jethro made a feast (Ex 18:12).

From the above it is evident that sacrifices were almost the substance of religion in that ancient world. From hilltops and temples innumerable, the smoke of sacrifices was constantly rising heavenward. Burnt offerings and expiatory offerings were well known. Moses, in establishing a religion, must have a sacrificial system.

He had abundance of materials to choose from, and under Divine guidance would adopt such rules and regulations as the pedagogic plans and purposes of God would require in preparing for better things.

V. The Mosaic Sacrificial System.—The fundamental function of Moses’ work was to establish the covenant between Israel and God.

1. The This important transition took place Covenant at Sinai and was accompanied by Sacrifice solemn sacrifices. The foundation principle was obedience, not sacrifices (Ex 19:4–8). No mention is made of these at the time, as they were incidental—mere by-laws to the constitution. The center of gravity in Israel’s religion is now shifted from sacrifices to obedience and loyalty to Jehovah. Sacrifices were helpful to that end and without obedience they were worthless. This is in exact accordance with Jer 7:21ff. God did not speak unto the fathers at this time about sacrifices; He did speak about obedience.

The covenant having been made, the terms and conditions are laid down by Moses and accepted by the people (Ex 24:3). The Decalogue and Covenant Code are given, an altar is built, burnt and peace offerings of oxen are slain by young men servants of Moses, not by priests, and blood is sprinkled on the altar (24: 4ff). The blood would symbolize the community of life between Jehovah and Israel, and consecrate the altar. The Law was read, the pledge again given, and Moses sprinkled the representatives of the people, consecrating them also (24:7ff). Ascending the mount, they had a vision of God, held a feast before Him, and enjoyed the joys and privileges of the new relationship. The striking feature of these ceremonies is the use of the blood. It is expiatory and consecrating, it is life offered to God, it consecrates the altar and the people; they are now acceptable to God and dare approach Him and feast with Him. There is no idea of God’s drinking the blood. The entire ritual is far removed from the gross features of common Semitic worship.

In the Covenant Code, which the people accepted, the customary altars are not abolished, but regulated (Ex 20:24ff). This law expressly applies to the time when they shall be settled in Canaan. In the Altars whole place where I cause my name to be remembered,’ etc (ver 21m). No need to change the reading to “in every place where I cause,” etc, as the Wellhausen school does for obvious reasons. All the land was eligible. On such rude altars sacrifice was allowed. This same law is implied in Dt 16:21, a passage that has been explained away by the Wellhausen school (see Wiener, Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism, 201ff). Moses commanded Joshua in accordance with it (Dt 27:5ff). Joshua, Gideon, Jephthah, Samuel,
Saul, David, Elijah and many others used such altars. There were altars at Shechem (Josh 24:1-26), Mizpah in Gilgal (Jgs 11:11), Gilgal (1 S 13:9). High places were chiefly used until the times of Hezekiah, when they were abolished because of their corruption and because the central altars were perfectly legitimate and in fact necessary, until there was a central capital and sanctuary in Jerusalem. The customary burnt and peace offerings with the worshipping officiating were the chief factors. Hence altars and the use of heathen altars were strictly forbidden (Ex 22:20 [Heb 19]; 34:15).

The altar used at the consecration of Aaron and his sons was a "horned" or official altar, the central one. The offerings were a bullock, two rams, unleavened bread, etc (Ex 29:1-4), and were brought to the door of the sanctuary. The ritual consisted of Aaron and his sons hand on the bullock's head, designating it as his substitute (29:10), killing it before the tent of meeting (ver 11), smearing some blood on the horns of the altar, and pouring the rest at its base (ver 12). The blood consecrated the altar, the life was given as atonement for its defilement, and the flesh was consumed as food for God, and the flesh and remainder were burned without the camp (vs 13,14). This is a sin-offering—burnt, for the altar is fire, the term is fire. Probably introduced by Moses, it was intended to be placid and to provide seven bullocks for the priest. The flesh was sprinkled round about the altar, flesh was cut in pieces, washed and piled on the altar, then burned as an offeringbringing to God. The burnt offering was an odor of a sweet savor (vs 15-18). The naive and primitive nature of this idea is apparent. The other ram, the ram of consecration, is slain, blood is smeared on Aaron's right ear, thumb and great toe; in the case of sons likewise. The blood is a sprinkled on the altar round about; some upon the garments of Aaron and his sons (vs 19-21). Certain parts were waved before God along with the bread, and are then burned upon the altar (vs 22-25). The breast is offered as a wave offering (tirshāh), the right thigh is offered as a heave offering (tiršāh). These portions here first mentioned were the central sanctuary offerings, alluding to the particular one went to Moses, since he officiated (vs 26-30). The flesh must be boiled in a holy place, and must be eaten by Aaron and his sons only, and at the sanctuary. What was left till morning must be burned (vs 31-34). Consecrated to a holy service it was dangerous for anyone else to touch it, or the Divine wrath would be committed. The same ceremony on each of the seven days attested for, cleansed and consecrated the altar to the service of Jehovah, and it was most holy (vs 35-37). The border of the altar is ordained (Ex 30:1), and Aaron is to put the blood of the sin offering once a year upon its horns to consecrate it.

When the golden calf was made an altar was erected, burnt and peace offerings were presented.

From the latter a feast was made, the sanctuary opened and the people rejoiced at such events before the festivals, went to excess and joined in Golden Calf revelry. Moses' ear quickly detected the nature of the sounds. The covenant was now broken and no sacrifice was available for this sin. Vengeance was executed on 3,000 Israelites. Moses mightily interceded with God. A moral reaction was begun; new tables of the Law were made with more stringent laws against idols and idol worship (Ex 32:1-55).

At the setting-up of the tabernacle burnt and meal offerings were sacrificed (Ex 40:29). The law of the burnt offering is found in Lev 1.

5. Law of the Burnt Offering ('olah)

Common altars and customary burnt offerings need no minute regulations, but this ritual was intended primarily for Aaron and his successors, and was brought to the people as needed. They were for the statutory individual and national offering upon the 'horned' altar before the sanctuary. Already the daily burnt offerings of the priests had been provided for (Ex 29:18). The burnt offering is here called korban, "oblation."

(1) The ritual for the offering (Lev 1:1-17).—This may be have from the herd or flock or fowls, brought to the tent of meeting; hands were laid (heavily) upon its head designating it as the offerer's substitute, it was killed, flayed and cut in pieces. If of the flock, it was to be killed on the north side of the altar; if a fowl, the priest must kill it.

(2) The ritual for the priest (Lev 1:3-17).—If a bullock, or one and seven bullocks, or a bullock and maleable torr

The sin offering was a sacrifice of a special kind, doubtless peculiar to Israel and first mentioned at the consecration of Aaron and his sons. It is not then spoken of as an offering innovation. It was of special value as an expiatory sacrifice.

(1) Use of the sin offering (Lev 4:2-21; Ezek 43:21; and his sons (Ex 29 10 ff.).—A bullock was killed before the altar, some blood was put upon the horns of the altar by Moses, the rest was poured out at the base. The fat of the inwards was burnt upon the altar, the flesh and skin were burned without the camp. Every day during the consecration this was done (Ex 29 36).

(2) The law of the sin offering (Lev 4 1 35; 6 24 30, etc.).—(a) The occasion and meaning: Specifically to atone for unwitting sins, sins of eternal sin, (zabanah), mistakes or rash acts, unknown at the time, but afterward made known. There were gradations of these for several classes of offenders: the anointed priest (vs 3 12), the whole congregation (vs 13 21), a ruler (vs 22 26), one of the common people (vs 27 31), etc). The congregation was also required to bring a young bullock before the tent of meeting, the elders were to lay their hands upon it and slay it before the Lord. The rafter must bring a he-goat and do the same. One of the common people might bring a fat tail of a lamb and do the same. If too poor for these, two turtle doves or young pigeons, one for a sin offering and one for a burnt offering would suffice. It must be without blemish, and be to the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour without oil or frankincense would it suffice.

(b) The ritual for the offering (Lev 4 1 5 13, etc.). The anointed priest must offer a bullock at the tent of meeting, lay his hands upon it and slay it before the Lord. The congregation was also required to bring a young bullock before the tent of meeting, the elders were to lay their hands upon it and slay it before the Lord. The rafter must bring a he-goat and do the same. One of the common people might bring a fat tail of a lamb and do the same. If too poor for these, two turtle doves or young pigeons, one for a sin offering and one for a burnt offering would suffice. It must be without blemish, and be to the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour without oil or frankincense would it suffice.

(c) The ritual for the priest (Lev 4 1 5 13, etc.). He must bring the bullock's blood to the tent of meeting, dip his finger into it and sprinkle blood 7 times before the veil of the sanctuary, and put some on the horns of the altar of incense, but most of this blood must be poured out at the base of the altar. The fat must be burnt upon the altar, all the rest of the carcass must be carried to a clean place without the camp and burnt. In the case of the whole congregation, the ritual is the same. In the case of a ruler, the blood of the horns of the altar of burnt offering, not the altar of incense. In the case of one of the common people, the ritual is simply substitution of the fat of his offering. In both cases the carcass belonged to the priest. If a bird, the priest must cut off its head, sing a song, and pour blood on the side of the altar and pour the rest at the base. Nothing is said of the disposal of the carcass. If of fine flour, the priest must take a handful of it and keep the remainder for himself. The use of fine flour for an offering was too low, it was to be eaten by the worshippers. At Aaron's consecration an ox and a ram were the peace offerings (Lev 9 4 13 22). The priest's portion was to be eaten in a clean place by the priest's family (Lev 10 14). When Israel should have a central sanctuary, all were to be burnt there (Lev 17 3 4). When they had no central place, the common altars would suffice. All peace offerings must be made in an acceptable manner (Lev 19 5). Votive offerings must be perfect (Lev 22 18 22), but certain imperfections are allowable in all freewill offerings (vs 23). At Pentecost two he-lambs of the first year could be offered as peace offerings (Lev 23 19). The Nazirite at the end of his separation must offer one ram for a peace offering with unleavened bread (Nu 6 14 17), and the hair shaved from his head must be burnt under the peace offerings (6 18). This has something to do the Nazirite and offered as a sacrifice by other nations. The various tribes brought peace offerings (ch 7, passim), and at the feast of trumpets the people were to rejoice and blow trumpets over the peace offerings (10 10). Some further regulations are given (15 9 f).

The sin offering was a sacrifice of a special kind, doubtless peculiar to Israel and first mentioned at the consecration of Aaron and his sons. It is not then spoken of as an offering innovation. It was of special value as an expiatory sacrifice.

(1) Use of the sin offering (Lev 4:2-21; Ezek 43:21; and his sons (Ex 29 10 ff.).—A bullock was killed before the altar, some blood was put upon the horns of the altar by Moses, the rest was poured out at the base. The fat of the inwards was burnt upon the altar, the flesh and skin were burned without the camp. Every day during the consecration this was done (Ex 29 36).

(2) The law of the sin offering (Lev 4 1 35; 6 24 30, etc.).—(a) The occasion and meaning: Specifically to atone for unwitting sins, sins of eternal sin, (zabanah), mistakes or rash acts, unknown at the time, but afterward made known. There were gradations of these for several classes of offenders: the anointed priest (vs 3 12), the whole congregation (vs 13 21), a ruler (vs 22 26), one of the common people (vs 27 31), etc). The congregation was also required to bring a young bullock before the tent of meeting, the elders were to lay their hands upon it and slay it before the Lord. The rafter must bring a he-goat and do the same. One of the common people might bring a fat tail of a lamb and do the same. If too poor for these, two turtle doves or young pigeons, one for a sin offering and one for a burnt offering would suffice. It must be without blemish, and be to the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour without oil or frankincense would it suffice.

(b) The ritual for the offering (Lev 4 1 5 13, etc.). The anointed priest must offer a bullock at the tent of meeting, lay his hands upon it and slay it before the Lord. The congregation was also required to bring a young bullock before the tent of meeting, the elders were to lay their hands upon it and slay it before the Lord. The rafter must bring a he-goat and do the same. One of the common people might bring a fat tail of a lamb and do the same. If too poor for these, two turtle doves or young pigeons, one for a sin offering and one for a burnt offering would suffice. It must be without blemish, and be to the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour without oil or frankincense would it suffice.

(c) The ritual for the priest (Lev 4 1 5 13, etc.). He must bring the bullock's blood to the tent of meeting, dip his finger into it and sprinkle blood 7 times before the veil of the sanctuary, and put some on the horns of the altar of incense, but most of this blood must be poured out at the base of the altar. The fat must be burnt upon the altar, all the rest of the carcass must be carried to a clean place without the camp and burnt. In the case of the whole congregation, the ritual is the same. In the case of a ruler, the blood of the horns of the altar of burnt offering, not the altar of incense. In the case of one of the common people, the ritual is simply substitution of the fat of his offering. In both cases the carcass belonged to the priest. If a bird, the priest must cut off its head, sing a song, and pour blood on the side of the altar and pour the rest at the base. Nothing is said of the disposal of the carcass. If of fine flour, the priest must take a handful of it and keep the remainder for himself. The use of fine flour for an offering was too low, it was to be eaten by the worshippers. At Aaron's consecration an ox and a ram were the peace offerings (Lev 9 4 13 22). The priest's portion was to be eaten in a clean place by the priest's family (Lev 10 14). When Israel should have a central sanctuary, all were to be burnt there (Lev 17 3 4). When they had no central place, the common altars would suffice. All peace offerings must be made in an acceptable manner (Lev 19 5). Votive offerings must be perfect (Lev 22 18 22), but certain imperfections are allowable in all freewill offerings (vs 23). At Pentecost two he-lambs of the first year could be offered as peace offerings (Lev 23 19). The Nazirite at the end of his separation must offer one ram for a peace offering with unleavened bread (Nu 6 14 17), and the hair shaved from his head must be burnt under the peace offerings (6 18). This has something to do the Nazirite and offered as a sacrifice by other nations. The various tribes brought peace offerings (ch 7, passim), and at the feast of trumpets the people were to rejoice and blow trumpets over the peace offerings (10 10). Some further regulations are given (15 9 f).
6—8). The leper must bring a guilt offering (a special kind of sin offering), a he-lamb (Lev 14:12—14.19); if too poor for a lamb, a turtledove or young pigeon (vs 22.31). Special use of the blood is required (ver 25). In uncleanness from issues a sin offering of a turtledove or young pigeon must be offered by the priest (Lev 16:15—30). (iii) On the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:1—28) Aaron must take a bullock for himself and house, two he-goats for the people, present the goats at the sanctuary, cast lots, one for Jehovah, as a sin offering, the other to be cast into the wilderness. The bullock was killed, sweet incense was burned within the rail, blood was sprinkled on the mercy-seat and before it 7 times. The one he-goat was killed and a similar ceremony was performed. Blood must be put on the horns of the altar and sprinkled 7 times about it. The other goat was presented, hands were laid on it, the sins of all confessed and put upon the goat, and it was sent into the wilderness. The earcuse of the bullock and he-goat were burnt without the camp. At the feast of first-fruits a he-goat was offered (Lev 23:19).

(iv) Other special instances were: in the case of defilement, the Nazirite must offer a turtledove or young pigeon on the 5th day after contrition (Lev 14:8); if this offering fulfilled a he-lamb with the other offerings (ver 14) was to be offered; the twelve tribes included in each case a he-goat for sin offering (7:16 ff); at the consecration of the Levites a young bullock (8:12). For unwitting sins at a religious congregation a he-goat was to be offered (15:21—25). If one person erred, a she-goat was permitted (ver 27). A sin offering was required at the feast of the new moon (28:15), at the Passover (ver 22), at Pentecost (ver 30), on the 1st day of the 7th month (Lev 23:26—27), on the 22nd day of the same month (ver 34—35). The ceremony of the red heifer (19:10—17.10) was a special sin offering for purification purposes only. It was of ancient and primitive origin. The young cow was brought without the camp and was slain before the priest's face, blood was sprinkled 7 times before the sanctuary, the entire carcase with cedar wood, hyssop and scarlet was burned, the ashes gathered and laid without the camp in a clean place to be kept for the water of impurity. It was to purify the city with the dead. In the case of the unknown homicide (Dt 21:1—9) a young unbroken heifer was brought to a running stream, its neck was broken, the elders washed their hands over the heifer in the presence of the priests, drank of the blood, and sprinkled it over the place where the body was found. The action was a judicial one, but essentially vicarious and expiatory and had doubtless a primitive origin.

The guilt offering (AV "trespass offering") (Lev 5:14—6:7) was a special kind of sin offering, always of a private character and accompanied by a fine. It expressed expiation and restitution. The classes of sin requiring a guilt offering with repARATION in money are: (1) a trespass in the holy things done unwittingly; (2) anything which the law forbade depriving God or the priest of their due; (3) dealing falsely with a neighbor in a deposit, or pledge, or robbery, or oppression; (4) swearing falsely regarding anything lost; (5) seduction of a betrothed girl (Lev 19:20—22). The first two of these are unwitting sins, the others cannot be. The clear statement is made in another place that sins done with a "high hand," i.e., in rebellion against the covenant and its provisions, can have no expiation. It is not possible, therefore, to add this a contrition, or a later development when it was found that the more stringent law would not work? (See J. M. P. Smith, et al., Atonement, 47 f.) Neither conclusion is probable. These conscious sins are of a kind that will admit of full reparation because against rights of property or in money matters. The sin offering makes atonement toward God, the restitution with the additional one-fifth makes full reparation to man. No such reparation can be made with the guilt offering, it is to be offered "a heifer of theouch hand." In the case of seduction, rights of property are violated (of Nu 5:5—8; Dt 22:29).

(1) The ritual (Lev 5:14—6:7).—A ram proportionately in value to the offence and worth at least two shekels as required. (2) The priest, by the mouth of the Lord, is to sprinkle the blood on the wine libation, and to offer a meal offering of unleavened bread, with it, and to "make atonement." (3) He is to offer one young ox and two young sheep as a sin offering for the unclean person. The priest shall offer a "inferior lamb," but sprinkled about the base of the altar, the fat and inside parts being burned, and the flesh eaten by the priests in a holy place.

(2) Special statutes.—The leper, when cleansed, on the 8th day must bring a guilt offering of two he-lambs and one ewe-lamb; the priest must wave one he-lamb before Jehovah, kill it, and smear blood on the right ear, thumb and toe of the leper. The guilt offering belongs to the priest (Lev 14:12—20). If the leper were too poor for two lambs, one sufficed, with a corresponding meal offering, or one turtledove and a young pigeon (vs 21.22). The Nazirite, if defiled during his period of separation, must bring a he-lamb for sin offering for his guilt offering were the priests' and most holy (18:9).

The wave offerings were parts of the peace offerings, and the custom was seemingly initiated at the consecration of Aaron and his sons (Ex 29:22—38). When the breast and bread were waved of the wave offering to Jehovah (Lev 7:30.34) fixes the law.

10. Wave Offerings. It must be brought from the peace offerings of the offerer himself. At Aaron's consecration Moses put the breast, etc. on Aaron's hands and waved them before Jehovah (Lev 8:27). On the 8th day Aaron and his sons waved the wave offerings to eat it in a clean place (Lev 10:14). The leper's he-lamb was to be waved by the priest, before being offered (Lev 14:22). When the peace offering was waved (Lev 14:24). At the feast of first-fruits the sheaf must be waved before Jehovah (Lev 23:10.11).5:5; two loaves also (vs 17.20). Of the Nazirite the priest took the boiled shoulder, a cake and a wafer, put them on the Nazirite's hand and waved them before Jehovah (Nu 6:19). Reheve offerings also are parts of the peace offerings, and refer particularly to what is lifted up, or separated unto the service of Jehovah. They are first mentioned at the consecration of Aaron's sons (Lev 27:28.29). The priest's fractions of the choice morsel of the offering of the peace offering must be heaved (Lev 7:14). The offering must be eaten in a clean place (Lev 7:14) by the priest's family only. The Nazirite's offering the heave of the peace offering also went to the priest (Nu 6:20). But when the Israelites were camped on the promised land to eat bread, they must offer a heave offering of the dough, a cake (Nu 15:19.20.21). The law is repeated with a slightly different wording to have to receive a tithe of the heave offerings of the people (ver 24). They were in turn to offer a tithe of this to the priests (vs 26—29). A portion of the spoil of Midian was a heave offering (31:29.41). Dt commands that all heave offerings be brought to the central sanctuary and eaten there (12:11).

Jacob poured oil on the stone he had set up (Gen 28:18) in honor of the Deity and consecrated the spot. Jacob later (Gen 35:14) set up a pillar where God had revealed Himself to him. Drink offerings or a libation of wine and drink offerings or libations. It probably wine was used. Drink offerings accompanied many of the sacrifices (Ex 29:40.41). None could be poured upon the altar of incense (Ex 30:9). At all set feasts the drink offerings must be presented (Lev 23:13.18.37). The Nazirite was not exempt (Nu 6:15.17). Wine and oil must accompany all votive and freewill offerings (18:4.5.7.10.24); the custom continued (28:7.8) in tabernacle and temple. All the drink offerings were set apart (Lev 2:13); 18:5—39, passions). That drink offerings were common among the heathen is shown by Dt 32:9.

The cultus is thoroughly in keeping with and adapted to the age, and yet an ideal system in
many respects. The ethical side is in the background, the external has the emphasis. No sacrifices will avail for a breach of the covenant between God and the people. People thoroughly believed in the efficacy of the blood. It secured stone-wall and forgiveness. Their religious life found expression in the sacrifices. God was fed and pleased by the offerings by fire. Many of the customs are ancient and crude, so that it is difficult to imagine how such a primitive system could have been arranged and accepted afterward by the people who had the lofty ethical teachings of the prophets in their hands.

VI. Sacrifices in the History of Israel.—The tribes were outwardly consolidated, and a religious system was provided. Some of it was for the rulers, much for the people and the priests alone. The various laws were given in portions and afterward compiled. No one expected them to be observed until the nation had a capital and central sanctuary. Even then not every detail was always possible. They were not observed to any extent in the wilderness (Am 5:25), as it was impracticable. Even circumcision was left to the wanderers crossing the Jordan (Josh 5:2). The body of the system was not in full practice for 300 or 400 years. The ritual, as far as it could be observed, served as an educational agency, producing in the minds of the worshippers proper conceptions of the holiness of God, the sinfulness of man, and the proper spirit in approaching God.

1. The Situation at Moses' Death

The tribes were outwardly consolidated, and a religious system was provided. Some of it was for the rulers, much for the people and the priests alone. The various laws were given in portions and afterward compiled. No one expected them to be observed until the nation had a capital and central sanctuary. Even then not every detail was always possible. They were not observed to any extent in the wilderness (Am 5:25), as it was impracticable. Even circumcision was left to the wanderers crossing the Jordan (Josh 5:2). The body of the system was not in full practice for 300 or 400 years. The ritual, as far as it could be observed, served as an educational agency, producing in the minds of the worshippers proper conceptions of the holiness of God, the sinfulness of man, and the proper spirit in approaching God.

2. In the Time of Joshua

The system of sacrifices was accepted until the nation had a capital and central sanctuary. Even then not every detail was always possible. They were not observed to any extent in the wilderness (Am 5:25), as it was impracticable. Even circumcision was left to the wanderers crossing the Jordan (Josh 5:2). The body of the system was not in full practice for 300 or 400 years. The ritual, as far as it could be observed, served as an educational agency, producing in the minds of the worshippers proper conceptions of the holiness of God, the sinfulness of man, and the proper spirit in approaching God.

3. In the Period of the Judges

The system of sacrifices was accepted until the nation had a capital and central sanctuary. Even then not every detail was always possible. They were not observed to any extent in the wilderness (Am 5:25), as it was impracticable. Even circumcision was left to the wanderers crossing the Jordan (Josh 5:2). The body of the system was not in full practice for 300 or 400 years. The ritual, as far as it could be observed, served as an educational agency, producing in the minds of the worshippers proper conceptions of the holiness of God, the sinfulness of man, and the proper spirit in approaching God.

4. In the Time of Samuel and Saul

The system of sacrifices was accepted until the nation had a capital and central sanctuary. Even then not every detail was always possible. They were not observed to any extent in the wilderness (Am 5:25), as it was impracticable. Even circumcision was left to the wanderers crossing the Jordan (Josh 5:2). The body of the system was not in full practice for 300 or 400 years. The ritual, as far as it could be observed, served as an educational agency, producing in the minds of the worshippers proper conceptions of the holiness of God, the sinfulness of man, and the proper spirit in approaching God.

5. In the Days of Solomon

The system of sacrifices was accepted until the nation had a capital and central sanctuary. Even then not every detail was always possible. They were not observed to any extent in the wilderness (Am 5:25), as it was impracticable. Even circumcision was left to the wanderers crossing the Jordan (Josh 5:2). The body of the system was not in full practice for 300 or 400 years. The ritual, as far as it could be observed, served as an educational agency, producing in the minds of the worshippers proper conceptions of the holiness of God, the sinfulness of man, and the proper spirit in approaching God.

6. In the Days of the Northern Kingdom

The system of sacrifices was accepted until the nation had a capital and central sanctuary. Even then not every detail was always possible. They were not observed to any extent in the wilderness (Am 5:25), as it was impracticable. Even circumcision was left to the wanderers crossing the Jordan (Josh 5:2). The body of the system was not in full practice for 300 or 400 years. The ritual, as far as it could be observed, served as an educational agency, producing in the minds of the worshippers proper conceptions of the holiness of God, the sinfulness of man, and the proper spirit in approaching God.

Saul and Samuel

The system of sacrifices was accepted until the nation had a capital and central sanctuary. Even then not every detail was always possible. They were not observed to any extent in the wilderness (Am 5:25), as it was impracticable. Even circumcision was left to the wanderers crossing the Jordan (Josh 5:2). The body of the system was not in full practice for 300 or 400 years. The ritual, as far as it could be observed, served as an educational agency, producing in the minds of the worshippers proper conceptions of the holiness of God, the sinfulness of man, and the proper spirit in approaching God.
the temple cult was in full operation according to Moses' Law (2 Ch 13 10 f). Asa removed many strange altars and high places because of their corruption (14 3), but not all (15 17; 20 35). In the days of Jehoshaphat and Jehoram, the altars were on different levels, according to Moses (23 18; 24 146; 2 K 12 4-16). Sin and guilt offerings were in sufficient numbers to be mentioned, but the money went to the priests. Kautzsch (HDB, V 91; Paterson, V 87) IV, with others, think these offerings were only fines and altogether different from those of lev 4, 5. Such a statement is wholly gratuitous. The guilt offerings must be accompanied by fines, but not necessarily by the sin offerings. The passage speaks of both as perfectly familiar and of long standing, but details are lacking and there can be no certainty in the matter, except that it proves nothing regarding a ritual of sin and guilt offerings existing or non-existent at that time. Kautzsch's and Paterson's motives are obvious. Having reversed the history and put the ritual law late, they must needs make adjustments in the records to have them agree. In the days of Ahaz, the regular offerings were observed for priests, kings and people (2 K 16 13-15). Hezekiah offered burning offerings in many high places (18 4). When repairing the temple, many sin offerings were presented to expiate the terrible sins of the previous reigns and the desecration of the temple (2 Ch 29 21-34); and so, also, burnt offerings (vs 27 f), peace and thank offerings, etc, in large number (vs 31). The High Priest of Isaa 1 10-17). The Passover was celebrated with peace offerings (2 Ch 30 1 2 15.22), oblations and tithes (31 12); courses of Levites were established (31 5), and the king's portion (ver 5). All the common altars were rebuilt and the religion and worship centralized in Jerusalem (22 12). Reversed by Manasseh (33 3 f), the high places were again used (ver 17). Josiah purged Jerus (34 3), and on the discovery of the Book of the Law, with its rule regarding a central sanctuary, that law was rigidly enforced (36 6-14). The reformation under Josiah did not change the hearts of the people, and the rule followed in spite of all the efforts of Jeremiah and other prophets.

That the temple was entirely suspended in Jerus from 586 to 536 BC seems certain. There is no support for G. F. Moore's statement (B, IV) that an altar was soon re-built and sacrificing was carried on there. Ezekiel used it on the third day of the exiles an altar was soon built and the continual burnt offerings began (Ezr 3 2 f), and likewise at the Feast of Tabernacles, new moons and set feasts (vs 4-7). Darius decreed that the Israelites should be given what was needed for the sacrifices (6 9 f). The band under Ezra offered many sin offerings on their return (8 35). At the dedication of the temple many burnt and sin offerings were made for all the tribes (6 17). Those who had married foreign wives offered guilt offerings (10 9). The firmans of Artaxerxes provided money for bullocks, rams, lambs, with meal and drink offerings (7 17). Under Nehemiah and after the formal acceptance of the Law, a more complete effort was made to observe it. The shewbread, continual burnt and meal offerings, subhaths, new moons, sabbaths, sin offerings, first-fruits, firstlings, first-fruits of dough, heave offerings of all trees, wine and oil, etc, were carefully attended to (Neh 10 33-37) and were in full force later (13 5). There is no hint of innovation, only a thoroughgoing attempt to observe laws that had been somewhat neglected.

At the time of Nehemiah and probably two or three centuries previous, there existed a temple on the island of Elephante in the Nile. It was built by a Jewish military colony, and a system of sacrifices was observed there, how far they conformed to, and what were their ideas of a central sanctuary are uncertain.

7. In the Southern Kingdom to the Exile. Several tribes continued in foreign countries, and the temple was not recognized by them as the place of sacrifice. Among the Phoenicians, Greeks and Romans human sacrifices were all too common. The customs were not transferred to the Israelites. Abraham felt called upon to prove his fidelity to the act, and a lesson was given for all time.

10. Human Sacrifices in Israel's History. The abominable practice is forbidden by the Law (Lev 18 19 f). Suffering was described as a passing through the fire to Moloch, referring to the Babylonish and Ammonitish practices. Anyone practising it was to be stoned (Lev 20 2). During this period, many people continued to offer sacrifices, and the practice was prevalent among the Israelites, especially in the south. The practice continued in the times of the Judges, and was prevalent among the Israelites throughout their history.

VII. The Prophets and Sacrifices. —The prophets were reformers, not innovators. Their emphasis was on the ethical, rather than the ritual. They gazed their teachings on the value of the covenant, not the incidents. They accepted sacrifices as part of the religious life, but would give them their right place. They accepted the law regarding common altars, and Samuel, David and Solomon, and the movements toward a national church and a central sanctuary, but the idea that public sacrifices were to be permitted in the temple was rejected. They did not hold that the whole nation was to be offered as a burnt offering in the temple.

11. Certain Heathen Sacrifices. —The Heathen sacrifices were quite different from the Jewish. The later books, such as Enoch, were written to show the difference between the two systems. The practice of human sacrifice was widespread among the Heathen, but the practice of sacrifice to the gods was not.

Sacrifice (OT)
but demands rather righteousness and justice. There is nothing here against the Mosaic origin of the laws.

In Hosea's time the hollow externalism of the cult had become worse, while vice, falsehood, murder, oppression, etc., were rampant. He utters an epoch-making sentence when he says, "I desire mercy, and not sacrifice," etc (6:6). This is no sweeping renunciation of sacrifices, as such; it is only putting the emphasis in the right place. Such sacrifices as Hosea speaks of were worse than worthless. It is somewhat extravagant for Kautzsch to say, "It is perfectly futile to read out of 6:6 anything else than a categorical rejection of sacrifices." Hosea recognizes their place in religion, and deplores the loss during exile (3:4). The corrupt cults he condemns (4:13f), for they are as bad as the Canaanitish cults (4:9). Jeh. will spurn them (8:13; 9:4). The defection of the nation began early (11:2), and they have multiplied altars (12:11; 13:2). He predicts the time when they shall render as bullocks the "calves" of their lips (14:2 AV).

Sacrifice is as emphatic. The sacrifices were more costly in his day, in order the more surely to purchase the favor of the Deity. Human sacrifices were in vogue, but Micah says God requires them "to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God" (6:8). The atonement does not only affect sacrifices of the right kind and with the right spirit.

Isaiah faces the same situation. There are multitudes of sacrifices, burnt offerings, blood of bullocks and goats, incense, "beasts," etc., but no justice, morality, love, truth or goodness. Thus their sacrifices, etc., are an abomination, though right in themselves (1:11-17; 61:8). The same is true of all pius performances today. If Micah'sMicah says that such worship was wrong in the temple (6:16). In his eschatological vision there is freedom to offer sacrifices in Egypt (19:19.21). The people are to worship in the holy mountain (27:13). Ariel must let the feasts come around (29:1).

Jeremiah maintains the same attitude. Your "frankincense from Sheba, and the sweet cane," burnt offerings and sacrifices are not pleasing to God (6:20; 14:12). They made the temple a den of robbers, in the streets they baked cakes to the Queen of Sheba, etc (Hag 1:6). He also says, "Add your burnt-offerings unto your sacrifices, and eat ye flesh. For I spake not unto your fathers . . . concerning . . . sacrifices: but . . . commanded . . . saying, Heurken unto me" (7:21-23). This was literally true, as we have seen above; the covenant was not based on sacrifices but on obedience. Such a statement does not deny the institution of sacrifices for those within the covenant who are obedient. It is no "subterfuge," as Kautzsch calls it, "to say that the prophets never polarize against sacrifice per se, but only against offerings presented hypocritically, without repentance and a right disposition, with blood-stained hands; against the opera operata of the carnally-minded, half-hearted mass of the people. This is exactly what they do, and they are in perfect harmony with the covenant constitution and with their own ethical and spiritual functions. Kautzsch can make such an extravagant assertion only by ignoring the fact that Jeremiah himself in predicting the future age of righteousness and blessedness makes sacrifice an important factor (33:11.18).

Picturing possible prosperity and glory, Jeremiah speaks of burnt and meal offerings, frankincense, thank offerings, etc, being brought into the house of the Lord (17:26). (We are aware of the historical reality.) In contrary case, the arbitrary transference of this passage to a later time.) Ezekiel is called by Kautzsch "the founder of the Levitical system. He is said to have preserved the fragment of the ritual that was broken up in the exile. But his references to the burnt, sin and trespass offerings presuppose familiarity with them (40:38-42).

He assigns the north and south chambers for the meal, sin and trespass offerings (42:13). The cleansing of the leper is required in the burnt offering; with burnt and peace offerings with a ritual similar to Lev 8:11 (Ex 29:18-27). Priests are to be ministers and slay burnt offerings and sacrifice for the people (44:11). The priest must offer his sin offering before offering the burnt offering. The national sanctuary is to be the meal, sin, and trespass offerings as in 44:29. In Mic 4, the people are to give ten lambs for meal, burnt and peace offerings, while the prince shall give the meal, burnt and drink offerings for the feasts, the new moons, and the sabbaths. He is to prepare them to make atonement (45:13-17). In cleansing the sanctuary the Levlcal ritual is followed with added details (45:18-20). The Passover requires the burnt, sin and meal offerings with an extra burnt offering. The prince's burnt and peace offerings (46:2-4.6.9-12) for the sabbaths, new moons, etc. The daily burnt offerings (vs 13-15) have a sixth instead of a tenth part of an ephah, as in Lev 1. The sin and guilt offerings are to be held in a certain place, and the meal offering baked (vs.20.26). Ezek varies from the Levitical Law in the quantity of the offerings, pictures a higher ideal situation than Moses. The people are all righteous, with new hearts, the Spirit in them enabling them to keep the Law (Ezk 36:26; 37:29) and yet holding the spirit of purification for them. Does this seem to indicate that the prophets would abolish sacrifices entirely? It is strange reasoning which makes the prophets denounced the whole sacrificial system, when one of the greatest achievements of humanity seeks to combine the natural and the spiritual for the blessed age in the future.

In the second part of Isa, God declares that He has not been honored by the people with burnt and meal offerings, etc., and that He has not burdened them with such offerings, but that they are in their sins (53:10). These foreigners who respect the covenant shall offer acceptable sacrifices (56:7) in the house of God. The servant of Jehovah is to be a guilt offering (53:10) to expiate the sins of Israel. Sacrifice is here for the first time lifted out of the animal sphere and found in the link between the OT and the NT. In the glorious age to come there shall be priests and Levites,新的一新, new moons, sabbaths and worship in Jerus (66:21.23).

Daniel speaks of the meal offering being caused to cease in the midst of the week (9:27).

Zechariah pictures the golden age to come when all nations shall go up to Jerusalem to keep the feast of tabernacles, which implies sacrifices. Pets are used, and all the worshippers shall use them in the ritual (14:16-21).

In Malachi's age the ritual was in practice, but grossly abused. They offered polluted bread (1:7), and a blind, lame and cripple sheep for sacrifice (1:3). They had the same attitude toward these as toward those in the times of Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah (Mal 1:10f). The Gentiles offer better ones (1:11). The Israelites covered the altar of Jah with tears by their hypocrisy. Mal. was literal, literalism is the arch-enemy of the Spirit of God. In the end he robbed God in withholding tithes and heavy offerings (3:8). It is the abuse of the cult that is denounced here, as in all the other Prophets.

A special use of the term "sacrifice" is made by Zephaniah (1:7f), applying it to the destruction of Israel by Jah. Bozrah and Edom are to be victims (Isa 34:6); also Gog and Magog (Ezk 39 17.19).

In summing up the general attitude of the prophets toward sacrifices, even G. F. Moore in his "Bible Dictionary" admits that the prophets only distinctly entertained the idea of a religion without a cultus, a purely spiritual worship. Sacrifice may well have seemed to them the natural expression of homage and gratitude. He might have added, "and a part of atonement." (J.M.)

VIII. Sacrifice in the "Writings."—Dates are very uncertain here. The Ps and Prov extend from David and Solomon into the Pers period.

The sages take the same attitude as the prophets. They enjoin the sacrifice of first-fruits (Prov 3:9). A feature frequently mentioned is the lot (Prov 18:11).

1. In the peace offerings (7:14). The trespass Proverbs offering (?) has no meaning to fools (14:9), and the sacrifices of the wicked are an abomination to God (15:8; 21:27). Right-
ousness and justice are more acceptable to Jeh than sacrifices (21:3), yet to them sacrifices are a regular part of worship. Kōhēleth speaks of sacrifices as quite the custom, and deprecates the offerings of fools (Eccl 5:1; 9:2).

The Psalmist is remarkable for the faithful to offer the sacrifices of righteousness, i.e., sacrifices offered in the right spirit (4:5). The drink offerings of idolaters are well known (16:4). Prayer is made for the acceptance of sacrifice (30:3). It is a coveted privilege to offer them (27:6; 84:1-4).

The true relation between sacrifice and obedience is expressed in 40:6-8. As in Jer 7:21 f., the emphasis is laid on obedience, without which sacrifices are worthless and repugnant to God. They are not the important thing in Israel's religion, for that religion could exist without them as in the wilderness and exile. The teaching corresponds exactly with that of the prophets and is probably late. Ps 80 is even more emphatic. The Psalmist knows that sacrifices are in the covenant regulations (ver 5), but repudiates the idea of giving anything to God or of feeding Him (vs 12,13). Everything belongs to Him. He is not hungry, He would scorn the idea of drinking the blood of goats, etc. The idea of the cultus being of any real value to God is scorned. Yet in the next verse the reader is admonished to offer sacrifices of thanksgiving and pay vows (ver 14). The sacrifices that express worship, penitence, prayer, thanksgiving and faith are acceptable. The penitent Psalmist speaks tenderly of sacrifices as such, no delight to God, the real sacrifice is a broken heart (61:16). When the heart is right, then, as an expression of true-heartedness, devotion, repentance and faith, burnt offerings are highly acceptable (Ps 50:14; Ps 109:3). He promises a free-will offering to God (64:6; 66:13, 15). Sacrifices of thanksgiving are advised (96:8; 107:22; 118:27) and promised (116:17). Prayer is likened to the evening sacrifice (141:2).

IX. The Idea and Efficacy of Sacrifices.—That the Hebrews thoroughly believed in the efficacy of sacrifices is without doubt. What ideas they entertained regarding them is not so clear. No single theory can account for all the facts. The unbloody sacrifices were regarded as food for the Deity, or a pleasant odor, in one instance, taking the place of a bloody offering (see above). The bloody offerings present some difficulties, and hence many different views.

Included among a host of gifts of food to the Deity would be the meal and peace offerings, in so far as they were consumed by fire, the burnt offerings and the shewbread, etc. They were fire-food, the fire-distilled essence or etherealized food for God which gave Him pleasure and disposed Him favorably toward the offerer. They were intended either to appease wrath, to win favor, or to express thanks and gratitude for favors experienced. The offering probably to win the favor of the Deity by a gift. Later, other ideas were expressed in the offerings.

The burnt offering best gave expression to the sentiments of adoration and devotion, though they may not be excluded from the meal and peace offerings. In other words, sacrifice meant worship, which is a complex exercise of the soul. Such was Abraham's attempted sacrifice of Isaac. The daily burnt offerings were intended to give value to God's unbroken course of adoration and devotion, to keep the right relations with the Deity. On particular occasions, special offerings were made to insure this relation which was specially needed at that time.

The burnt and sin offerings were the principal kinds used for the purpose of purification; water being used in case of uncleanness from contact with the dead. There were three classes of uncleanness: (1) those resulting from the touch of men and women; (2) those resulting from contact with a corpse; (3) the case of recovery from leprosy. Purification ceremonies were the condition of such persons enjoying the social and religious life of the community. They may be seen as occurring when most of them occurred in the regular course of nature and could not be guarded against, can be understood only as we consider that these offences were the effects of sin, or the weaknesses of the fleshly nature, due to sin. Such uncleannesses made the subject unfit for society, and that unfitness was an offence to God and required a particular offering.

Consecration was of men and things. The ceremonies at the sealing of the covenant and the consecration of the Levites and of Aaron. The altar and furniture of the tabernacle were consecrated by the blood of a sin offering, and the service in the temple, by sprinkling the blood consecrated them to the service of God. The blood being holy, it was made all holy (Ex. 29:19 f.).

In other words, it is a kind of sacred communion. The blood is the sacred cement between God and man. This is possible only because it contains the life and is appropriated by God as a symbol of the communion between Him and the believer.

5. To Establish a Community of Life between Worshippers and God

This blood "covers" all sin and defilement in man, permits him to enter God's presence and attests the communion with Him. This is the view of Schultz, and partly that of Kautzsch, in regard to earlier ideas of sacrifice. Such a view may have been held by certain peoples in primitive times, but it does not do justice to the Levitical system.

The view of Ritschl is that sacrifices served as a form of self-protection from God who was a recreation to a weak creature. Thus sacrifices have no moral value and no relation to sin and defilement. But they are only to man's creaturely weakness which is danger of destruction removes the presence of God. God's presence necessarily meant death to the creature without reference to his holiness, etc. Such a view banishes all real sense of sin, all ethical values, and furnishes no proper motives. It gives a false idea of the character of God, and is entirely out of accord with the sacred record.

That sacrifices were really a sacrament has been advocated by many. According to some theologians, the sacrifices were signs of spiritual realities, not only representing but serving as means of spiritual blessings, and their efficacy was proportionate to the faith of the offerer. By some Roman Catholic theologians it is held that the Pass-over was a sacrifice of a sacramental character, corresponding to the Eucharist. The purificatory rites corresponded to penance and the consecrating sacrifices to the sacrament of ordination. Bähr says that the acceptance of the sacrifice by Jeh and His gift of sanctification to the worshippers give to the sacrifice the character of a sacramental act. Cave also speaks of the unique sacramental signification, while refuting the position of Bähr. Though there may be a slight element of truth in some of these ideas, it is not the idea expressed in the cultus, and seems to read into the ritual the
theology of the theologians themselves. This view is closely allied to a phase of the following view (see Paterson, HDB, IV).

It that is a symbol or expression of prayer is held by Maurice and to some extent by Schultz. Thus the sacrifices are supposed to be symbols of the guilt and reparation which are the conditions of acceptance with God. The victim serves as an index of what is in the worshipper's heart, and its virtue is exhausted when it is presented to God. Thus the aspiration or supplication, hatred of sin and surrender to God with confession and supplication. Bähr holds that a valuable and unblemished victim is selected as symbolical of the excellence and purity to which the offerer aspires, the death is necessary to procure life which may be offered to God, and the sprinkling of the blood is the presentation to God of the life still resident in the blood. Schultz thinks that the sin offering was distinctive. Hence the real ground of purification is that God accepts the sacrifice and thereby enters into communion with the sinner, granting him actual pardon, and that man in this offering enjoined by God as the embodied prayer of a penitent and confession of guilt, and its petition for forgiveness." While there is an element of truth in this, and it is particularly applicable to the burnt offering, it does not embrace all the facts. It represents the views of the prophets and psalmists more than that of the Levite code.

Kautzsch holds that the efficacy of sacrifices consists in this: God has given the accomplishment of atonement with the obedient discharge of the external prescriptions. Whoever fulfills these and gives the priest to perform the atoning usages, is forgiven. Thus the actual, essential, purgative condition of atonement, is the fulfillment of the Law, is not synonymous. Forgiveness of sin flows from the grace of God as taught by the prophets, only with them it is unnecessary, but with them it is necessary, as the Levite code. The Kautzsch teaches a fundamental contradiction between the prophets and the Law, which is utterly wrong and is made necessary by first turning the history upside down and making the PC a hideous anachronism. He says, "that the process of atonement is connected with the precious of blood, explains itself naturally as a powerful after-influence of primitive sacrificial usages, in which the process was a different, more solemn act. It was a symbolic (not real) satisfaction, as through the animal's life symbol the sin was given to God, in a manner that the sin is proceeded to God. But the main idea is that God has commanded it" (HDB, V, 721c). The half-truths in these statements will be obvious to most readers.

The theory that sacrifices were a vicarious expiation of sin and atonement, by a victim whose life is forfeited instead of the sinner's, is the only one that will complete the Levitical idea of sacrifices. This of course applies esp. to the sin offering. While there is an element of truth in the gift-theory, the prayer and sacramental theories and others, including that of Kautzsch, the idea of a vicarious suffering is necessary to complete the conception. Oehler recognizes the importance of these relations to the idea that in sacrifices man places the life of a pure, innocent, sacrificial animal between himself and God, because he is unable to approach God on account of his sinfulness and impurity. Thus it becomes for him, through the victim, not a punishment inflicted on the animal, although in the case of uncertain homicide it is (Dt 21 1-9). The law does not lay the emphasis upon the slaughter, but on the shedding of the blood and the sprinkling of it on certain articles. The spoil is regarded as a gift. The altar is not regarded as a place of execution, it is the means for "covering" the sins of the covenant people, a gracious ordination of God and well-pleasing to Him. But the gift can please God only as the gift of one who has given himself up to Him; therefore the ritual must represent this self-surrender, the life of the clean and guiltless animal in place of the impure and sinful soul of the offerer, and this pure soul, coming in between the offerer and the Holy God, lets Him see at the altar the life by which our life is covered. In the same way the pure element serves to cover the pollutions of the sanctuary and the altar, etc. Its meaning is specific, it is the self-sacrifice of the offerer vicariously accomplished. Thus self-sacrificial suffering and punishment, which is inflicted on the beast to which the guilt and sin are imputed, not imparted (see Oehler, OT Theol., 2781).

Objections have been raised by Dillmann, Kautzsch and others on the ground that it could not have been vicarious cause sacrifices were not allowed for sins which merited death, but only for venial transgressions (Nu 16 30). Certainly, but the more sacrificial system was for those who were in the covenant, who did not commit sins that merited death, and was never intended as a penal sacrifice, because the sins of those in the covenant were not of a penal nature. The sacrifices were 'to cover the sin and death penalty of one who broke the law' (Bähr). Again they object, a sacrificial offering may atone, and this excludes the substitute sacrifices, they are not strictly penal, and the ceremonial was an exception to the rule. In any case it represented the self-sacrifice of the offerer, and that was the important thing. Further, the victim was the person by the offerer's own hands, whereas it should have been put to death by God's own hands. This carries the idea that the essential thing was a sacrifice, and priests were not necessary for that. A more serious objection is that in the case of the substitution, the sins of the offerer and guilt are transferred to the animal, the flesh of that animal that is regarded as most holy is offered to the priest only, whereas it would necessarily be regarded as laden with guilt and curse, and hence polluted and unfit for use. According to this view, the substitution was not strictly penal, and, secondly, there is the fact that actual pollution is conveyed to the flesh of the animal or to the blood. Even if it were so, the shedding of the blood would expiate the sin and guilt, wipe out the pollution, and the flesh would be in no way affected. On the contrary, the flesh, having been the vehicle for the blood which has accomplished such a sacred and meritorious service, would necessarily be regarded as most holy. All the animal would be holy, rather than polluted, since it had performed such a holy service. Kautzsch's objection thus appears puerile.

The ritual on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16) by virtue of its many features. It is distinctly stated that the high priest confides the iniquities of the children of Israel over the scapegoat, and when the scapegoat is sent into the desert. Its blood is not shed, it is wholly clean, and the man carrying it away is his own property, and is not necessarily a vicarious act. In the case of the other goat, a sin offering, the sin and guilt are imputed to it, and the life is taken away, and so the explanation that the flesh of the victim used in such a holy service is most holy.

That this view of a vicarious expiation was generally accepted is evident on every hand. There was no need of a theoretical explanation in the cultus; it was self-evident; as Holtzmann says, "the most external indeed, but also the simplest and most generally intelligible and the readiest answer to the nature of expiation" (NT Theol., I, 68). This view is amply corroborated by the researches of S. I. Curtiss in his Primitive Sem Religion of Today. Of searching questions he found that the fundamental idea of bloody sacrifices was that the victim took the place of the man, redeemed him, or atoned for him as a substitute. The "bursting forth of the blood" was the essential thing (see pp. 218 f).

The typology and sin has been fully discussed. There can be no question that, from the standpoint of the NT, many of the sacrifices were typical. They prefigure, and designedly so, the great sacrifice of Christ. Thus they could really take a new place in that sense unreal. But the question is, were they typical to the people of Israel? Did Moses and the priests and prophets and people understand that
they were merely figures, adumbrations of the true Sacrifice to come, which alone could take away sin? Did they understand that their Messiah was to be sacrificed, His blood shed, to make an atonement for them, and that their Law is but a Divinely given means of atonement all unreal? The answer must be an emphatic "No." There is no hint that their minds were directed to think of the Coming One as their sacrifice, foreshadowed by their offerings. That was the one thing they did not and could not understand, and to this day the cross is their chief stumbling-block. The statement that the Servant is to be a guilt-offering (Isa 53 10) is the nearest approach to it, but this is far from saying that the whole sacrificial system was understood as foreshadowing that event. The teaching is a total collapse of a sacrificial system in full vogue in the Messianic age.

We prefer to regard the sacrificial system as a great religious educational system, adapted to the capacity of the people at that age, intended to develop right conceptions of sin, proper appreciation of the holiness of God, correct ideas of how to approach God, a familiarity with the idea of sacrifice as the fundamental thing in redemption, life, and service to God and man.

A selection is attempted: arts. in Enc. Brit. 11th ed.: EB (G. F. Moore); HDB (Paterson); RE and Sch.-Herz (Orelli); Jew Enc; Neutliefen and Stein; R. Smith's "Bibl. and Lit. of the Jewish Religion"; Curtiss; Kautzsch; Jastrow and Wiedemann in HDB; art. on "Commissary Sacrifice," in Sch.-Herz; OT Theologies of Oehler, Dillmann, Smend, Schultz, Davidson, Koenig, etc.
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LITERATURE

SACRIFICE (OT) SACRIFICE (NT)

I. TERMS OF SACRIFICE EPITOMISED.

The word "offering" (προσφορά, prosphorá) describes the death of Christ, once in Paul (Acts 8:32; Rom 5:8-10; Eph 5:2; Col 1:20; 2:13; 3:12). The same word, whether in the NT or OT sacrifices, occurs 116 times in LXX, usually as the tr of ἔκτασις, miššah, "sacrifice." This word recurs in Paul, in Acts 2:14; 7:17; 10:38; 26:23; 28:28; 1 Cor 3:14; 15:15; 1 Pet 5:2.

The word "sacred" (θύσια, thússia, translates in LXX a Heb word for various kinds of sacrifice, occurring about 190 times, in the NT as the death of Christ's sacrifice, once in Acts 7:1; 1 Cor 3:14; 11:16; 15:34; 26:23; 10:12; 13:15; 14:19). The same word, whether in the NT or OT sacrifices, occurs 13 times in He (7:27; 9:28: 13; 15; 17; 19:7; 20:12).

The word "sacrifice" (θυσία, thússia, translates in LXX a Heb word for various kinds of sacrifice, occurring about 190 times, in the NT as the death of Christ's sacrifice, once in Acts 7:1; 1 Cor 3:14; 11:16; 15:34; 26:23; 10:12; 13:15; 14:19).

The word "sacrifice" (θυσία, thússia, translates in LXX a Heb word for various kinds of sacrifice, occurring about 190 times, in the NT as the death of Christ's sacrifice, once in Acts 7:1; 1 Cor 3:14; 11:16; 15:34; 26:23; 10:12; 13:15; 14:19).

The word "sacrifice" (θυσία, thússia, translates in LXX a Heb word for various kinds of sacrifice, occurring about 190 times, in the NT as the death of Christ's sacrifice, once in Acts 7:1; 1 Cor 3:14; 11:16; 15:34; 26:23; 10:12; 13:15; 14:19).
or not the system of animal sacrifices would have ceased, not only in Judaism but also in all the ethnic religions, had not Jesus lived and taught and died, is a question of pure speculation. It must be conceded that the sect of the Jews (Essenes) attaining to the highest moral level and living the most unselfish lives of brotherhood and benevolence did not believe in animal sacrifices. But they exerted small influence over the Jewish nation as compared with the Pharisees. It is also to be noted that the prophets Amos, Hosea, Micah and Isaiah exalted the ethical standard and living the moral lives of men, and did not believe in animal sacrifices. But they exerted small influence over the Jewish nation
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of sacrifice. Sacrifice, Isa 21.10; 10:1; Mt 26:28. There is a sacrifice of the OT system as a whole. Christ is a superset of all sacrifices. Mt 16:21; Mk 8:31; Lk 9:22; Jn 10:14; 19:30. It is the central idea of the NT in the Synoptic Gospels (Mt 26:26-29; Mk 14:17-25; Lk 22:19-20; 1 Cor 11:24). In the former He declares Jesus to be the Lamb of God. Luke 22:19, says that John saw Christ "suffering under the load of human sin." There are recorded in the Synoptic Gospels two unmistakable references by Jesus to His death as a sacrifice.

1. Teaching God," in the former passage adding of John the "that taketh away the sin of the world." Westcott (Comm. on St. John, 20) says: "The title as applied to Christ...is the title of one suffering, of patient submission, of sacrifice, of redemption, etc." There is scarcely any doubt that the Baptist looked upon the Christ as the one who came to make the great sacrifice for man's sins. Professor Burton (B. Ideas of Atonement, Burton, Smith and Smith, 107) says that John sees Christ "suffering under the load of human sin."

There are recorded in the Synoptic Gospels two unmistakable references by Jesus to His death as a sacrifice. Mt 26:28 refers to Him as "the Lamb of sacrifice." But as to whether there could be any doubt as to the sacrificial import of this passage, there is a clear case of the sacrificial idea in Mt 26:28; Mk 14:24; Pray that this divine prerogative, the continuance of sacrifice as a system, when He said, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many." The only important differences in the discontinuation of the system. "Thus it was that our Lord disavowed the inferiority of sin, and the divine necessity of the sacrifice of the new covenant, as superior to the sacrifices of the old system as the new covenant is superior to the old. Paul's estimate of the Jewish sacrifices was easily seen, although he does not often refer to them. The author of the Ep. to the Hebrews regards the OT sacrifices more fully than other NT writers. He regards the bloody sacrifices as superior to the unbloody and the yearly sacrifice on the Day of Atonement by the high priest as the climax of the OT system. The high priest under the old covenant was the type of Christ under the new. The sacrifices of the old covenant could not take away sin, or produce remission; Mt 27:22; and because God had appointed another high priest, His Son, to supplant those of the old coven-
remission of sins). In his first Ep. (1 18.19) he expressly declares that we are redeemed by the blood of the spotless Christ, thus giving the sacrificial significance to His death. The same is implied in 1 2; 3 18.

Paul ascribes saving efficacy to the blood of Christ in Rom 3 25; 5 9; 1 Cor 10 16; Eph 1 7; 2 13; Col 1 20. He identifies Christ with a sin offering in Rom 8 3, and perhaps also in 2 Cor 5 21, and with the paschal lamb in 1 Cor 5 7. In other passages he speaks of Christ's death as redemption, forgiveness of sins, justification and adoption (Rom 3 24-26; 5 10.11; 8 15.17, etc.).

The argument of the author of Heb to prove the finality of Christianity is that Christ is superior to the Aaronic high priest, being a royal, eternal high priest, according to the order of Melchizedek, and offering Himself as the final sacrifice for sin, and for the moral restoration of men (4 14; 10 18).

In the first of these NT teaching passages he speaks of Christ's death as the propitiation for sin. He identifies Himself with the Lamb of God (Rev 1 5; 5 6.9.12).

John ascribes deliverance (not washing or cleansing, according to best MSS) from sin to the blood of Christ. Several times he calls Christ the Lamb, making the sacrificial idea prominent. Once he speaks of Him as the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world (15 8).

To sum up, all the NT writers, except James and Jude, refer to Christ's death as the great sacrifice for sin. Jesus Himself regarded His death as such. In the various types of NT teaching Christ's death is presented (1) as the covenant sacrifice (Mk 14 24; Mt 26 28; Lk 22 19; He 9 15-22); (2) as the sin offering (Rom 8 3; 2 Cor 5 21); (3) as the offering of the paschal lamb (1 Cor 5 7); (4) as the sacrifice of the Day of Atonement (He 2 17; 9 12 ff).

IV. Relation of Christ's Sacrifice to Man's Salvation.—The saving benefits specified in the NT as resulting from the sacrificial death of Christ are as follows:

Redemption or deliverance from the curse of sin: This must be the implication in Jesus' words, 'Father... the Son of man came 1. Redeem-to give his life a ransom for many' (Mk 10 45; Mt 20 28). Man is a captive in sin, the Father sends His Son to pay the ransom price for the deliverance of the captive, and the Son's death is the price paid. Paul also uses the words "redeemed" and "redemption" in the same sense. In the great letters he asserts that we are "justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a propitiation... in his blood" (Rom 3 24.25). Here the apostle traces justification back to redemption as the means for securing it, and redemption back to the "blood" (Christ's death) as the cause of its procuring. This is Christ's death secures redemption and redemption procures justification. In Gal (3 13), he speaks of being redeemed "from the curse of the law." The law involved man in a curse because he could not keep it. This curse is the penalty of the broken law which the transgressor must bear, except deliverance from said penalty is somehow secured. Paul represents Christ by His death as securing for sinners deliverance from this curse of the broken law (cf Gal 4 5 for the same thought, though the word "curse" is not used). Peter emphasizes the same teaching in the Captivity Epistles: "In whom we have our redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses" (Rom 1 14). In the pastoral letters (1 Tim 2 6) he teaches that Christ gave "himself a ransom for all." This is the only NT passage in which occurs the strong word antilutron for "ransom." In his old age the apostle feels more positively than ever before that Christ's death is the ransom price of man's deliverance from sin.

The author of Heb as asserts that Christ by the sacrifice of Himself "obtained eternal redemption" for man (9 12). John says that Christ "loosed... us from our sins by his blood" (Rev 5 1). This idea of John is akin to that of redemption or deliverance by ransom. Peter teaches the same in 1 Pet 1 19. So, we see, Jesus and all the NT writers regard Christ's sacrifice as the procuring cause of human redemption.

The idea of reconciliation involves a personal difference between two parties. There is estrangement between God and man. Reconciliation is the restoration of favor between the two parties. Jesus does not utter any direct message on reconciliation, but he implies God's sin and strained relations between God and the unrepentant sinner (see Lk 18 13). He puts into the mouth of the praying tax-gatherer the words, 'God be propitiated to me' (see Thayer, Gr-Eng. Lex., hilaškein, etc), but Jesus is the one who makes the sacrifice. His death secures the reconciliation of God to the sinner. Paul, however, does. "For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son," etc (Rom 5 10). There can be no doubt from this passage that Paul thought of the death of Christ as the procuring cause of reconciliation. In Eph 2 13.14.18 Paul makes the cross of Christ the means of reconciliation between the hostile races of men. Paul reaches the climax in his conception of the cross of Christ when he asserts the unifying results of Christ's death to be cosmic in extent (Eph 1 10).

The author of He also implies that Christ's death secures reconciliation when he regards this death as the ratification of the "better covenant" (6 6 ff), and when he plays on the double meaning of the word ἱλασθείς, 9 15 ff, now "covenant" and now "atonement." The death of Christ is necessary to secure the ratification of the new covenant which brings God and man into new relationships (8 12 ff). This is a word implying propitiation as wrought by the death of Christ. So the doctrine of reconciliation is also in the Ep. to the Hebrew, John teaching also that Christ is the Advocate through Christ our Advocate, but does not expressly connect it with His death as the reconciling cause (1 Jn 3 2). Peter is likewise silent on this point.

Reconciliation implies that God can forgive; yea, has forgiven. Jesus and the NT writers declare the death of Christ to be the basis of God's forgiveness. Jesus in instructing of Sins tating the memorial supper said, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto remission of sins" (Mt 26 28). It is true Mk and Lk do not record this last phrase, "unto remission of sins." But there is no intimation that this phrase is the result of Matthew's theologizing on the purpose of Christ's death (see Wendt, Teaching of Jesus, II, 239 ff, who claims this phrase is not from Jesus; also Allen in "Mt., ICC, in loc.). But Paul leaves no doubt as to the connection between man's forgiveness by God and Christ's sacrifice for him. This idea is rooted in the great passage on justification (Rom 3 21-4 21; see esp. 4 7) is positively declared in Eph 1 7; Col 1 14. The author of He teaches that the shedding of Christ's blood under the new covenant is as necessary for secure forgiveness of the offending of animal's blood under the old. John also implies that forgiveness is based on the blood (1 Jn 1 7-9).

True reconciliation and forgiveness include the canceling of the offender's guilt. Jesus has no direct
word on the cancellation of guilt. Paul does his argument for the universality of human sin by asserting that "all the world may be brought 4. The under the judgment of God" (AV Cancellation "guilty before God," Rom 3 19). of Guilt Thayer (Gr-Eng. Lex. in loc.) says that this word "guilty" means "owing satisfaction to God" (liable to punishment by God). But in Rom 8 1 3 Paul exclaims, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus... God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh on earth (Rom 8 3 26; merely an offering for sin"). The guilt, or exposure of the sinner to God's wrath and so to punishment, is removed by the sin offering which Christ made. This idea is implied by the author of He (2 1 5), but is not expressed in Peter and John.

Right standing with God is also implied in the preceding idea. Forgive sin and canceling guilt are the negative, bringing into right standing with God the positive, acquisition of the same transaction. "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?" (Rom 8 36). Right standing the sin offering; so Augustine and with God other Fathers, Ewald, Ritschl; see Meyer, Comm., in loc., who denies this meaning on our behalf that "he who has the righteousness of God in him" (2 Cor 5 21).

In this passage Paul makes justification the divine purpose of the sacrificial death of Christ. This thought is elaborated by the apostle in Gal and Rom, but is not expressed by Jesus, or in He, in Pet or in Jn.

Jesus does not connect our cleansing or sanctification with His death, but with His word (Jn 17 17). The subst. cleansing (καθαρισμός) is not used by Paul, and the sanctify. vb. "to cleanse" (καθαρίζω, καθαρίσα) occurs only twice in his later letters (Eph 5 26; Tit 2 14). He does use the idea of sanctification, and in Rom 6--8 teaches that sanctification is a logical consequence of justification which is secured by Christ's sacrificial death. In Phil 3 10.11, he views Christ's death and resurrection as the dynamic of transformation in the new life. The author of He (1 3; 9 14.22.23; 10 2), following the OT figures, uses the idea of cleansing for the whole process of putting away sin, from atonement to sanctification (see Westcott, Comm., in loc.). He makes Christ's death the procuring cause of the cleansing. John does the same (1 Jn 7 17--19).

Divine sonship of the believer is also traced by Paul to the sacrificial death of Christ (Rom 8 17), though this thought is not found in Sonship other NT writers.

So, we sum up, the whole process of salvation, from reconciliation with God to the adoption of the saved sinner into heaven's household, is ascribed, to some extent by Jesus, largely by Paul the theologian of the NT, and, in varying degrees, by other NT writers, to the sacrificial death of Christ. Even Holtzmann (Neutest. Theol., II, 111) admits "It is upon the moment of death that the grounding of salvation is exclusively concentrated.

V. How Christ's Sacrifice Procures Salvation.-- It must be conceded that the NT writers, much less Jesus, did not discuss this subject from the philosophical point of view. Jesus never philosophizes except incidentally. Paul, the author of He, and John had a philosophy underlying their theology, the first and second dealing most with the sacrificial work of Christ and the righteousness of God. But Paul and the author of He did not write their letters to produce a philosophical system explaining how Christ's sacrificial death can and does procure man's salvation.

By some it is claimed that the word "ransom" (Mk 10 45) gives us the key to the philosophy of the atonement, as presented in Paul's teaching. But the rules of exegesis are against this supposition. Jesus in the context is teaching his disciples the greatness of his greatness. To illustrate the truth he refers to his own example of coming to minister, and then giving his life to ransom (v. 45). This is not enforcing a practical principle and not elaborating a theoretical truth. Moreover, the word is used metaphorically, and the laws of exegesis forbid us to press the literal meaning of a figure. The figure suggests captivity, payment of a price (the price of the death of Christ). But Jesus does not tell us how his sacrifice procures the cleansing of man's redemption from sin. The word "ransom" does give the clue to the development of the vicarious sacrifice (elaborated later by Paul. Romans 3. 25; Thayer, Verfahrun, II, 85) does not do the word "ransom" justice when he claims that it merely reproduces the meaning of the Heb. דוד, kapher, "covering as a protection," and that Christ's death, like a covering, delivers us by stimulating us to lead the life of sacrificial service as Christ did. (Luders Jcsu, 237; Teaching of Jesus, II, 226 f) admits the "ransom" idea in the word, but says Christ delivers us from bondage to suffering and death, not by his death, but by His teaching which is illustrated by His sacrificial death. Boushler (Neutest. Th., I, 15) thinks that the word "ransom" refers to the whole body. Meyers (Comm., in loc.) does not go so far. He considers the word as an expression of "the deliverance of the sinner from the penalty of sin," and that Christ's death cancels the debt of the sinner, and so abolishes the debt. Moreover, as Paul says, Mar's death cancels all debts, and by implication he says that it cancels the debt of the sinner. But this statement fails to tell us how (that is, the sacrificial death) cancels the debt, or in other words, how Christ's sacrifice procures the cleansing of sin.

Now does Jesus' saying at the Last Supper, "This is my blood of the covenant" (Mt 26 28), mean the same as the takeable evidence of how His death saves men. It does teach that sinners on entering the kingdom come into a new covenant relation with God which implies forgiveness of sin and fellowship with God, and that, as the covenant sacrifice of Christ is made at Mt. Sinai (Exod. 24 10), there is an analogous covenant relation between God and His people, so that the death of Christ is a vicarious sacrificial death. In the account of grace between God and lost sinners, by virtue of which covenant God on His part forgives the penitent sinner, and the sinner enters into the covenant, there is an allusion to the sacrifice of Christ to God for the life of sacrifice. But this statement fails to tell us how (that is, the sacrificial death) procures the cleansing of sin.

Nor do Jesus' saying at the Last Supper, "This is my blood of the covenant" (Mt 26 28), mean the same as the takeable evidence of how His death saves men. It does teach that sinners on entering the kingdom come into a new covenant relation with God which implies forgiveness of sin and fellowship with God, and that, as the covenant sacrifice of Christ is made at Mt. Sinai (Exod. 24 10), there is an analogous covenant relation between God and His people, so that the death of Christ is a vicarious sacrificial death.
in His death. (c) The design of God in making such a propitiation was the exhibition of His righteousness; i.e., the vindication of that side of His character which demands the punishment of sin, which had not been shown in former generations when His forbearance had passed men’s sins by. See Sanday, Comm. on Rom, in loc. The classical passage containing the other word to redeem (καταλαλάτείον) is Gal 3:13: “Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us.” Professor E. D. Burton (Ant., p. 347, October, 1907) thinks: (a) Law here means “law legalistically understood.” (b) The “curse” was the verdict of the law of pure legalism, “a disclosure to man of his actual status before God on a basis of merit.” (c) The redemption meant is that Christ “brought to an end the régime of law . . . rather than deliverance of individuals through release from penalty.” He bases this argument largely on the use of ἐλεησόμενος, ἐλεηθήναι, “us,” meaning Jews in antithesis with ἐλεηθησαίτε, τί ἐλθήναι, the Gentiles (ver 14). Everett (The Gospel of Paul) thinks that Christ was cursed in that He was “crucified” (the manner not the fact of His death being the curse); that is, as Everett sees it, Christ became ceremonially unclean from the law. So does Paul follow in being crucified with Christ become ceremonially unclean and so free from the law. The passage seems to give us the following propositions: (a) Man under law (whether the revealed law of the OT or the moral law) is under a “curse,” that is, liable to the penalty which the broken law demands. (b) Christ by His death on the cross became a “curse for us.” (c) By means of Christ thus becoming a “curse for us” He delivered us, “not the Jews as a nation, but all of us, Jews and Gentiles, whom He believed.” (Rom 15:8). Professor Burton admits that the participle ἐλαλάτείον, γενέσθαι, “becoming,” may be a “participle of mean” (art. cited above, 615), and so we have “Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us.” The passage at least suggests, if it does not declare, that Christ saves us by vicariously enduring the penalty to which we were exposed.

(2) The idea of Reconciliation.—Paul uses the phrase “wrath of God” (Rom 1:18, etc) to express the attitude of God toward sin, an attitude of displeasure and of grief, of revulsion of holy character which demands the punishment of sin. On the other hand, God loves the sinner; love is the principle of the Christian idea of God. (Rom 5:8; 8:32). That is, wrath is love grieving and righteousness revolting because of sin, and both phases may act simultaneously (Simon, Redemption of Man, 216, to the contrary). So Paul says, “God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses” (2 Cor 5:19). Now this word “reconcile” (καταλαλάτείον) means in the active, “to receive into favor,” in the passive, “to be restored to favor” (Thayer, Syn. and Exeget. Lex., October, 1900, 600 ff, where Professor Estes shows, from Sophocles, Xenophon, Josephus, LXX and passages in the NT like Mt 5:24, that the word must mean a change in the attitude of God toward men and not merely a change of men toward God. Practically the same is in Emmert, Comm. on Rom, 2 Cor). Lipsius (Handb. zum NT); Sanday (Comm. on Rom); Denney (Exeget. Gr. Test. on Rom); Lietzmann (Handbuch zum NT); Holtmann (Neuest. Theol.); Weiss (Rel. of the NT); Pfleiderer (Paulinism); Stever (Christian Doctrine of Salvation); Liddon (Commen. on Rom and 2 Cor); and by all the writers on NT theology except Byschlag. See also Reconciliation; Rethorisation.

The idea of propitiation.—Only once (Rom 3:25) does Paul use the word “propitiation.” As we saw in (1) above, the redemption in Christ is based upon the propitiation which Christ made in His death. Thayer (Gr-Eng. Lex., in loc.) says the noun signifies “a means of appeasing, expiating, or propitiating, an expiatory sacrifice.” He thinks it has this meaning in Rom 3:25, but refers to it in the “mercy-seat” in He 9:5. Sanday (Comm. on Rom, 88) regards hilasterion as an adj., meaning “propitiatory.” De Wette, Fritzche, Meyer, Lipsius and many others take it in this sense; Gifford, Vaughan, Liddon, Ringgenberg think it means propitiation as in Heb. But with either meaning the blood of Christ is viewed as securing the mercy of God. Propitiation of God is made by the blood of Christ, and because of that men have access to the mercy-seat and forgiveness of sins. See Romans, Epistle to the, 9, (3).

The prepositions τῆς, ἐλαλάτειον, ἐλαλθήναι, etc.—Paul never uses ἐλαλάτειον ("for," instead of, "in place of," so Thayer) to express what Christ’s sacrifice does for the sinner, but ἐλαλθήναι ("for one’s safety and advantage," and correspondingly, the word ἐλαλάτειον, "instead of," so Thayer). See Rom 5:8; 8:32; 14:15; 1 Cor 11:24; 2 Cor 5:15; Gal 3:13; Eph 5:225; 1 Thess 5:10; 1 Tim 2:6; Tit 2:14. It is to be noted that in 1 Tim 3:6 Paul uses antiluton, "ransom," (and surrounded with the same qualifications) to follow it with ἐλαλάτειον, which may suggest that ἐλαλάτειον is here used in the sense of ἐλαλθήναι, "in place of."

Summing up Paul’s teaching as to how Christ’s sacrifice saves: (a) The propitiatory sacrifice does not “soften God, or assuage the anger of God”; but claims the advocates of the satisfaction theories assert, Victorinus, Sacrifice, 486. God is already willing to save men’s love makes the propitiatory sacrifice (Rom 5:8). God’s love makes the sacrifice, not the sacrifice His willingness to save men. (b) But God’s love makes the sacrifice (Rom 5:8), and so was under God’s wrath (Rom 1:18), i.e. man’s sin exposed him to punishment, while at the same time God’s love for the sinner was grieved. (c) Christ by His sacrificial death made it possible for God to show His righteousness and love at the same time; i.e. that He did punish sin, but did love the sinner and wish to save him (Rom 25:26; 5:8). (d) Christ, who was sinless, suffered vicariously for sinful men. His death was not due to His sins but those of men (2 Cor 5:21). (e) His death, followed by His resurrection which marked Him off as the sinless Saviour of God, and so appointed the Saviour of men (Rom 1:4), was designed by God to bring men into right relation with God (Rom 3:26; 2 Cor 5:21). So, we may say, Paul explains the relation of the sinner to Christ by the sinner’s spiritual life by thinking of a transfer of the sinner’s “curse” to Christ, which is followed by a transfer of God’s righteousness through Christ (Phil 3:9) to the sinner by faith in Christ. But we must not press this vicarious idea too far. It is not the sinner’s claim of the atonement and claim that the system is the teaching of Paul. The vicarious, compensatory, expiatory view is not in Paul’s mind. The language of redemption, propitiation, ransom, is largely figurative. We must feel the spiritual truth of a qualitative transfer of sin from man to Christ and of righteousness from Christ to man, and rest the matter there, so far as Paul’s teaching goes. Beyond this our conclusions as to substitution as the method of atonement are results of philosophising on Paul’s teaching.

The author of He adds nothing to Paul’s teaching respecting the method whereby Christ’s sacrifice operates in saving men. His purpose

3. Teach— to produce an apology showing forth of Hebrews—priestly sacrifice over that of the Apostolic priesthood, with its emphasis on the efficacy of the sacrifice rather than on its mode of operation. He does use the words “redemption” (9:12; of vers 15), “propitiation” (2:17), and emphasizes the opening up of the heavenly holy of holies by the high-priestly sacrifice of Christ. By the right of access to the holy place (the vineyard) Christ gave us data forming a system based on a real propitiation for sin and reconciliation of God similar to the Pauline teaching formulated above.

The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia: Sacrifice (NT)
Peter asserts that Christ suffered vicariously (1 Pet 2:22-24), who, although He "did no sin," "his own self bare our sins in his body 4. Petrine on the tree;" who "suffered for and 19:18, John); for the righteousness of sinners., and was not evil to the unrighteous. (1 Pet 3:18). But Peter than Paul (perhaps not so far) in elaborating how Jesus' vicarious suffering saves the sinner. The Johannine writings contain the propitiatory idea (1 John 2:2; 4:10), although John with other emphasis on the work of the Incarnate One (1 John 1:18; 1 John 4:23).

To sum up the NT teachings on the mode or operation: Jesus asserts His vicarious suffering (Mk 10:45; cf. John 10:20) and hints at the mode of its operation by using the "ransom" figure. Paul, Peter and John teach that Christ's sacrifice was vicarious, and all but Peter suggest the idea of propitiation as to the mode of its operation. There is no direct discussion of what propitiation means.

VI. Rationale of the Efficacy of Christ's Sacrifice. - Jesus emphatically rejected the sacrifice. 1. Jesus' Teaching in Hebrews 14:10. Jesus asserted His vicarious suffering (Mk 10:45; cf. John 10:20) and hinted at the mode of its operation by using the "ransom" figure. Paul, Peter and John teach that Christ's sacrifice was vicarious, and all but Peter suggest the idea of propitiation as to the mode of its operation. There is no direct discussion of what propitiation means.

The author of Hebrews, most of all NT writers, elaborates the grounds of Christ's sacrifice. (1) It was a personal and not an animal sacrifice (9:12-14). (2) It was the sacrifice of himself (Heb 10:14). (3) It was a sacerdotal person who made the sacrifice (6:20; 7:1, "after the order of Melchizedek . . . king of Salem"). (4) It was a sinner person (7:26-27; 9:14; 10:10,12). When Christ entered Consecration, 286, well says: "It became necessary, therefore, in order to gain a complete view of the sacrifice to come, to crown him upon the Cross His fulfillment of the will of God from first to last, the sacrifice of Life with the sacrifice of Life (9:11) and the sinner person to whom it was offered," "for every one (7:16, "after the power of an endless [m 'insoluble'] life") who is asked to come to the climax of argument for the superior efficacy of Christ's sacrifice when he represents Him as entering the holy of holies in the very presence of God to complete the offering for man's sin (§ 1.2; § 11.12.24).

To sum up our conclusion as to the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice: Jesus and the leading NT writers intimate that the efficacy of His sacrifice centers in His personal character, who do not discuss the subject directly. Paul, though discussing it more extensively, does not do so fully, but the author of Hebrews and culminates his argument for the finality of Christianity, in the superior efficacy of Christian sacrifice, which is grounded in his personality, Divine, royal, sinless, eternal (see Menagé, Théol. de l'Ep. ou Hébreu). It is easy to see, from the position taken by the author of Hebrews, that Anselm in Cur Deus Homo developed his theory of a sufficient sacrifice, according to which the Divinity in Christ gave His atoning sacrifice its priceless worth in God's eyes.

VII. The Human Conditions of Application. - The sacrificial death of Christ is universal in its objective potentiality, according to Jesus (Luke 24:47, "unto all the nations"); according to Paul (Rom 1:5; 5:18; 11:32; 2 Cor 5:20). But the objective redemption to be efficacious must be subjectively applied. The blood of Christ is the universally efficacious remedy for the sin-sick souls of men, but it is efficacious when the sinner makes an application. Subjectively applied, how is the application made? And the threefold answer is, by repentance, by faith, and by obedience.

(1) By repentance. - The Baptist and Jesus emphasized repentance (change of mind, as to submission of all, change of course of life) as the condition of entrance into the kingdom of God, of the kingdom of the Messianic salvation (Matt 3:2; Mark 1:15). Peter, once he repented at Pentecost and immediately after as a means of obtaining forgiveness (Acts 2:38), although emphasizing faith, also stressed repentance as an element in the human process of salvation (Acts 20:21; Rom 2:4, 5; Rev 2:5, 6). Paul, however, stresses repentance, though not stressing it as a means of receiving the benefit of salvation.

(2) By faith. - Jesus connected faith with repentance (Mark 1:15) as the condition of receiving the Messianic salvation. Peter connected faith with repentance, applying the work of the Cross. The gospel is "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth" (Rom 1:16); "whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith" (3:5). "Faith not works is reckoned for righteousness" (4:6). Paul, in the letters to the Cor. In the Captivity and the Pastoral Ep., he emphasizes faith as the condition of obtaining salvation. But what kind of faith is it that appropriates the saving benefit of Christ's death? Not historical faith, not intellectual assent, nor will, or will and intellect. Peter "heart" meant the seat or essence of the whole personality, a phrase which speaks of the faith which is in Christ the personal commitment of one's self to Christ as Saviour and Lord (2 Cor 5:15). See Thayer, Gr-Eng. Lex., "heart" and "faith," for a particular discussion of the meaning of faith in this sense. The author of Hebrews emphasizes faith as a concurring power, but also implies that it is the condition of entrance upon the life of spiritual rest and fellowship (chs 3:14). Peter and John also stress the saving benefit of the human condition of salvation when he shows how sanctification grows spontaneously out of justification (Rom 8:8) and when he says that what "avails" is "faith working through love" (Gal 5:6). The author of Hebrews says, "He became unto all them that obey Him the author of (Gr, arn, altis, cause) of eternal salvation" (Heb 2:3). Peter and John states that the latter esp. emphasizes the keeping of His commandments, the life of service, as the means of appropriation to the fullest the saving benefits of Christ's death. The theologians in classrooms and preachers in the pews have failed to emphasize this aspect of "saving faith," as did Jesus, Paul, the author of Hebrews, and John. In the NT salvation is a process as well as an objective benefit, which is wrought on the part of God, and the process is carried on by means of obedience, the life of service, which is appropriate by faith the dynamic of Christ's sacrifice.

VIII. The Christian Life's Life and the Life of Sacrifice. - This discussion of the faith that "obeys" leads to the consideration of that climactic thought of NT writers, namely, that the Christian's life is sacrificial living based on Christ's sacrifice for him. We note in outline the following:

The Christian life's life is the logical consequence of Christ's sacrificial death. The Christ who sacrificed Himself for the believer is now continuing the sacrifice in the believer's life...
exercise of all our gifts and graces is viewed by Peter as sacrificial living (1 Pet 2:5): "Ye also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices," etc. All Christians daily live as they operate as God's mighty dynamite for the apostle's moral and spiritual transformation (Phil 3:10).

It is to be noted, Jesus also emphasized this kind of living, though not so expressly connecting the believer's sacrificial life with His sacrificial death (see Mk 8:34).

Christ's sacrificial death becomes the persuasive appeal for the Christian's sacrificial life, "Because we thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died; and he died for all; that they that live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who for their sakes died and rose again" (2 Cor 5:15). Because He died for us, we should live for Him. But what is the appeal which Christ's sacrificial death makes to the saved sinner? "The love of Christ constraineth us" (2 Cor 5:14). Christ's death on the cross exhibits His love, unsurpassed, unthinkable, love for it was love for His "enemies" (Rom 5:10), and this love that He shed for the sinner's heart. He is willing to do anything, even to die, for his Saviour who died for him (Acts 21:13; Phil 2:29-30).

It is a greater privilege for the saved sinner to suffer for Christ than it is to believe on Him. Peter (1 Pet 3:17-18), the author of He (12:13) and John (1 John 3:16; 4:16-19) emphasize this truth.

The Christian's sacrifice is necessary to fill out Christ's sacrifice. 'Now I rejoice in my sufferings for you, and in my flesh I suffer with Christ (Col 1:24).

s. sacrifice

Roman Catholic exegetes have made the apostle teach that the sufferings of the saints, along with Christ's sufferings, have atoning efficacy. But Paul nowhere intimates that his sufferings avail for putting away sins. We may hold with Weiss (Comm. on the NT) that Paul longed to experience in his flesh the full measure of Christ's sacrificial suffering as Christ did; or with Alford (in loc.) that he wished to suffer his part of Christ's sufferings to be endured by him through his Church; or, as it seems to us, he longed to make effective by his ministry of sacrifice the spiritual benefit that all things in this sacrifice are to Christ's sacrifices avails in saving men only when Christians sacrifice their lives in making known this sacrifice of Christ.

(1) The Christian is to present his personality (Rom 15:16). Paul commends the Macedonians for "first" giving "their own selves to the Lord" (2 Cor 8:5). (2) Christians must present their "bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God" (Rom 12:1). In the old system the animals were offered as dead; Christians are to offer their bodies, all their members with their powers, to God a "living sacrifice," i.e. a sacrifice which operates in lives of holiness and service (see also Rom 6:15). (3) Christians receive many benefits. Their money is used up in the service of God. Paul speaks of the gift from the church at Philippi as "a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God" (Phil 4:18). This gift was to the apostle a beautiful expression of the sacrificial spirit imparted to them because they had the "mind of Christ who emptied himself ... becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross" (2:5-8). The author of He (13:16) exhorts his readers, "But to do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." (4) The general

5. The Supper as a sacrifice

Neither Jesus, Paul, the author of He, and Peter, nor John, ever hints that in eating the bread and drinking the wine, we offer a sacrifice to God in Christ. Paul tells that in partaking of the Supper we "proclaim the Lord's death till he come" (1 Cor 11:26). That is, instead of offering a sacrifice ourselves to God, in partaking of the Supper we proclaim the offering of Christ's sacrifice for us. Milligan argues that Jesus in heaven perpetually offers Himself for us, so we on earth, in the Supper, offer ourselves to Him (Heavenly Priesthood, 266).

Even Cavelly (Spiritual Doctrine of the Eucharist, 436) maintains, "In some sense saying the Lord's Supper may be called a sacrifice." See the above books for the argument supporting this position.

To sum up our conclusions on sacrifice in the NT:

(1) Jesus and NT writers regard the OT sacrificial system as from God, but imperfect, the various sacrifices serving only as types of the one great sacrifice which Christ made.

(2) All the writers, except James and Jude, with Jesus, emphasize the sacrificial idea. Jesus less, giving only a hint of His sacrificial death (in the Synoptic Gospels), the author of He putting the climactic emphasis on Christ's sacrifice as the sacrifice of atonement.

(3) As to the relation of Christ's sacrifice to man's salvation, the latter is the achievement of the former, so expressed only twice by Jesus, but emphatically so declared by Paul, the author of He, Peter, and John (Paul and He laying most emphasis on this point).

(4) As to how Christ's sacrifice saves men, Jesus, the author of He, Peter and John suggest the idea of propitiation, while Paul emphatically teaches that man is under a curse, exposed to the displeasure of God, and that Christ's sacrifice secured the reconciliation of God by vindicating His righteousness in punishing sin and His love in saving sinners.

(5) As to the rational basis of efficacy in Christ's sacrifice, there is no direct discussion in the NT except by the author of He who grounds its final, eternal efficacy in Christ's personality, Divine, royal, sinless and eternal.

(6) As to the conditions of applying Christ's sacrifice, repentance, faith, and all the leading NT writers as the means of appropriating the benefits of Christ's sacrifice.

(7) By Jesus, Paul, the author of He, Peter and John the Christian life is viewed as the life of sacrifice. Christ's death is at once the cause, motive,
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measure, and the dynamic of the Christian's sacrificial life.

Literature.—In addition to the great comm.—


C. B. Williams

SACRIFICE, HUMAN, bû'man: As an expression of religious devotion, human sacrifice has been widespread at certain stages of the race's development. The tribes of Western Asia were deeply affected by the practice, probably prior to the settlement of the Hebrews in Palestine and it continued at least down to the 4th century B.C. At times of great calamity, anxiety and danger, parents sacrificed their children as the greatest and most costly offering which they could make to propitiate the anger of the gods and thus secure their favor and help. There is no indication in the Bible that strangers or captives were sacrificed; only the offering of children by their parents is mentioned. The belief that this offering possessed the proper recluse value is seen in Mic 6:6; where the sacrifice of the firstborn is the climax of a series of offerings which, in a rising scale of values, are suggested as a means of mitigating the angry Jeh. A striking example of the rite as actually practiced is seen in 2 K 3:27, where Mesha the king of Moab (made famous by the Moabite Stone), under the stress of a terrible siege, offered his eldest son, the heir-apparent to the throne, as a burnt offering upon the wall of Kir-hareseth. As a matter of fact this horrid act seems to have had the effect of driving off the allies.

Human sacrifice was ordinarily resorted to, no doubt, only in times of great distress, but it seems to have been practiced among the old Canaanitish tribes with some frequency (Dt 12:31). The Israelites are said to have borrowed it from their Canaan- neighbors (2 K 15:5; 2 Ch 28:3), and as a matter of fact human sacrifices were never offered to Jeh., but only to various gods of the land. The god who was most frequently worshipped in this way was Moled or Molech, the god of the Ammonites (2 K 21:12; Lev 18:21), the Heid. In Dn 1 we learn that the Phoen. god Baal was, at least in the later period of the history, also associated with Molech in receiving this worship (Jer 19:5; 32:35). As in the case of the Canaanites, the only specific cases of human sacrifice mentioned are among the Semites; the two kings of Judah who were most deeply affected by the surrounding heathen practices and who, at the same time, fell into great national disasters, are those of 67:5; Ezek 23:6; 2 Ch 36:6). But it is clear from many general statements that the custom was widespread among the masses of the people as well. It is forbidden in the Moabite legislature (Lev 18:21; 20:2-5; Dt 18:10); it is said in 2 K 17:17 that the sacrifice of sons and daughters was one of the causes of the captivity of the ten tribes. Jeremiah charges the people of the Southern Kingdom with doing the same thing (Jer 7:31; 19:5; 32:35); with those general statements agree the special references of the W. to the life of the period. The practice continued in the Northern Kingdom, and then only in the summary of the causes of their captivity (2 K 17:17), but the Southern Kingdom in its later years was evidently deeply affected. Thus there were various places where the bloody rite was celebrated (Jer 19:5), but the special high place, apparently built for the purpose, was in the Valley of Tophet or Hinnom (ge-hinnôm, Gehenna) near Jerus (2 Ch 29:3; 35:6). This great high place was built for the special purpose of human sacrifice (Jer 31:35; 32:35); was defiled by the good king Josiah in the hope of eradicating the cruel practice (2 K 23:10).

The Bib. writers without exception look upon the practice with horror as the supreme point of national and religious apostasy, and a chief cause of national disaster. They usually term the rite "passing through fire," probably being unwilling to use the sacred term "sacrifice" in reference to such a revolting custom. There is thus no evidence of a continuance of the practice in captivity nor after the return. It is said, however, that the heathen Sepharvites, settled by the Assyrians in the depopulated territory of the Northern Kingdom, buried their children in the fire of Adad-nirer, Adanelech and Ananaelech, the gods of Sepharvaim" (2 K 17:31). The practice is not heard of again, and probably rapidly died out. The restored Israelites were not affected by it. Cf. Sacrifices, I, VI, 10.

William Joseph McGoogan

SACRILEGE, sak'r-i-lej: For "commit sacrilege" in Rom 2:22 (AV and ERV), RV has "rob temples," which more exactly expresses the meaning of the Vulg. "vandalizet," ofActs 19:19 ("sacrilege of temples" q.v.). The noun occurs in 2 Mar 2:39 (AV and RV) for the corresponding form hierodôluma.

SADAMIAS, sad-a-mi'as: AV=RV SALEMAS (q.v.).

SADAS, sa'das: AV=RV ASTAD (q.v.).

SADDEUS, sa'de'us: AV=RV LODDUES (q.v.).

SADDLE, sa'dl': As noun (בַּלדָקן, merkâb, "a riding seat") the word occurs in Lev 16:9 in "carriage;" ordinarily it is used as a vb. (מְחָנָה, hâbbash, lit. to "bind up" or "gird about"), to saddle an ass (Gen 22:23; Nu 22:21; Igs 19:10, etc.).

SADDUCEES, sa'dû-zéz (Σαδουκαῖοι, Saddûkâiôi): I. INTRODUCTORY

1. Name: The etymology is uncertain. Probably a transliteration of Zadok the High Priest.

2. Authorities: NT: Josephus, Talmud (primary); Church Fathers (secondary).

II. ORIGIN AND HISTORY

1. Earliest Occurrence of the Name: Josephus: Alleged Relation to Differences between Prophets and Priests

2. Tenets of Sadducees toward Hellenism as Causing Raising of Ἰσαίαθέν (Jehovah) of Alexandria

3. Favorord by Alex. Jannuus: Put in the Back-ground the Historical and Theological

4. From a Political, Become Also a Religious Party

5. NT: The Sadducees—Dressed in the Manner of the Classic, Recognized as Messiah by Many, Antagonistic to the Pharisees

6. Sadducees Antagonistic to the Sanhedrin

7. Fall of Saducean Party at Outbreak of Jewish War
III. Doctrines of the Sadducees
1. Laid Siid Sid Ceremonial Untruth
2. Rehearsal in the Spiritual World, in a Resurrec-
3. 4. 5. tional, and in Providence: Their Materialism
3. 4. 5. The Sadducees
4. Relation to Epicureans
5. Chalices of the Sadducees
1. Josephus Describes Them as Boors
2. Talmudic Account of the Sadducees
3. Relation to the Temples and Worship a Hebrewish
4. Marks of the Sadducees
V. Relation of the Sadducees to Jesus
1. Reasons for His Denouncing the Sadducees as
2. Attitude of the Sadducees to Jesus

This prominent Jewish sect, though not so nu-
1. Name: The probability is, that the name is derived
2. Rival Etymologies: from some person named "Zadok.
3. The most prominent Zadok in history was the Davidic
4. Rival Etymologies: high priest (2 S 8 17, 16 24; I K 1 35), whose name was
5. Rival Etymologies: claimed to descend. It is in harmony with this,
6. Rival Etymologies: that, in the NT the Sadducees are the party to whom
7. Rival Etymologies: the high priests belonged. On the authority of
8. Rival Etymologies: Socho (c 250 BC) who taught that love to God
9. Rival Etymologies: be absolutely disinterested (Parkes Rabbah, i.3; "Rabbah d-Rabbi Nathan's account of
10. Rival Etymologies: the derivation of the Sadduceanism from this teaching
11. Rival Etymologies: it is purely an imaginary deduction (Charles Taylor,
12. Rival Etymologies: the Jewish Fathers, 112). The majority of
13. Rival Etymologies: prefer to derive the name from Zadok,
14. Rival Etymologies: of Davids, the contemporary of David.

Our main authorities for the teaching of the
1. Authorities: Sadducees are the NT and Jos. According to
2. Authorities: the Sadducees denied the
3. Authorities: the resurrection of the body, and did not
4. Authorities: in angels or spirits (Mt 22 23; Ac 23 4). Much
5. Authorities: Jos, but his evidence is to be received with
6. Authorities: that he was a Pharisee and moreover, had the
7. Authorities: and the Epicureans. The Talm is late. Before
8. Authorities: the Mishna was committed to writing (c 200 AD)
9. Authorities: the Sadducees had ceased to exist; before the
10. Authorities: Gemara was completed (c 700 AD) every valid
11. Authorities: their opinions must have vanished. Further,
12. Authorities: and the Pharisees, the Fathers, Origen, Hippolytus, Epiphanius
13. Authorities: and Jerome, have derived their information from later Pharisaic

II. Origin and History.—Jos describes the Sadducees along with the contemporary sects, the
1. Notices in I, viii, 14. His earliest notice of
2. Notices: them is after his account of the treaties of
3. Notices: Jonathan with the Romans and the
4. Notices: Lacedemonians. He indicates his belief that the
5. Notices: parties were ancient; but if so, they must have
6. Notices: formerly had a name. In preceding
7. Notices: the earlier form of the conflict between the
8. Notices: Sadducees and Pharisees was opposition between the
9. Notices: priests and the prophets. This, however, is not
10. Notices: tenable; in the Southern Kingdom there was no
11. Notices: such opposition; whatever the state of matters in
12. Notices: the Northern Kingdom, it could have had no influence on opinion in Judea and Galilee in the time of Our
13. Notices: Lord. By others the rivalry is supposed to be
14. Notices: inherited from the time between the scribes and the
15. Notices: priests, but Ezra, the earliest scribe, in the later
16. Notices: the term, was a priest with strong sacerdotal

 Probably the priestly party only gradually crystallized into the sect of the Sadducees. After the
1. Failure: return from the exile, the high priest
2. Failure: to himself all powers, civil and
3. Failure: toward religious. To the Pers authorities he
4. Failure: Hellenism was as the king of the Jews. The high
5. Failure: and those about him were the persons who had to do with the
6. Failure: government and the heathen nationalities around; this
7. Failure: would tend to lessen their religious fervor, and, by reaction, this roused the zeal of a
8. Failure: section of the people for the law. With the Gr
9. Failure: the power of the high priests at home
10. Failure: increased, but they became still more subser-
11. Failure: to their heathen masters, and were the leaders in
12. Failure: Hellenizing movement. They took no part in the
13. Failure: effort, which was mainly supported
14. Failure: by their opponents the Pre-Zaddic (as they were called (the Hasideans of 1 Macc 2 42, etc).
15. Failure: the hatahidim, having lost sympathy with the
16. Failure: Maccabees, sought to reconcile themselves to the
17. Failure: party, Alcimus, the legitimate high priest,
18. Failure: by his treachery and cruelty soon renewed the
19. Failure: The Hasmonaeans then were confirmed in
20. Failure: in the high-priesthood, but were only lukewarmly
21. Failure: supported by the hatahidim.

The division between the Hasmonaeans and the
22. Division: hatahidim, or, as they were now called, Pharisees,
23. Division: culminated in the insult offered by
24. Division: Joseph by Janus, the Has-
25. Division: menean high priest (Jos, Ant, XIII,
26. Division: naeus, Titus 5). Alexander Januarius, the son of
27. Division: Haran, became a violent partisan
28. Division: the Sadducees, and crucified large
29. Division: numbers of the Pharisees. Toward
30. Division: the end of his life he fell out of sympa-
31. Division: with the Sadducees, and on his
32. Division: his death recommended his wife Alexandra Salome,
33. Division: as guardian to his sons succeeded him, to favor
34. Division: the Pharisees, which she did. In the conflict be-
35. Division: between her two sons, John Hyrcanus II and
36. Division: Archelaus II, the Sadducees took the side of
37. Division: Archelaus, the younger. But, it is learned
38. Division: he was, that the conflict was between Jews, the
39. Division: Sadducean candidate prevailed. When the Romans were called in, they
came to the advantage of Hyrcanus.

Thrown into the background by the overthrow of
40. Thrown: their candidate for the high-priesthood, they soon
41. Thrown: regained their influence. They allied
42. Thrown: themselves with the Herodians who
43. Thrown: a Religious Party who had supported
44. Thrown: Hyrcanus, but were subversive to Rome. Though they
45. Thrown: are not theological fact, they be
46. Thrown: came to defend their policy against the attacks of the
47. Thrown: Pharisees. A historic parallel may be found in
48. Thrown: in the Cavaliers of the reign of Charles I, as over
49. Thrown: the Puritans.

The Sadducees at first regarded the struggle between Our Lord and the Pharisees as a matter
50. Regarded: with which they had no concern. It
51. Regarded: was not until Our Lord claimed to be the
52. Regarded: Messiah, and the excitement of the
53. Regarded: people consequent on this proved likely to
54. Regarded: the Pharisees, the most effective of the Roman
55. Regarded: authorities, that they intervened. Should
56. Regarded: Claims Are Tiberius learn that there was wide-
57. Regarded: recognition spread among the Jews the belief in
58. Regarded: the coming of a Jewish king who was to
59. Regarded: to rule the world, and that one had appeared who
60. Regarded: to be this Messiah, very soon would the
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quasi-independence enjoyed by the Jews be taken from them, and with this the influence of the Sadducees would depart. An oligarchy is proverbially sensitive to anything that threatens its stability; a priesthood is unmindful of its vindictiveness; and the Sadducees were a priestly oligarchy. Hence it is not wonderful that only the death of Jesus would satisfy them.

After the resurrection, the Pharisees became less hostile to the followers of Christ; but the Sadducees maintained their attitude.


Antagonistic. Although a Pharisee, it was as agent to Apostles after the death of Christ.

Departure. In the Sanhedrin, and later, under the leadership of Annas, or as he is sometimes called by Jos, Ananus, the high priest, they put James the brother of Our Lord to death (Jos, Ant., XX, ix, 1) with many others, presumably Christians. The Pharisees were against these proceedings; and even sent messengers to meet Albinus who was coming to succeed Festus as governor to entreat him to remove Annas from the high-priesthood.

With the outbreak of the Jewish war, the Sadducees with their allies the Herodians were driven into the background by the Zealots, John of Gischala and Simon ben Gioras. Annas and Joshua, also called high priest by Jos, were both put to death by the Zealots and their Iudamaean allies (Jos, BJ, IV, v, 2).

With the destruction of the temple and the fall of the Jewish state the Sadducee party disappeared.

III. Doctrines of the Sadducees.—As the ascetic party, the Sadducees laid great stress on the ceremonial of sacrifices, and rejected the changes introduced by their opponents unless these found support in the words of the Law.

The most prominent doctrine of the Sadducees was the denial of the immortality of the soul and of the resurrection of the body. The Sadducees believed that Moses had decreed that there would be no resurrection. He who was not found by Moses—i.e. found to be conformable to the Jewish Law—would not come to a resurrection. We can only surmise how this doctrine was derived.

2. Disbelief in the immortality of the soul and in the resurrection of the body.

As appearances of angels are mentioned in the Law, it is difficult to harmonize their reverence for the Law with this denial. They may have regarded these angelophanies as phantasmata. Jos distinctly asserts (Ant., XVIII, i, 4) that the Sadducees believe that the soul dies with the body. They deny, he says, Divine providence (BJ, II, viii, 14). Their theology might be called "religion within the limits of mere sensation."

The Fathers, Hippolytus, Origen and Jerome, credit the Sadducees with regarding the Pentateuch as the Canon, or the ordinary rule of life, and its Canonicity of Pentateuch Alone. This may be due to a false identification of the views of the Sadducees with those of the Samaritans. Had they rejected all the rest of Scripture, it is hardly possible that they would fail to notice this.

The Talmud does not mention this among their errors. It is certain that they gave more importance to the Pentateuch than to any other of the books of Scripture. Hence Our Lord, in the passage commented on by Origen and Jerome, appeals to the Law rather than to the Prophets or the Ps. It follows from the little value they put upon the Prophets that they had no sympathy with the Messianic hopes of the Pharisees.

It need hardly be said that there was no real connection between Sadduceanism and the doctrine of the Resurrection. The Sadducees believed in no hope of immortality, and their chief characteristic was their flagrant unbelief. Their theory of the resurrection was purely accidental. Their favor for Hellenism would give a color to this identification.

IV. Character of the Sadducees.—Jos says that while the Pharisees have amiable manners and cultivate concord among all, the Sadducees are "very boorish" (BJ, II, viii, 14).

1. Characterized as Rough and Boorish.

The way in which it behooves us to write of this sect, towards the end of the 2nd century, is one of an aristocracy, or with supple diplomats, yet it suits what we find in the NT. The cruel horseplay indulged in when Our Lord was tried before the irregular meeting of the Sanhedrin (Mt. 26:67-68), the show of Annas at the trial of Paul before the same tribunal who "emite him on the mouth," show them to be rough and overbearing.

What Jos relates of the conduct of Annas (or Ananus) in regard to James, above referred to, agrees with this. Jos, however, does not express such condemnation. Ananus—in BJ (IV, v, 2)—calls him "a man venerable and most just." Only the violence which, as Jos relates in the chapter immediately preceding that from which we have quoted, Ananus resorted to against the Zealots better agrees with the dict of Jos than the latter. As to their general character Jos mentions that when the Sadducees became magistrates they confirmed their judgments to Pharisaic opinion, otherwise they would not have been tolerated by Ant, XVIII.

As noted above, the Talmud account is untrustworthy, late and Pharisaic. The Gemara from which most of the references were taken was not committed to writing till 7 centuries after Christ, when the traditions concerning the Sadducees, such as had survived, had filtered through 20 generations of Pharisaism.

Despite this lengthened time and suspicious medium, these may be some truth in the representations of the Talmudic rabbins. In Perekham 57a it is said, "Woe's me on account of the house of Hanan [Ananas], woe's me on account of the house of Phabi; woe's me on account of the house of Kaisros; woe's me on account of their pen; woe's me on account of their house; woe's me on account of their house; woe's me on account of their house; woe's me on account of their house." This shows, if anything, that the Sadducees were not a degraded lot, as later reported; they were, perhaps, more of a sort that would appeal to such a lofty study as that of the Talmud.

2. Talmudic Accounts of the Sadducees.

At any rate, the Sadducees were the temple's metalurgists; the more severe rabbis said that they were a "sacred people with sticks." As these are Sadducean names, this passage exhibits Pharisaic tradition as to the habits of the Sadducees.

The Sadducean high priests made Hophni and Phinehas too much their models. Annas and his sons had booths in the courts of the temple for the sale of sacrificial requisites, tables for money-changers, and their Worship into the shrines of the temple. From all these the priests of the high-priestly caste derived profit at the expense of deceiving the people (Edereram, Life and Times of Jesus, I, 371 ff.). They did not, as did the Pharisees, pay spiritual religion the homage of hypocrisy; they were frankly irreligious. While officials of religion, they were devoid of its spirit. This, however, represents a later stage.

The favor for the memory of John Hyrcanus shown by the writer of 1 Macce 16:23-24 renders probable Geiger's opinion that the author was a Sadducee. He shows that the history of Hyrcanus: his outlook on life is eminently sane, and his history is trustworthy. He has sympathy with the patriotism of the Sadducees, but none with the religious scruples which led them to desert Judas Maccabaeus.

That the writer
of Eccles from his silence as to the national expectation of a Messiah and the hope of a future life was also a Sadducee, is almost certain.

V. The Relation of the Sadducees to Jesus.—As the doctrines and practices of the Sadducees were quite alien from the teaching of Our Lord, it is evident that any words He ever said to His disciples that were not in harmony with the Jewish Law, and in particular with the dietary laws, could have been taken to be derogatory of the Sadducees or had some other meaning. It is thus possible that the Sadducees were not in harmony with the Pharisees in their practice of the Law, but were more interested in the letter of the Law than the spirit of it. It is also possible that the Sadducees were not in harmony with the Pharisees in their views on the resurrection of the dead, and that the Sadducees held a different view from the Pharisees on this subject.

1. Less Denounced by Jesus than the Pharisees. Sadducees were quite alien from the teaching of Our Lord, and in particular from the teaching of His disciples. It is thus possible that the Sadducees were not in harmony with the Pharisees in their practice of the Law, but were more interested in the letter of the Law than the spirit of it. It is also possible that the Sadducees were not in harmony with the Pharisees in their views on the resurrection of the dead, and that the Sadducees held a different view from the Pharisees on this subject.

2. Attitude toward Our Lord. The Sadducees were quite alien from the teaching of Our Lord, and in particular from the teaching of His disciples. It is thus possible that the Sadducees were not in harmony with the Pharisees in their practice of the Law, but were more interested in the letter of the Law than the spirit of it. It is also possible that the Sadducees were not in harmony with the Pharisees in their views on the resurrection of the dead, and that the Sadducees held a different view from the Pharisees on this subject.

3. Saffron. Saffron is a yellow dye that is derived from the flowers of the crocus sativus plant. It is used in various foods and is also a traditional food in many countries. It is also used in medicine as a remedy for stomach problems.

4. Saints. Saints are people who are considered to be holy by the Christian church. They are usually considered to be people who have led a life of virtue and who have done good works. They are also considered to be people who have helped others and who have been examples of good behavior.

5. Sail, Sailor. Sail and sailor are terms that are used to refer to a person who is a part of the crew of a ship or boat. They are also used to refer to a person who is a part of the crew of a plane or aircraft.
of the saints" (Rom 16:2) and as such "as becometh saints" (Eph 5:3). The thought of the holy character of the "saints," which is now so common as almost completely to obscure the real thought of the NT writers, already lay in their thinking very clearly, as a clear expression of saintliness and consecration by God to be His own. David Foster Estes
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Sala, Salah, Salome (σαλά, σαλα, σαλωμή, Salomīth, סאלמה; an ancestor of Judith (Jth 8:1)) = AV “Samuel.”

Salamin, sa-lā-mīn (A, Σαλαμήν, Salamīn, סאלמיא; An ancestor of Judith (Jth 8:1)) = AV “Samuel.”

Salamin (Σαλημία, Salamía): A town on the east coast of Cyprus, situated some 5 miles north of the N. of Medievea and a little south of the town of Famagusta. It lay near the river Pediaeus, at the eastern extremity of the great plain of the Mesoreia, which runs far into the interior of the island toward Nicosia (Lefkada, the present capital). It was a good harbor and was the most populous and flourishing town of Cyprus in the Hellenic and Rom periods, carrying on a vigorous trade with the ports of Cilicia and Syria. Its population was mixed, consisting of Gr and Phoen elements. The former, however, gave its tone and color to the city, and the chief cult and temple were those of Salaminian Zeus.

Tradition represented Salamin as founded soon after the fall of Troy by Teucer, the prince of Gr archers according to the narrative of the Iliad, who named it after his home, the island of Salamis off the Attic coast. In the 6th cent. BC it figures as an important Hellenic city, ruled by a line of kings reputed to be descended from Teucer and strengthened by an alliance with Cyrene (Herod. iv.162). Gorgus, who was on the throne in 496 BC, refused to join the Ionian revolt against Persia, but the townsmen, led by his brother Oenclus, took up arms in the struggle for freedom. A crushing defeat, however, inflicted under the walls of Salamis, restored the island to its Pers overlords, who reinstated Gorgus as a vassal prince (Reed, 1 c.196). In 432 a Gr fleet under Athenian leadership defeated the Phoen. navy, which was in the service of Persia, off Salamis; but the Athenian admiral which conducted the battle led to a decided anti-Hellenic reaction, until the able and vigorous Samian prince Euphorbas, who was a warm friend of the Athenians (Isocrates, Euph.) and a successful champion of Hellenism. In 306 a sensational battle was fought at Salamis, in which Demetrius Poliorcetes defeated the forces of Pharaoh Ptolemy (Sext. Alexander). 11 years after the town came into Ptolemy’s hands and, with the rest of the island, remained an appanage of the Egypt kingdom until the incorporation of Cyprus in the Rom Empire (58 BC).

When Barnabas and Paul, accompanied by John Mark, set out on their 1st missionary journey, they sailed from Seleucia, the seaport of 3. Visit of Antioch, and landed at Salamin, about the Apostles 150 miles distant, as the harbor nearest to the Syrian coast. There they preached the gospel in the “synagogues of the Jews” (Acts 13:5); the phrase is worse noting as pointing to the existence of several synagogues and thus of a large Jewish community in Salamin. Of work among the Gentiles we hear nothing, nor is any indication given either of the duration of the apostles’ visit or of the success of their mission; but it would seem that after a short stay they proceeded to the W. to Paphos. The words seem to imply that they visited all, or at least most, of the towns in which there were Jewish communities. Paul did not return to Salamin, but Barnabas doubtless went there on his 2nd missionary journey (Acts 15:29), and tradition states that he was martyred there in Nero’s reign, on the site marked by the monastery named after him.

In 116 AD the Jews in Cyprus rose in revolt and massacred 240,000 Greeks and Romans. The rising was crushed by the utmost severity of punishment. Salamin was almost completely depopulated, and its destruction was afterward consumed by earthquakes in 332 and 342 AD. It was rebuilt, though on a much smaller scale, by the emperor Constantine (A.D. 324) under the name Constantia, and became the metropolitan see of the island. The most famous of its bishops was Epiphanius, the staunch opponent of heresy, who held the see from 367 to 403. In 617 the city was finally destroyed by the Saracens. Considerable remains of ancient buildings still remain on the site; an account of the excavations carried on there in 1890 by Messrs. J. A. R. Munro and H. A. Tubbs under the auspices of the Cyprus Exploration Fund will be found in the Journal of Hellenic Studies, XII, 56–68.

Salathiel, sa-lā-thiāl (1) (Σαλαθήθι, Salathēthi): AV; Gr form of “Shealtiel” (thus RV). The father of Zerubbabel (1 Esd 5:48–56; 6:2; Mt 1:12; Lk 3:27). (2) RV Another name of Estars (2 Esd 3:1, “Salathiel”).

Sale, sāl (ם놀, mînkār): The word is used: (1) in the sense of the transaction (Lev 25:50); (2) in the sense of the limit of time involved in the transaction (Lev 25:27); (3) in the sense of the price paid in the transaction (Lev 19:8), though it may be the same as (1) above.

Salecah, sal’-kā, Salah, Salchah, Salcah (σαλκά, σαλκά, σαλχά, σαλχά; Aḥéth, אשה, Ašhá, Asha, Ḡāl, Ṣālī, Sālī, Sālī; Ḡāl, ʾĂḵā, Ṣalāh, Ṣalāh, Ṣūlāḥ): This place first appears in Dt 3:10 as marking the eastern boundary of Bashan. It is named as one of the cities in which Og, king of Bashan, ruled (Josh 12:5). It must certainly have been included in the portion given to the half-tribe of Manasseh, "all the kingdom of Og king of Bashan," although it is not named among the cities that fell to him (Josh 13:29ff). At a later time we are told that Gad dwelt over against the Reubenites in the land of Bashan unto Salecah (1 Ch 5:11). The boundaries of the tribes probably changed from time to time.

The ancient city is represented by the modern Salkhad, a city in a high and strong position at the southern end of Jebel ed-Drūze (the Mountain of Bashan). On a volcanic hill rising some 500 ft. above the town, in what must have been the crater, stands the castle. The view from the battlements, as the present writer can testify, is one of the finest of E. of the Jordan, including the rich hollow of the Hazarán, Mt. Hermon, and all the intervening country to the mountains of Samaria, with vast reaches of the desert to the S. and to the E. The old Rom roads are still clearly seen running without curve or deviation across the country to Bozrah and Der’ah, away to the S.E. over the desert to Kal‘at el-Drūz, and eastward to the Pers Gulf. The castle was probably built by the Romans. Restored by the Arabs, it was a place of strength in Crusading times. It has now fallen on evil days. The modern town, containing many ancient houses, lies mainly on the slopes S.E. of the castle. The inhabitants are Druzes, somewhat noted for turbu-
lence. In the recent rising of the Druzees (1911) the place suffered heavily from bombardment by the Turks. For water-supply it is entirely dependent on cisterns filled during the rainy season.

SALEM, ᵐˁlem, ᵐ экономическ, ᵐאлем, ᵐאלם: The name of the city in which Melchizedek, king of Salem, was king (Gen 14: 18; Ps 76 1; 2). To all appearance it lay near and “the Vale of Shaveh,” described as “the King’s Vale.” The general opinion among the Jews was that Salem was the same as Jeru, as stated by Jos (Ant, i, 2), who adds (VII, iii, 2) that it was known as Solyym (Σαλμών, ᵐאולם, variants, according to Whiston, Salem and Hierosolyma) in the time of Abraham. It was also reported that the city and its temple were called Solyyma by Homer, and he adds that the name in Heb means “security.” This identification with Jerus was accepted by Orlkos and all the Tgs, as well as by the early Christians. The Samaritans have always identified Salem with Nazareth, but Jewish and Christian tradition is more likely to be correct, supported, as it is, by Ps 76 2.

1. Identification: The name of the city in which Melchizedek, king of Salem, was king (Gen 14: 18; Ps 76 1; 2).

2. Testimony on the Tab is apparently negative. Knudtzon’s no. 287 mentions “the land” and “the lands of the Urusalm called Bit-Ninigiy Tablets (Brit 128, 3: 2, 2). As there is no prefix of any kind before the element salim, it is not probable that this is the name of either a man (the city’s founder) or a god (like the Assyry Saliman). The form in Sennacherib’s inscriptions (cf Taylor Cylinder, II, 53, 54, Utartummi, gives the whole as a single word in the nominative, the double m implying that the i was long. As the Assyrians pronounced a as sh, it is likely that the Usurimites did the same, the Heb yāḏaḥānit, with sh. See Jerusalem.

T. G. Pinches

SALEM (Σαλήμ, ᵐאלהם, AV Salum): An ancestor of Ezra (1 Esd 8 1) = “Shallum” in Ezr 7 2 = “Salmans” in 2 Esd 1 1.

SALEMAS, saꞌē-mas, saꞌē-mas (Lat Salome; AV Sadamia): An ancestor of Ezra (2 Esd 1 1) = “Shallum” in Ezr 7 2; called also “Salem” in 1 Esd 8 1.

SALIM, saꞌim (Σαλήμ, ᵐאלהם, Salém): A place evidently well known, since the position of Aeon, the springs where John was baptizing, was identified by reference to it: they were “near to Salim” (Jn 3 23). It must be sought on the W. of the Jordan, as will be seen from comparison of Jn 1 28; 3 26; 10 40. Many identifications have been proposed: e.g., that of Afford with Shilhim and Ain in the S. of Judah; that of Bleshin with “Ain Kārim, and that of Barday, who would place Salim in Wady Salem near Andā, making Aeon the springs in Wady Fā’rah. These are all ruled out by their distance from the district where John is known to have been at work. If there were no other objection to that suggested by Conder (Tent Work, 49 f) following Robinson (BR, III, 333) with Salim in the plain E. of Nablus, Aeon being “Ainān in Wady Far’ah,” it would be sufficient to say that this is in the very heart of Samaria, and therefore impossible. In any case the position of Aeon, 6 miles distant, with a high intervention, could hardly be defined by the village of Salim, with the important city of Shechem quite as near, and more easily accessible.

Onom places Aemon 8 Rom miles S. of Scythopolis (Beta), near Samim (Salim) and the Jordan. This points to Tell ʿRudhārā, on the northern side of which is a shrine known locally as Sīkār Salīm. Not far off, by the ruins of Um ʿum El-ʿAmārā, there are seven copious fountains which might well be called Aemon, “place of springs.”

There is reason to believe that this district did not belong to Samaria, but was included in the lands of Scythopolis, which was an important member of the league of ten cities. W. Ewing

SALIMOTH, salīm’oth (B, ᵐאלום, Salmith; A, ᵐאלוים, ᵐאשלום; the latter is due to a wrong division of syllables; AV Assalimoth): The same as “Shelmoth” (Ezr 8 10). S., the son of Josephias, of the family of Banias, and with him 130 men went up to Jerus with Ezra (1 Esd 8 36).

SALLAI, sal’ā-ī, sal’ā (ט’ י, sallyay; סָלָלִים, Salōm, א, Sālā, Sālā, Sālā, with variants):

1. (1) Eponym of a Benjamite family which settled at Jerus after the return, descendants of “Sallu” (1 Ch 9 7; Neh 11 7 8; Jer 14 1 3; 29 11 21). The pedigree of Sallu differ decidedly in the two passages. Curtius (ICC) suggests that “son of Hadaviah, the son of Hase- mhah (Ch) is a corruption or derivation of ‘Judah the son of Hassumah’ (Neh).”

2. Name of a priestly family (Neh 12 20), called “Salim” in ver 7.

SALLU, sal’ū. See Sallai.

SALLUMUS, sa-lat’mas, sa-lat’mas (Σαλλομοῦσα, Σαλλομώσα): One of the porters who had taken “strange wives” (1 Esd 9 25) = “Salum” in Ezr 10 24; called also “Salum” in 1 Esd 5 28.

SALMA, sa’lma. See Salom.

SALMAI, sa’lmî, sa’lmâ-ī (ט’ י, salmay; AV Shalmai [AV in Neh 7 48 is “Shalmai” = Ezr 2 40; RV “Salmoi”]): The eponym of a family of Nethinim, called “Shamlaiai” in Ezr 2 46 (K, ᵐאלוים, ᵐאשלם, ʿAin, Kithib, ᵐב Malone, av S. of Judah; that of Bleshin with “Ain Kārim, and that of Barday, who would place Salim in Wady Salem near Andā, making Aeon the springs in Wady Far’ah. These are all ruled out by their distance from the district where John is known to have been at work. If there were no other objection to that suggested by Conder (Tent Work, 49 f) following Robinson (BR, III, 333) with Salim in the plain E. of Nablus, Aeon being “Ainān in Wady Far’ah,” it would be sufficient to say that this is in the very heart of Samaria, and therefore impossible. In any case the position of Aeon, 6 miles distant, with a high intervention, could hardly be defined by the village of Salim, with the important city of Shechem quite as near, and more easily accessible.
SALOAS, salt'6-as (Σαλώας, Salōas; AV Talsus after LXX Thalass)); In 1 Esd 9 22, for “Elashah” of Ex 10 22.

SALOM, sāl'om (Σαλομ, Salōm):
1) The father of Heklas (Bar 1 7). Gr form of “Salt”.
2) AV=RV “Sahu” (1 Mace 2 26).

SALOME, sa-lō'mē (Σαλομή, Salōmē):
1) One of the holy women who accompanied with Jesus in Galilee and ministered to Him (Mk 16 40.41). She was present at the crucifixion (15 40), and was among those who came to the tomb of Jesus on the resurrection morning (16 1.2). Comparison with Mt 27 56 clearly identifies her with the wife of Zebedee. It is she, therefore, who made the ambitious request for her sons James and John is recorded in Mt 20 20-24; Mk 10 35-40. From Jn 19 25 many infer that she was a sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus (thus Meyer, Luthardt, Alford); others (see Godet, KJ) dispute the inference.
2) Salome was the name of the daughter of Herodias who danced before Herod, and obtained as reward the head of John the Baptist (Mt 14 3-11; Mk 6 17-28; of Jos, Ant, XVIII, v. 4). She is not named in the Gospels. JAMES ORR

SALT, sōlt (σάλτ, melôb; ἁλας, ἡδας, ἄλας, ἡδά): Common salt is considered by most authorities as an essential ingredient of our food. Most people intentionally season their cooking with more or less salt for the sake of palatability. Others depend upon the small quantities which naturally exist in water and many foods to furnish the necessary amount of salt for the body. Either too much salt or the lack of it creates undesirable disturbance in life. The Men and animals alike instinctively seek for this substance to supplement or improve their regular diet. The ancients appreciated the value of salt for seasoning food (Job 6 6). So necessary was it that they dignified it by making it a requisite part of sacrifices (Lev 2 13; Ex 3 6; 7 22; Ezk 43 24; Mk 9 49). In Nu 18 19; 2 Ch 13 5, a “covenant of salt” is mentioned (cf Mk 9 49). This custom of pledging friendship or confirming a compact by eating food containing salt was observed among Arab-speaking peoples. The Arab, word for “salt” and for its “compact” or “treaty” is the same. Doughty in Arabs appealed more than once to the superstitious belief of the Arabs in the “salt covenant,” to save his life. Once an Arab has received in his hand even his worst enemy and has eaten salt (food) with him, he is bound to protect his guest as long as he remains. See COVENANT OF SALT.

The chief source of salt in Pal is from the extensive deposits near the “sea of salt” (see Dead Sea), where there are literally mountains and valleys of salt (2 S 8 13; 2 K 14 7; 1 Ch 18 12; 2 Ch 25 11). On the seacoast the inhabitants frequently gather the sea salt. They fill the rock crevices with sea water and leave it for the hot summer sun to evaporate. After evaporation the salt crystal can be collected. As salt-gathering is a government monopoly in Turkey, the government sends men to pollute the salt which is being surreptitiously crystalized, so as to make it unfit for eating. Another extensive supply comes from the salt lakes in the Syrian desert E. of Damascus and toward Palmyra. All native salt is more or less bitter, due to the presence of other salts such as magnesium sulphate.

Salt was used not only as a food, but as an astringent in medicine. Newborn babes were bathed and salted (Exk 16 4), a custom still prevailing. The Arabs of the desert consider it so necessary, that in the absence of salt they bathe their infants in camels' urine. Elisha is said to have healed the waters of Jericho by casting a crust of salt into the spring (2 K 2 20 f). Abimelech sowed the ruins of Shechem with salt to prevent a new city from arising in its place (Jgs 9 45). Lot's wife turned to a pillar of salt (Gen 19 26).

Figuratively Salt is emblematic of loyalty and friendship (see above). A person who has once joined in a “salt covenant” with God and then breaks it is easily to be cast out (cf Mt 5 13; Mk 9 50). Saltiness typified barrenness (Dt 29 23; Jgs 17 6). Often compared with the same mouth giving forth blessings and cursings to a fountain yielding both sweet and salt water (Jas 3 11 f). JAMES A. PATCH

SALT, CITY OF, τ'ρ ho-melâh; Αι, πολείς (τας, τας πόλεις hand): One of the six cities in the wilderness of Judah mentioned between Nibshan and Engedi (Jos 15 62). The site is very uncertain. The large and important Tell el-Milh (i.e. “the salt hill”), on the route from Hebron to Akaba, is possible.

SALT, COVENANT OF. See COVENANT OF SALT.

SALT, PILLAR OF. See LOT; SALT; SIDDIM; SLIME.

SALT SEA. See Dead Sea.

SALT, VALLEY OF (τ'ρ ho-melâh), ge ho-melâh): The scene of battles, firstly, between David or his lieutenant Abishai and the Edomites (2 S 8 13; 1 Ch 18 12; Ps 60, title), and later between Amaziah and those same foes (2 K 14 7; 2 Ch 25 11). It is tempting to connect this “Valley of Salt” with et Sebelah, the marshy, salt-impregnated plain which extends from the southern end of the Dead Sea to the foot of the cliffs, but in its present condition it is an almost impossible place for a battle of any sort. The ground is so soft and spongy that a wide detour around the edges has to be made by those wishing to get from one side to the other. It is, too, highly probable that in earlier times the whole of this low-lying area was covered by the waters of the Dead Sea. It is far more natural to identify ge ho-melâh with the Wādy el-Milḥ (“Valley of Salt”), one of the three valleys which unite at Beersheba to form the Wādy es-Še'ba. These valleys, el-Milḥ and es-Še'ba, together make a natural frontier to Camaan.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

SALT-WORT, sōlt'wurt (σαλτάρης, melâth, a word connected with melâb, “salt,” tr in LXX ἁλόμος, ἁλίμος; AV mallow): The halimos of the Greeks is the sea orache, Atriplex halimus, a silvery whithish shrub which flourishes upon the shores of the Dead Sea alongside the ruin (see JENIPER). Its leaves are oval and somewhat like those of an olive. They have a sour flavor and would never be eaten when better food was obtainable (Job 30 4). The “mallows” is due to the apparent similarity of the Heb melâb to the Gr melâth, melâchê, which is the Lat meloa and Eng. “mallow.” Certain species of meloa known in Arab, as 3lûlah, khubâzeh, are very commonly eaten by the poor of Pal.

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

SALU, sāl'û (Σαλού, salâ; LXX B, Σαλωναί, Salōnai, Σαλω, Salâ; AV has “Salom” in 1 Mace 2 26): A prince and the head of the tribe of Simeon and the father of Zimri who was slain by Phinehas along with the Midianitish woman.
whom he had brought to the camp of Israel (Nu 25:14; 1 Mac 2:26).

**SALUM, sālūm (Σαλούμ, Salaōm):** The head of one of the families of porters (1 Esd 5:28; om. in B) = “Shallum” in Exr 2:42; 10:24; Neh 7:45 = “Sallumus” in 1 Esd 9:25.

**SALUTATION, sal-ō-ū-thum (ἀσπασμός, aspas-mōs):** A greeting which might be given in person, orally (Lk 1:20-14.44), or in writing, usually at the close of a letter (1 Cor 16:21; Col 4:18; 2 Thess 3:17). The use of salūm, “greeting,” “joy” (in Jas 1:1). The Pharisaic Jews loved salutations in public places (Mt 23:7; Mk 12:38, AV “greeting,” RV “salutation”); Lk 11:43; 20:46). Often these salutations were very elaborate, involving much time in prostrations, embraces, etc. When Jesus therefore sent out the Seventy, He forbade salutation by the way (Lk 10:4), though He ordinarily encouraged proper civilities of this sort (Mt 5:47; 10:12).  

**EDWARD BAGBY POPLAND**

**SALVATION, sal-vā-šún:**

1. **I. IN THE OT:**
   1. General
   2. Individualism
   3. Faith
   4. Moral Law
   5. Ritual Law

2. **II. INTERMEDIATE LITERATURE:**
   1. General
   2. The Law

3. **III. THE TEACHING OF CHRIST:**
   1. The Baptist
   2. Kingdom of God
   3. Present and Future
   4. Individualism
   5. Moral Progress
   6. Forgiveness
   7. Person of Christ
   8. Notes

4. **IV. ST. PAUL:**
   1. General
   2. Moral Progress
   3. The Spirit
   4. Mystical Union
   5. Forgiveness
   6. Atonement
   7. Summary
   8. Notes

5. **V. REST OF NT: SUMMARY:**
   1. St. John
   2. Hebrews
   3. St. Peter
   4. Summary

**LITERATURE:**

In EV the words “salvation,” “save,” are not technical theological terms, but denote simply “deliverance,” in almost any sense the latter word can have. In systematic theology, however, “salvation” denotes the whole process by which man is delivered from all that would prevent his attaining to the highest good that God has prepared for him. Or, by a transferred sense, “salvation” denotes the actual enjoyment of that good. So, while these technical senses are often associated with the Gr or Heb words τρ “save,” etc, yet they are still more often used in connection with other words or represented only by the general sense of a passage. And so a collection of the original terms for “save,” etc. is of use, not only for the student doing minute detailed work, while it is the purpose of the present article to present a general view of the Bib. doctrine of salvation.

1. **I. IN THE OT.** (1) As long as revelation had not raised the level that separates this life from the next, the Israelite thought of his high-

2. **II. General**
   1. General

*But a definite religious idea was present also, for the “land of milk and honey,” even under angelic protection, was worthless without access to God (Ex 33:1-4), to know whom gives happiness (Isa 1:19; Hab 2:14; Jer 31:34). Such a concept is normal for most of the OT, but there are eternal significances behind it. That Israel should receive God’s characteristic of righteousness is a part of the ideal (Isa 1:26; 4:3.4; 32:1-8; 33:24; Jer 31:33-34; Ezek 26:26; Zec 8; Dn 9:24; Ps 81:19-12). Good was found in the extension of Israel’s good to the surrounding nations (Mic 4:1-4; Isa 2:4-5; 45:5.6; Zec 2:11; 8:22-23; Is 60:66-19-21; Zec 14:16-17, etc), even to the extension of the legitimate sacrificial worship to the soil of Egypt (Isa 19:22). Paul was insufficient for the enjoyment of God’s gifts, and a new heaven and a new earth were to be received (Isa 66:17; 66:22), and a share in the glories was not to be denied even to the dead (Isa 26:19; Dn 12:2). And, among the people so glorified, God would dwell in person (Isa 60:19-20; Zec 2:10-15). (2) Salvation, then, means deliverance from all that interferes with the enjoyment of these blessings. So it takes countless forms—deliverance from natural plagues, from internal dissensions, from external enemies, or from the subjugation of conquerors (the exile, particularly). As far as enemies constitute the threatening danger, the prayer for deliverance is often based on their evil character (Ps 101, etc). But for the individual all these evils are summed up in the word “death,” which was thought to terminate all relation to God and all possibility of enjoying His blessings (Ps 115:17; Isa 38:18, etc). And so “death” became established as the antonym to “salvation,” and in this sense the word has persisted, although the equation of salvation = physical death has long been transcended. But death and its attendant evils are worked by God’s wrath, and so it is from this wrath that salvation is sought (Josh 7:26, etc). And thus, naturally, salvation is from everything that raises that wrath, above all from sin (Ezk 36:25-28, etc).

* (1) At first the “unit of salvation” was the nation (less prominently the family), i.e. a man through righteous could lose salvation through idolatry (2 S 21:1-14), a king on his subjects (2 S 24), or an unknown sinner could bring guilt on an entire community (Dt 21:1-9). (On the other hand, ten righteous would have saved Sodom (Gen 18:32). And the principle of personal responsibility was grasped but slowly. It is enunciated partly in Dt 24:16 (cf Jer 31:29-30), definitely in Ezek 14:12-20; 33:1-20, and fairly consistently in the Ps. But even Ezekiel still held that five-and-twenty could defile the whole nation (8:16), and he had not the premises for resolving the problem—that temporal disasters need not mean the loss of salvation. (2) But even when it was realized that a man lost salvation through his own fault, the converse did not follow. Salvation came, not by the man’s mere merit, but because the man belonged to a nation peculiarly chosen by God. God had made a covenant with Israel and His fidelity insured salvation: the salvation comes from God because of His promise or (in other words) because of His name. Indeed, the great failing of the people was to trust too blindly to this promise, an attitude denounced continually by the prophets throughout (from, say, Am 3:2 to Mt 3:9). And yet even the prophets admit a real truth in the attitude for despite Israel’s sins, eventual salvation is certain. Ezek 20 states this baldly: there has been nothing good in Israel and there is nothing good in her at the prophet’s own day, but, notwithstanding, God will give her restoration (cf Isa 8:17-18; Jer 32:15-18, etc).
Hence, of the human conditions, whole-hearted trust in God is the most important. (Belief in God is, of course, never argued in the Bible.)

3. Faith
Inconsistent with such trust are, for instance, seeking aid from other nations (Isa 30:5–8), putting reliance in human skill (2 Ch 16:12), or forsaking Pal through fear (Jer 42). In Isa 26:20 entire passivity is demanded, and in 2 K 13:19 lukewarmness in executing an apparently meaningless command is rebuked. (1) Next in importance is the attainment of a moral standard, expressed normally in the various codes of the Law. But fulfilment of the letter of the commandment was by no means all that was required. For instance, the Law permitted the selling of a debtor into slavery (Dt 15:12), but the rarely use of the creditor's right is sharply condemned (Neh 5:1–13). The prophets are never weary of giving short formulae that will exclude such supralegalism and reduce conduct to a puremotive: "Hate the evil, and love the good, and establish justice in the gate" (Am 5:15); "To do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God (Mic 6:8). And the chief emphasis is placed under the Law, esp. Ps 119 (cf Ps 147:20). (2) Certain breaches of the Law had no pardon, but were visited with death at once, even despite repentance and confession (Josh 7). But for the most part it is promised that men may remove the guilt of the sin if the sin be forsaken (Ezk 18) or, in the case of a sin that would not be repeated, if contrition be felt (2 S 12). Suffering played a part in salvation by bringing knowledge of sin to the conscience, the exile being the most important example (Ezk 33:21). But always it is assumed that the possibility of keeping the Law is in man's own power, Dt 30:11–14 stating this explicitly, while the Wisdom Books equate virtue with learning. Consequently, an immense advance was made when men felt the need of God's help to keep the Law, the need of the inscription of the Laws on the heart (Jer 31:31–34). So an outlook was opened to a future in which God would make the nation righteous (see references in 1, above), instead of repentance as expiating past sins was an act of God's mercy. And so His mercy instituted other and additional 5. Sacrifices means of expiation, most notably that of the sacrifices. But a theology of sacrifice is completely absent in the OT; for Lev 17 11 is too incidental and too obscure to be any exception. The Christian (or very late Jewish) interpretations of the ritual laws lack all solidity of exegetical foundation, despite their one-time prevalence. Nor is the study of origins of much help for the meaning attached to the rites by the Jews in historic times. General ideas of offering, of self-denial, of propitiation of wrath, and of entering into communion with God assuredly existed. But in the advanced stages of the religion there is no evidence that sacrifices were thought to produce their effect because of any of these things, but solely because God had commanded the sacrifices. (2) Most sins required a sacrifice as part of the act of repentance, although in case of injury done to the neighbor, only after reparation had been made. It is not quite true that for conscious sins no sacrifices were appointed, for in Lev 5:1; 6 1–3, sins are included that could not be committed through mere negligence. (1) Some rules of such 18:30–31 nature cannot be construed too rigorously. (3) Sacrifices as means of salvation are taught chiefly by Ezek, while at the rebuilding of the temple (Hag, Zec) and the depression that followed (Mal), they were much in the foreground, but the preexilic prophets have little to say about their positive value (Jer 7:22 is the nadir). Indeed, in prexilic times the danger was the exaltation of sacrifice at the expense of morality, esp. with the peace offering, which could be turned into the sowing of idolatry (Am 5:21–24; Isa 22:13; cf Prov 7:14). Attempts were made to "strengthen" the sacrifices to Jeh by the use of ethnic rites (Hos 4:14; Isa 66:1–5), even with the extreme of human sacrifice (Jer 7:31; Ezek 20:36). But insistence on the strict consecration of the sacrifices, giving increasing emphasis laid on the sin and trespass offerings did away with the worst of the abuses. And many of the Ps, esp. 66, 118, give beautiful evidence of the devotion that could be nourished by the sacrificial rites.

Of the other means of salvation the ritual law (not always sharply distinguishable from the moral law) bulks rather large in the legislation, but is not prominent in the Law prophets. Requisite to salvation was the abstention from certain acts, articles of food, etc., such abstinence seeming to lie at the background of the term "holiness." But a ritual breach was often a matter of moral duty (burying the dead, etc.), and, for such breaches, a ritual means of atonement was provided. But yet it is too widely dropped. Evidently such things lay rather on the circumference of the religion, even to Ezekiel, with his anxious zeal against the least defilement. The highest ritual point is touched by Zec 10:20,21, which would not be unif to use in the temple (cf Jer 31:38–40). Yet, even with this perfect holiness, sacrifices would still have a place as a means by which the holiness could be increased. Indeed, this more "positive" view of sacrifice was doubtless more prominent in the ant. II. Intermediate Literature.—(1) The great change, compared with the earlier period, is that the idea of God had become more 1. General transcendent. But this did not necessarily mean an increase in religious value, for there was a corresponding tendency to take God out of relation to the world by an intellectualizing process. This, when combined with the persistence of the older concept of salvation in this life only, resulted in an emptying of the religious instinct and in indifferentism. This tendency is well represented in Ecc, more acutely in Sir, and in NT times it dominated the thought of the Sadducees. On the other hand the expansion of the idea of salvation to correspond with the higher conception of God, and the thoroughgoing ethical life and created the new literary form of apocalyptic, represented in the OT esp. by Zec 9–14; Isa 24–27, and above all by Dnl. And in the intermediate literature all shades of thought between the two extremes are represented. But too much emphasis can hardly be laid on the fact that this intermediate teaching is in many regards simply faithful to the OT. Almost anything that can be found in the OT—with the important exception of the note of joyousness of Dt, etc.—can be found again here. (2) Of the conceptions of the highest good the lowest is the Epicureanism of Sir. The highest is probably that of 2 Esd 7:91–98 RY: "To behold the face of him whom in their lifetime they served," the last touch of materialism being eliminated. Indeed, real materialism is notably absent in the period, even En 10 17–19 being less exuberant than the fancies of such early Christian writers as Papias. Individualism is generally taken for granted, but that the opposite opinion was by no means dormant even at a late period is shown by Mt 3:9. The idea of a special privilege of Israel, however, of course pervades all the literature, Sib Or 6 and Jub being the most exclusive books and the XII Tests, the most broad-hearted. In place of national privilege, though, is sometimes found the
still less edifying feature of party privilege (Ps Sol; En 94:105); the most offensive case being the assertion of En 90:6-9 that the (inactive) Israel will be saved by the exertions of the "little lamb" Pharisees, before whom every knee shall bow in the Messianic kingdom.

(1) The conceptions of the moral demands for salvation at times reach a very high level, esp. in the XII Tests. (making every allowance for Christian interpolations). The spirit of love worketh together with the law of God in long-suffering unto the salvation of men" (Test. Gad 4:7) is hardly unworthy of St. Paul, and even Job can say, "Let each love his brother in mercy and justice, and let none wish the other evil" (36:8). But the great tendency is to view God's law merely as a series of written statutes, making no demands except those gained from a rigid construing of the letter. In Lk 10:29, "Who is my neighbor?" is a real question—"if he is not my neighbor I need not love him!" So duties not literally commanded were settled by utilitarian motives, as outside the domain of religion, and the unhealthy phenomenon of works of supererogation made its appearance (Lk 17:10). The writer of Wisd. can feel the real need of salvation, and he saw too that idolatry had been abstained from (15:4; contrast St. Paul's polemic in Rom. 2). And discussions about "greatest commandments" caused character in its relation to religion to be forgotten. (2) As God's commands were viewed as statutes the distinction between the moral and the ritual was lost, and the ritual law attained enormous and familiar proportions. The beautiful story of Judith is designed chiefly to teach abstinence from ritual uncleanness (Lk 17:10). And the most extreme case is in Job 9:33-38—all of Israel's woes come from keeping the feasts by the actual moon instead of by a correct (theoretical) moon (1). (3) Where self-complacency ceased and a strong moral sense was present, despair makes its appearance with extraordinary frequency. The period is the period of penitential prayers, with an undercurrent of doubt as to how far mercy can be expected (Three vs 3-22; Pr Man; Bar 3:1-8, etc.). "What profit is it unto us, if there be promised us an immortal time, whereas we have done the works that Balak the son of Zippor hath commanded us?" (Ps. 119:11 RV). The vast majority of men are lost (9:16) and must be forgotten (6:55), and Ezra can trust for his own salvation only by a special revelation (77:77 RV). So, evidently, St. Paul's pre-Christian experience was very great. (4) The NT background is the extreme lack of prominence of the sacrifices. They are never given a theological interpretation (except in Philo, where they cease to be sacrifices). Indeed, in Sir 36:38 they are explicitly said to be devotions for the righteous only, apparently prized only as an inheritance from the past and "because of the commandment" (Sir 35:5; yet of 38:11). When the temple was destroyed and the sacrifices ceased, Judaism went on its way almost unaffected, showing that the sacrifices meant nothing essential to the people. And, even in earlier times the Essenes rejected sacrifices altogether, without losing thereby their recognition as Jews.

III. The Teaching of Christ.—The Baptist proclaimed authoritatively the near advent of the kingdom of God, prepared by a Messianic judgment that would bring fire for the wicked and the Holy Spirit for the righteous. Simple but incisive moral teaching and warning against trusting in national privileges, with baptism as an outward token of repentance, were to prepare men to face this judgment squarely. But we have no data to determine how much farther (if any) the Baptist conceived his teaching to lead.

It was in the full heat of this eschatological revival that the Baptist had fanned, that Christ began to teach, and He also began to 2. Kingdom with the eschatological phrase. The kingdom of God is a connotation of "judge-ment" and at hand," and in this context, "Repent ye" (Mk. 1:15) must mean "lost ye be judged." Hence, Our Lord's teaching about salvation had primarily a future content: positively, admission into the kingdom of God, and negatively, deliverance from the preceding judgment. So the kingdom of God is the "highest good" of Christ's teaching but, with His usual reserve, He has little to say about its externals. Man's nature is to be perfectly adapted to his spiritual environment (see RESURRECTION), and man is to be with Christ (Lk 22:30) and the patriarchs (Mt 8:11). But otherwise—and again as usual—the current descriptions are used without comment, even when they rest on rather materialistic imagery (Lk 9:60). Thus the kingdom of God is, however, its meaning is hardly certainly not exhausted by a mere reformulation of the present order of material things.

But the fate of man at judgment depends on what man is before judgment, so that the practical problem is salvation from the conditions that will bring judgment; i.e. present and Future and future salvation are inseparably connected, and any attempt to make rigid distinctions between the two results in logomachies. Occasional cases where Christ is said to be the kingdom of God as present, in the sense that citizens of the future kingdom are living already on this earth (Mt 11:11; Lk 17:21[?]: the meaning of the latter verse is very dubious). Such men are "saved" already (Lk 19:9; 7:50?), i.e. such men were delivered from the bad moral condition that was so extended that Satan could be said to hold sway over the world (Lk 10:18; 11:21).

That the individual wiles the name in this deliverance needs no proof. Still, the Divine privilege of the Jews was a reality and Christ's normal work was limited to them (Mt. 15:24). He admitted even that the position of the Jewish religious leaders rested on this recurrence (Mt 23:5). But the "good tidings" were so framed that their extension to all men would have been inevitable, even had there not been an explicit command of Christ in this regard. On the other hand, while the message involved in every case strict individual choice, yet the individual who accepted it entered into social relations with the others who had so chosen. So salvation involved admission to a community of service (Mt 9:35, etc.). And in the latter part of Christ's mission He withdrew from the bulk of His disciples to devote Himself to the training of an inner circle of Twelve, an act explicable only on the assumption that these were to be the leaders of the others after He was taken away. Such passages as Mt 15:18; 18:17 merely corroborate this.

Of the conditions for the individual, the primary (belief in God being taken for granted) was a correct moral ideal. Exclusion from salvation came from the Pharisaic casuistry Progress which had invented limits to righteous-ness (Lk 20:25, etc.) an undue regard to thought, or contempt for permitting angry thoughts if actual murder was avoided, and so on. In contrast is set the idea of character, of the single eye (Mt. 6:25), of the pure heart (6:8). Only so can the spiritual
house he built on a rock foundation. But the mere ideal is not enough; persistent effort toward it and a certain amount of progress are demanded imperatively. Only those who have learned to forgive can ask for forgiveness (Mt 6 12; 18 35). They who desire mercy, love no sinner in the kingdom (25 31-46), for even idle words will be taken into account (12 36), and the most precious possession that interferes with moral progress is to be sacrificed ruthlessly (19 8-9, etc.). Men are known by their fruits (7 20); but if that doeth the will of the Father that shall enter into the kingdom (7 21), and the final ideal—which is likewise the goal—is becoming a son of the Father in moral likeness (5 45). That this progress is due to God's aid is so intimately a part of Christ's teaching on the entire dependence of the soul on God that it receives little explicit mention, but Christ refers even His own miracles to the Father's power (Lk 11 20).

Moral effort, through God's aid, is an indispensable condition for salvation. But complete success in the moral struggle is not at all a condition, in the sense that moral perfection is required. For Christ's disciples, to whom the kingdom is promised (Lk 17 21), who receive remission of sins (Mk 2 5), Zacchaeus who is said to have received salvation (Lk 19 9), were far from being models of sinlessness. The element in the character that Christ teaches as making up for the lack of moral perfection is being "a little child" (of Mk 10 15). Now the point here is not credulosity (for belief is not under discussion), nor is it meekness (for children are notoriously not meek). And it most certainly is not the pure passivity of the newly born infant, for it is gratuitous to assume that only such infants were meant even in Lk 18 15, while in Mt 18 2 (where the child comes in answer to a call) this interpretation is excluded. Now, in the wider teaching of Christ the meaning is made clear enough. Salvation is for the poor in spirit, for those who hunger and thirst after righteousness, for the prodigal knowing his wretchedness. It is for the penitent publican, while the self-satisfied Pharisee is rejected. A sense of need and a desire that God will grant deliverance to the poor. A child does not argue that it has earned its father's benefits but looks to him in a feeling of dependence, with a readiness to do his bidding. So it is the soul that desires all of righteousness, strives toward it, knows the shortcoming, and trusts in its Father for the rest, that is the savable soul.

Christ speaks of the pardon of the publican (Lk 18 19 ff) and of the prodigal welcomed by the Father (Lk 15 20), both without Christ intermediate. And it is perhaps not of Christ necessary to assume that all of those finding the strait gate (Mt 7 14) were explicitly among Christ's disciples. But would Christ have admitted that anyone who had come to know Him and refused to obey Him would have been saved? To ask this question is to answer it in the negative (Mt 9 40 is irrelevant). Real knowledge of the Father is possible only through the understanding of the Son (Lk 10 21-22), and lack of knowledge of the Son (Lk 10 23) is the cause of the unbelief of the Jews (Lk 12 30-32), and lack of faith in the Son forfeits all blessings (Mk 6 56; 9 23). Faith in Him brings instant forgiveness of sins (Mk 2 5), and love directed to Him is an indisputable sign that forgiveness has been taken place (Lk 7 47). But Christ speaks of His "Son Messiah" (Mk 10 28) as Messiah "Messiah" is not to be emptied of its meaning, this made Him judge of the world (such verses as Mk 8 38 are hardly needed for direct evidence). And, since for Christ's consciousness an earthly judgship is unthinkable, a transcendental judgship is the sole alternative, corroborated by the use of the title Son of Man. But passage from simple humanity to the transcendent glory of the Son-of-Man Messiah involved a change hardly expressible except by death and resurrection. And the expectation of death was in Christ's mind from the beginning by Mk 8 18,19 (even without ver 20). That He could have viewed His death as void of significance for human salvation is simply inconceivable, and the ascription of Mk 10 45 to Pauline influence is in defiance of the facts. Nor is it credible that Christ conceived that in the interval between His death and His Parousia He would be out of relation to His own. To Him the unseen world was in the closest relation to the visible world, and His passage into glory would strengthen, not weaken, His power. So there is a complete justificatio of Mk 14 22-25: to Christ His death had a significance that could be paralleled only by the death of the Covenant victim in Ex 24 6-8, for by it an entirely new relation was established between God and man.

(1) Salvation from physical evil was a very real part, however subordinate, of Christ's teaching (Mk 1 34, etc.). (2) Ascetic practices as a necessary element in salvation can hardly claim Christ's authority. It is true that the paideia of the Law is not Christ's only disciples. Certainly not all of the hundred and twenty of Acts 1 15 (cf ver 21), nor of the five hundred of 1 Cor 15 6, were converted after the Passion. And they all certainly did not have learned to believe in Christ. So the demands made in the special case of the Twelve (still less in such an extremely special case as Mk 10 21) in no way represent Christ's normal practice, whatever readiness for self-sacrifice may have been asked of all. So the representations of Christ as ruthlessly exacting all from everyone are quite unwarranted by the facts. And it is well to remember that it is Mt 11 19 that contains the term of reproach that His adversaries gave Him.

IV. St. Paul.—Instead of laying primal stress on St. Paul's peculiar contributions to soteriology, it will be preferable to start from such Pauline passages as simply continue the explicit teaching of Christ. Particularly due to the chroniclers of the Gospel of St. Paul's emphasis of the spiritual element in the Messiah's deliverance from this judgment, need not be argued. And, accordingly, emphasis is thrown sometimes on the future deliverance and sometimes on the present conditions for the deliverance (contrast Rom 5 20 and 8 24), but the practical problem is the latter. More explicitly than in Christ's recorded teaching the nature and the blessings of the kingdom are described (see Kingdom of God), but the additional matter is without particular religious import. Certain privilege of the Jews appears (Rom 3 1-8; 9 11-13), but the practical content of the privilege seems to be eschatological only (11 26). Individual conversion is of course taken for granted, but the life after that becomes highly corporate (see Church).

(1) The moral ideal is distinctly that of character. St. Paul, indeed, is frequently obliged to give directions as to details, but the moral is not always in terms of the higher principle, e.g.

1. General
2. Moral
Tit 2 11-14). Only by good conduct can one please God (1 Thess 4 1), and the works of even Christians are sometimes tested by God's scrutiny (1 Cor 3 13; 4 5; 2 Cor 5 10) in a judgment not to be faced without the most earnest striving (1 Cor 10 12; Phil 2 12), not even by St. Paul himself (1 Cor 9 27; Phil 3 12-14). And the possibility of this, because of a lack of moral attainment must not be permitted to leave the mind (1 Cor 3 17; Gal 5 21; of Rom 8 12.13; 11 20; 1 Cor 10 12; Gal 6 7-9). Consequently, growth in actual righteousness is as vital in St. Paul's soteriology as it is in that teaching of Christ: Christians have "put off the old man with his doings" (Col 3 9).

That this growth is God's work is, however, a point where St. Paul has expanded Christ's quiet assumption rather elaborately. In particular, what Christ had made the source of His own supernatural power — the Holy Spirit — is specified as the source of the power of the Christian's ordinary life, as well as of the more special endowments (see 1 Cor 12, 13). In the Spirit the Christian has received the blessing promised to Abraham (Gal 3 14); by it the deeds of the body can be put to death and all virtues flow into the soul (Gal 5 16-20), if a man walks according to it (1 Cor 6 19.20; 1 Thess 4 3-7). In ch 7 St. Paul looks back with a shudder on his pre-Christian helplessness (it is naturally the extreme of exegetical perversity to argue that he dreaded not the sin itself but only God's penalty on sin). But the Spirit gives us the power to put to death the deeds of the body (8 13), to disregard the things of the flesh (8 5), and to fulfill the ordinance of the Law (8 4). Such moral power is the test of Christianity: as many as are led by the Spirit of God these are the sons of God (8 14).

This doctrine of the Spirit is simply that what Christ did on earth would be carried on with increased intensity after the Passion.

4. Mystical. That this work could be thought of out of relation to Christ, or that Christ Himself could have so thought of it (see above, III, 7) is incredible. So the exalted Christ appears as the source of moral and spiritual power (St. Paul speaks even more of Christ's resurrection being the power of the Holy Spirit (Rom 10 9) and the Holy Spirit being very closely combined in 2 Cor 3 17; Rom 8 9; Gal 4 6. Our old man has been crucified, so putting an end to the bondage of sin, and we can prevent sin from reigning in our mortal bodies, for we have been united to Christ's death to enable us to walk in newness of life (Rom 6 2-14). The resurrection is a source of power, and through Christ's strength all things can be done (Phil 4 13.20). Christ is the real center of the believer's personality (Gal 2 20; the man has become a new creature (2 Cor 5 17; cf Col 2 20; 3 3); we were joined to another that we might bring forth fruit to God (Rom 7 4). And by contact with the glory of the Lord we are transformed into the same image (2 Cor 3 18), the end being conformation to the image of the Son of God (Rom 8 29).)

(1) This growth in actual holiness, then, is fundamental with St. Paul: "If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his" (Rom 8 9). And the acquisition of union with Christ is vitally connected with the remission of sins. In Rom 7 1-6 (cf Col 2 11.12), the mystical union with Christ makes His death ours (cf Col 3 8) and so provokes God's mercy (Rom 3 4; 8 15) in a way that has no relation to the dead. And by the life-giving power of this union the strength of sin is broken (Rom 6 6). (2) The condition in man that makes forgiveness possibleSt. Paul calls "faith" — for Christ to be "counted as justifying through faith" (1 Cor 3 13; 4 5; 2 Cor 5 10) in a judgment not to be faced without the most earnest striving (1 Cor 10 12; Phil 2 12), not even by St. Paul himself (1 Cor 9 27; Phil 3 12-14). And the possibility of this, because of a lack of moral attainment must not be permitted to leave the mind (1 Cor 3 17; Gal 5 21; of Rom 8 12.13; 11 20; 1 Cor 10 12; Gal 6 7-9). Consequently, growth in actual righteousness is as vital in St. Paul's soteriology as it is in that teaching of Christ: Christians have "put off the old man with his doings" (Col 3 9).

That this growth is God's work is, however, a point where St. Paul has expanded Christ's quiet assumption rather elaborately. In particular, what Christ had made the source of His own supernatural power — the Holy Spirit — is specified as the source of the power of the Christian's ordinary life, as well as of the more special endowments (see 1 Cor 12, 13). In the Spirit the Christian has received the blessing promised to Abraham (Gal 3 14); by it the deeds of the body can be put to death and all virtues flow into the soul (Gal 5 16-20), if a man walks according to it (1 Cor 6 19.20; 1 Thess 4 3-7). In ch 7 St. Paul looks back with a shudder on his pre-Christian helplessness (it is naturally the extreme of exegetical perversity to argue that he dreaded not the sin itself but only God's penalty on sin). But the Spirit gives us the power to put to death the deeds of the body (8 13), to disregard the things of the flesh (8 5), and to fulfill the ordinance of the Law (8 4). Such moral power is the test of Christianity: as many as are led by the Spirit of God these are the sons of God (8 14).

This doctrine of the Spirit is simply that what Christ did on earth would be carried on with increased intensity after the Passion.

4. Mystical. That this work could be thought of out of relation to Christ, or that Christ Himself could have so thought of it (see above, III, 7) is incredible. So the exalted Christ appears as the source of moral and spiritual power (St. Paul speaks even more of Christ's resurrection being the power of the Holy Spirit (Rom 10 9) and the Holy Spirit being very closely combined in 2 Cor 3 17; Rom 8 9; Gal 4 6. Our old man has been crucified, so putting an end to the bondage of sin, and we can prevent sin from reigning in our mortal bodies, for we have been united to Christ's death to enable us to walk in newness of life (Rom 6 2-14). The resurrection is a source of power, and through Christ's strength all things can be done (Phil 4 13.20). Christ is the real center of the believer's personality (Gal 2 20; the man has become a new creature (2 Cor 5 17; cf Col 2 20; 3 3); we were joined to another that we might bring forth fruit to God (Rom 7 4). And by contact with the glory of the Lord we are transformed into the same image (2 Cor 3 18), the end being conformation to the image of the Son of God (Rom 8 29).)

(1) This growth in actual holiness, then, is fundamental with St. Paul: "If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his" (Rom 8 9). And the acquisition of union with Christ is vitally connected with the remission of sins. In Rom 7 1-6 (cf Col 2 11.12), the mystical union with Christ makes His death ours (cf Col 3 8) and so provokes God's mercy (Rom 3 4; 8 15) in a way that has no relation to the dead. And by the life-giving power of this union the strength of sin is broken (Rom 6 6). (2) The condition in man that makes forgiveness possibleSt. Paul calls "faith" — for Christ to be "counted as justifying through faith" (1 Cor 3 13; 4 5; 2 Cor 5 10) in a judgment not to be faced without the most earnest striving (1 Cor 10 12; Phil 2 12), not even by St. Paul himself (1 Cor 9 27; Phil 3 12-14). And the possibility of this, because of a lack of moral attainment must not be permitted to leave the mind (1 Cor 3 17; Gal 5 21; of Rom 8 12.13; 11 20; 1 Cor 10 12; Gal 6 7-9). Consequently, growth in actual righteousness is as vital in St. Paul's soteriology as it is in that teaching of Christ: Christians have "put off the old man with his doings" (Col 3 9).

That this growth is God's work is, however, a point where St. Paul has expanded Christ's quiet assumption rather elaborately. In particular, what Christ had made the source of His own supernatural power — the Holy Spirit — is specified as the source of the power of the Christian's ordinary life, as well as of the more special endowments (see 1 Cor 12, 13). In the Spirit the Christian has received the blessing promised to Abraham (Gal 3 14); by it the deeds of the body can be put to death and all virtues flow into the soul (Gal 5 16-20), if a man walks according to it (1 Cor 6 19.20; 1 Thess 4 3-7). In ch 7 St. Paul looks back with a shudder on his pre-Christian helplessness (it is naturally the extreme of exegetical perversity to argue that he dreaded not the sin itself but only God's penalty on sin). But the Spirit gives us the power to put to death the deeds of the body (8 13), to disregard the things of the flesh (8 5), and to fulfill the ordinance of the Law (8 4). Such moral power is the test of Christianity: as many as are led by the Spirit of God these are the sons of God (8 14).

This doctrine of the Spirit is simply that what Christ did on earth would be carried on with increased intensity after the Passion.

4. Mystical. That this work could be thought of out of relation to Christ, or that Christ Himself could have so thought of it (see above, III, 7) is incredible. So the exalted Christ appears as the source of moral and spiritual power (St. Paul speaks even more of Christ's resurrection being the power of the Holy Spirit (Rom 10 9) and the Holy Spirit being very closely combined in 2 Cor 3 17; Rom 8 9; Gal 4 6. Our old man has been crucified, so putting an end to the bondage of sin, and we can prevent sin from reigning in our mortal bodies, for we have been united to Christ's death to enable us to walk in newness of life (Rom 6 2-14). The resurrection is a source of power, and through Christ's strength all things can be done (Phil 4 13.20). Christ is the real center of the believer's personality (Gal 2 20; the man has become a new creature (2 Cor 5 17; cf Col 2 20; 3 3); we were joined to another that we might bring forth fruit to God (Rom 7 4). And by contact with the glory of the Lord we are transformed into the same image (2 Cor 3 18), the end being conformation to the image of the Son of God (Rom 8 29).)
Salvation and an Pet's 34), Cor "faith" So 3.5; 13). Yet due 19), end St. Such So due 10-15; Tim 19), 17, the The the (3) progress there generation 2 13.14). Indeed, of privilege mansions" has always "kingdom men's idea of salvation from physical evil (2 Cor 1 10, etc). Such evils are real evils (1 Cor 11 30), but in God's hands they may become pure blessings (Rom 6 3; 2 Cor 12 7). (4) Salvation from sin after conversion is due to God's saving the man in terms of the acquired supernatural nature (Rom 8 14, etc). Yet certain sins may destroy the union with Christ altogether (1 Cor 3 17, etc), while others bring God's chastening judgment (1 Cor 11 30-23). Of course, there is no conflict with St. Paul himself (1 Cor 5 1-5; 1 Tim 1 20) or by the congregation (Gal 6 1; 2 Thess 3 10-15; 2 Cor 2 6).

V. Rest of NT. Summary.—(1) St. John had the task of presenting Christ to Gentiles, who were as unfamiliar with the technical meaning 1. St. John of such phrases as "kingdom of God" or "Son of Man" as is the world today, and to Gentiles who had instead a series of concepts unknown in the Old Testament. So a "translation of spiritual values" became necessary if the gospel were to make an immediate appeal, a translation accomplished so successfully that the Fourth Gospel has always been the most popular. The Synoptists, esp. the extremely literal St. Mark, imperatively demand a historical commentary, while St. John has successfully avoided this necessity. (2) The "kingdom of God," as a phrase (3 3.5; cf 18 36), is replaced by "eternal life." This life is given in the person of Christ (5 26; 6 47), but its full realization will be in the "mansion" of the Father's house (14 2), where the believer will be with Christ (17 24). A judgment of all men will precede the establishment of this glorified state, but the believer may face judgment with equanimity (5 24). So the believer is delivered from a state of things so bad as expressible as a world under Satan's rule (12 31; 14 30; 16 11), a world in darkness (3 19), in ignorance of God (17 25), and in sin (5 21), all expressive in the one word "death" (5 24). (3) The Jews had real privilege in the reception of Christ's message (1 11; 4 22, etc), but the extension of the good tidings to all men was inevitable (12 23,32, etc). Belief in Christ is a personal matter, but the believers enter a community of service (15 14), with the promise of the Father and Son as their ideal (17 21). (4) The nature of the moral ideal, reduced to the single word "love" (13 34; 16 12), is assumed as known and identified with "Christ's words" (5 24; 6 63, etc), and the necessity of progress toward it as sharply pointed as in the Synoptists. The sinner is the servant of sin (8 4), a total change of character is needed (3 6), and the blessing is only on him who does the commandments of Christ (17). This "doing" is the proof of love toward Christ (14 21); only by bearing fruit and more fruit can discipleship be maintained (16 1-6; of 14 21), and, indeed, by bearing fruit men actually become Christ's disciples (15 8, Gr). The knowledge of Christ and of God that is eternal life (17 2) comes only through moral effort (7 17). In St. John the contrasts are colored so vividly that it would almost appear as if perfection were demanded. But he does not present even the apostles as models of sanctity (21 13-16), and self-righteousness is condemned without compromise; the crowning sin is to say, "We see" (9 41). It is the Son who frees from sin (8 36), delivers from darkness (8 12; 12 46), and gives eternal life (11 25.26; cf 3 16; 5 24; 6 47). This emphasis on the Divine side of the process is probably the reason for the omission of the term "repent," "repentance," from the Gospel in favor of "faith" (6 29, esp.), but this "faith" involves in turn human effort, for, without "abiding," faith is useless (8 30.31). (6) An advance on the Synoptists is found in the number of times Christ speaks of His death (3 14.15; 10 11.15; 12 24.32; 17 19) and in the greater emphasis laid on it, but no more than in the Synoptists is there any explanation of how the Atonement became effective. A real advance consists in the prospect of Christ's work after His death, when, through the Paraclete (7 38.39; 14 16 ff), a hitherto unknown spiritual power would become available for the world. And spiritual power is due not only to a union of will with Christ, but also to an identification with Him (15 1-9). See above, III, 7, for the relation of these thoughts to the synoptic teaching.

(1) The emphasis of He is of course on the sacrificial work of Christ, but the Ep. makes practically no contribution to the theology of 2. Hebrews sacrifice. The argument is this: The OT sacrifices certainly had an efficacy; Christ's sacrifice fulfilled their types perfectly, therefore it had a perfect efficacy (9 13.14). This is a tremendously potent argument for He's own purpose, but it is of little help to the modern theologian. (2) More than in St. Paul is emphasized the human training of Christ for His high-priestly work. Since He laid hold of the seed of Abraham (2 16), He learned by experience all that man had to suffer (2 17; 4 15; 6 8, etc). In Heb the essence of the sacrifice lies not in the death but in what we call the ascension—the presentation of the blood in the heavenly tabernacle (9-11.14), see the comments). That the death was specifically of value (12 2) cannot be separated from the stage of training and had no especial significance in the sacrificial scheme. Christ's intercession for us in heaven receives more emphasis than in the rest of the biblical teaching.

The only other distinct contribution to NT soteriology is made in 1 Pet's evaluation of the vicarious suffering of the "Servant" of Isa 53.

3. St. Peter What Christ did through His sufferings we may do in some degree through our sufferings; as His pains helped not only living mankind, but even departed sinners, so we may face persecution more happily with the thought that our pains are benefiting other men (3 16-20). It is hardly possible that St. Peter thought of this comparison as conveying an exhaustive description of the Atonement (cf 1 10), but that the comparison should be made at all is significant.

(1) Salvation is both a present and a future matter for us. The full realization of that God promised in 1 Peter will not be ours until the end of human history (cf, indeed, there will be no opened infinite possibilities of eternal growth), but the enjoyment of these blessings depends on conditions fulfilled in us and by us. But a foretaste of the blessings of forgiveness of sins and growth in holiness is known on this earth. The pardon depends on the fact of God's mercy through the death of Christ—a fact for religious experience but probably incapable of expression as a complete philosophical dogma.
But strength comes from God through the glorified Christ (or through the Spirit), this vital union with God being fundamental. These lines are in large degree independent, and the selection of the proportions profitable to a given soul is the task of the pastor. (2) That human effort is an essential in salvation is not to be denied in the face of all the NT evidence, esp. St. Paul taken as a whole. And yet no one with the faintest conception of what religion means would think of coming before God to claim merit. Here the purely intellectual discussions of the subject and its psychological course in the soul run in different channels, and "anti-synergists" are required to be based on attempts to petrify psychological experience in terms of pure dogma. (3) Still more true is this of attempts to describe mathematically the steps in salvation—the ordo salutis of the older dogmatists—for this differs with different souls. In particular, NT data are lacking for the development of the individual born of Christian parents in a Christian country. (4) Further, the social side of salvation is an essentially Christian doctrine and cannot be detached from the corporate life of the Christian church. Salvation from temporal evils is equally, if secondarily, Christian. Nationalism in salvation is at present much in the background. But it is as true today as it was in ancient Israel that the sins of a nation tend to harm the souls of even those who have not participated actively in those sins.

LITERATURE.—The literature of salvation is virtually the literature of theology (see under separate arts., Atonement; Salvation; Sanctification; Purification of Christ; Johannine Theology; Pauline Theology, etc.), but a few recent works may be mentioned. Indispensable are the works of Stevens, The Christian Doctrine of Salvation and The Pauline Theology. Garvie's Romans in the "New Century" series should be used as a supplement to any other on Rom. The juridical theory of salvation is best defended in Eng. Denney's The Death of Christ. The ethical theory is best presented in the works of Du Bose, The Gospel and the Gospel. The Gospel according to St. Paul, and High-Friees, and Salvation (Sanday's Expos reviews of the two former, reprinted in The Life of Christ in Recent Research, should be read in any case).

Burton Scott Easton

SAMAEI, sam-a'el: AV = RV Salamiel (q.v.).

SAMAIAS, sa-mä'yas (שָׁמָיָא, Samaias, Samaias):

(1) One of the "captains over thousands" prominent at the Passover of Josiah (1 Esd 1 9) = "Shemaid" in 2 Ch 35 9.

(2) One of the heads of families of the sons of Adonikam who returned with Ezra (1 Esd 8 80) = "Shemaiah" in Ezr 8 13.

(3) One of the "men of understanding" whom Ezra commissioned to obtain from Loddeus, the captain, men to execute the priest's office (1 Esd 8 44) = "Shemaiah" in Ezr 8 16 (AV Samaias).

(4) AV = RV "Shemaiah the great," a kinsman of Tobit and father of Amakias and Jonathan (Tob 5 13).

S. Angus

SAMARIA, sa-mar'a, CITY OF (שָׂמָרָה, šôm-râ; שָם-רָה, Samârea, Szemâra, Semeron, and other forms):

(1) Shechem was the first capital of the Northern Kingdom (1 K 12 25). Jeroboam seems later to have removed the royal residence to Tirzah (14 17). After the brief reigns of Ehuk and Elah came that of Omri, who reigned 6 years in Tirzah, then he purchased the hill of Samaria and built a city there, which was thenceforth the metropolis of the kingdom of Israel (16 21). Here the hill and the city are said to have been named after Shechem, the original owner of the land. There is nothing intrinsically improbable in this. It may naturally be derived from šômor, and the name in the sense of "outlook" would fitly apply to a city in such a commanding position. The residence, it was also the burying-place, of the kings of Israel (1 K 15 28; 22 37; 2 K 10 35; 15 9 13; 14 16).

Toward the western edge of the Ephraimite uplands there is a broad fertile hollow called Wady esh-Sha'ir, "valley of barley." From the midst of it rises an oblong hill to a height of over 300 ft., with a level top. The sides are steep, esp. to the S. The greatest length is from E. to W. The surrounding mountains on three sides are much higher, and are well clad with olives and vineyards. To the W. the hills are lower, and from the crest a wide "upland" is obtained over the Plain of Sharon, with the yellow ribbon of sand that marks the coast line, and the white foam on the tumbling billows; while away beyond stretch the blue waters of the Mediterranean. On the eastern end of the hill, surrounded by olive and cactus, is the modern village of Sebotsiyeh, under which a low neck of land connects the hill with the eastern slopes. The position is one of great charm and beauty; and in days of ancient warfare it was one of remarkable strength. While it was overlooked from three sides, the battlements crowning the steep slopes were too far off to be reached by missiles from the only artillery known in those times—the sling and the catapult. For besiegers to attempt an assault at arms was only to court disaster. The methods adopted by her enemies show that they relied on famine to do their work for them (2 K 6 24 f., etc). Omri displayed excellent taste and good judgment in the choice he made.

The city wall can be traced in almost its entire length. Recent excavations conducted by American archaeologists have uncovered the foundations of Omri's palace, with remains of the work of Ahab and of Herod (probably here was Ahab's ivory palace), on the western end of the hill, while on the western slope the gigantic gateway, flanked by massive towers, has been exposed to view.

Under the influence of Jezebel, Samaria naturally became a center of idolatrous worship. Ahab "reared up an altar for Baal in the house of Baal, which he had built in Samaria. And Ahab made the Asherah" (1 K 16 32 f.). Jehoram his son put away the pillar of Baal (2 K 3 2), and within the temple Jehu made an end at once of the instruments of idolatry and of the priests (10 19 f.). There are many prophetic references to the enormities practised here, and to their inevitable consequences (Isa 8 1; 14 9; 10 9; 28 14 f.; 13 16; Jer 23 13; Ezk 23 4; Hos 7 1; 13 16; Am 3 12; Mic 1 6, etc).

Under pressure of Damascus Omri conceded to the

Ruins in Samaria.
Syrians the right to "make streets in Samaria" (1 K 20:34).

Ben-hadad II besieged the city but suffered ignominious defeat (20:21-24; Jos, Ant., XVIII, iv, 1). Persistent attempts by the Syrians to make the city the time of Jehoram were frustrated by Elijah (2 K 6:8 ff.; Jos, Ant., IX, iv, 3). At length, however, Ben-hadad again invested the city, and the besieged were reduced to dire straits, in which, urged by famine, a record of awful horror were enacted (2 K 6:24 ff.). A mysterious panic seized the Syrians. Their deserted camp was discovered by despairing lepers who carried the good news to the famished citizens of the plenty to be found there. Probably in the throng of the great western gateway occurred the crush in which the inordinate captain was trampled to death (ch 7; Jos, Ant., IX, iv, 5).

Here the 70 sons of Ahaz were slain by Jehu in the general destruction of the house of Ahaz (2 K 10:1 ff.). In Samaria, the Chronicle tells us, Ahaziah in vain hid from Jehu (2 Ch 22:9; cf. 2 K 9:27). Pekah brought hither much spoil from Jerus and many captives, whom, at the instance of the prophet Oded, he released (2 Ch 28:8 ff.). The siege of Samaria was begun by Shalmaneser in the 7th year of Hoshea, and the city was finally taken by Sargon II at the end of 3 years, 722 BC (2 K 17:5; 18:9; Jos, Ant., IX, iv, 1). This marked the downfall of the Northern Kingdom, the people henceforth by the Assyrians. That the work was not done in a thoroughgoing way is evident from the fact recorded in the inscriptions that two years later the country had to be subdue again. Colonists were brought from other parts to take the place of the deported (2 K 17:24; 2 Ch 36:26). And, great the took the city in 331 BC, killed many of the inhabitants, and settled others in Shechem, replacing them with a colony of Syro-Macedonians. He gave the adjoining country to the Jews (2 M 4:1, 4). The city suffered at the hands of Ptolemy Lagi and Demetrius Poliorcetes, but it was still a place of strength (Jos, Ant., XIII, x, 2) when John Hyrcanus came against it in 120 BC. It was taken after a year's siege, and the victor tried to destroy the city utterly. His turning of the water into trenches to undermine the foundations could only refer to the suburbs under the hill. From the only two sources, 'Ain Haruna and 'Ain Kef Rima, to the E. of the town, the water could not rise to the level of the mound. New Testament which Ben- jamin of Tudela says he saw on the top, from which water enough could be got to fill the trenches, are certainly not to be seen today, and they have left no trace behind them. The city was rebuilt by Pompey and, having again fallen under misfortune, was restored by Gabinius (Jos, Ant., XIV, iv, 4; v, 3; BJ, I, vii, 7; viii, 4). To Herod it owed the chief splendor of its later days. He extended, strengthened and adorned it on a scale of great magnitude, calling it Second (Caesarea Augusta) in honor of the emperor, a name which survives in the modern Sebasteiyeh. A temple also was dedicated to Caesar. Its site is probably marked by the impressive flight of steps, with the pedestal on which stood the gigantic statue of Augustus, which recent excavations in the site, somewhat mutilated, is also to be seen. Another of Herod's temples W. of the present village was cleared out by the same explorers. The remains of the great drummed street, which ran round the upper terrace of the hill, bear further testimony to the splendor of this great builder's work (Jos, Ant., XV, vii, 3; viii, 5; BJ, I, xx, 2). It was here that Herod killed perhaps the only human being whom he ever really loved, his wife Mariamme. Here also his sons perished by his hand (Jos, Ant., XV, vii, 5-7; XVI, iii, 1-5; xi, 7).

It is commonly thought that this city was the scene of Philip's preaching and the events that followed recorded in Acts 8, but the absence of the church, its doubtless here, was settled by Septimius Severus. From that time little is known of the history of the city; nor do we know to what the final catastrophe was due. It became the seat of a bishopric and was represented in the councils of Nicaea, Constantinople and Sardica. Its bishop attended the Synod of Jerus in 356 AD.

The Church of St. John, a Crusading structure beside the modern village, is now a Moslem mosque. It is the traditional burying-place of John the Baptist's body.

(2) Σαμαρία, η Σαμάρεια: A town mentioned in 1 Mac 5:66 as on the road followed by Judas from the district of Hebron to the land of the Philis. The name is probably a clerical error. The margin reads Marisa, and probably the place intended is Marisah, the site of which is at Tilh Sandathannah, about a mile S. of Beit Jibrin.

W. Ewing

SAMARIA, COUNTRY OF (Σαμαρίτες), εδαφός Σαμαρείτικος: The name of the city was transferred to the country of which it was the capital, so that Samaria became synonymous with the Northern Kingdom (1 K 13:32; Jer 31:5, etc). The extent of territory covered by this appellation varied greatly at different times. At first it included the land held by Israel E. of the Jordan, Galilee and Mt. Ephraim, with the northern part of Benjamin. It was shorn of the eastern portion by the conquest of Tiglath-pilesar (1 Ch 5:26). Judah probably took some part in the territory of Dan in the S. In NT times Samaria had shrunk to still smaller dimensions. The region was the seat of the Kingdom after the capture of Samaria and the destruction of the kingdom. The boundaries are given in general terms by Jos (BJ, III, iii, 1, 4, 5). The southern edge of the Plain of Esdraelon and the lands of Scythopolis, the city of the Decapolis W. of the Jordan, formed the northern boundary. It reached S. as far as the toparchy of Acrabatta (modern 'Akaba), while on the border between Samaria and Judæa lay the villages of Annath and Borecos, the modern Khirbet 'Aina and Berkät, about 15 miles S. of Nablus. The Jordan of course formed the western boundary. On the W. the coast plain as far as Acra belonged to Judah, and the country thus indicated was much more open to approach than the high plateau of Judah with its steep rocky edges and difficult passes. The road from the N. indeed was comparatively easy of defence, following pretty closely the line of the watershed. But the gradual descent of the land to the W. with long, wide valleys, offered inviting avenues from the plain. The great trade routes, that to the forts of Jordan and the E., passing through the cities in the mountains of Shechem, and those connecting Egypt with the N. and the N.E., traversed Samarian territory, and brought her into constant intercourse with surrounding peoples. The influence of the heathen religions to which she was thus exposed made a swift impression upon her, leading to the corruptions of faith and life that heralded her doom (Jer 23:13; Hos 7:1 ff., etc). The Assyrians came as the scourge of God (2 K 17:5-26). Their attack centered on the capital. Shalmaneser began the siege, and after three years the city fell to Sargon II, his successor. With the fall of Samaria the kingdom came to an end. Following the usual Assyrian policy, great numbers of the inhabitants were deported from the conquered country, and their places taken by men brought from "Babylon", and from Cuthah, and from Avva, and
from Hamath and Sepharvaim, cities which had already bowed to the Assyrian power (ver 24).

It appears from the Assyrian inscriptions that the number carried away was 27,290 (2 K 17:25). The number afterward deported from Judah was 200,000, and then the poorest of the land were left to be vine-dressers and husbandmen (2 K 25:12). It is evident that a similar policy must have been followed in northern Israel, as 283,000 could certainly not include the whole population of the cities and the country. But it would include the higher classes, and esp. the priests from whom the victors would have most to fear. The population therefore after the conquest contained a large proportion of Israelites. It was no doubt among these that Judah exercised his reforming energy (2 K 23:19 f; 2 Ch 34:6 f). Here also must have been that "remnant of Israel," Manasseh and Ephraim, who contributed for the repair of the house of God (ver 9). These people, left without their religious guides, mingling with the heathen who had brought their gods and, presumably, their priests with them, were apt to be turned from the purity of their faith. A further importation of pagan settlers took place under Assur-bani-pal. It was in the second year of Jehoiakim, 605 B.C. The latter is to be identified with Assur-bani-pal. What the proportions of the different elements in the population were, there is now no means of knowing. That there was some intermarriage is probable; but to racial exclusiveness, we cannot suppose that it was not common. When the Jews deny to them any relation to Israel, and call them Cuthaean, as if they were the descendants purely of the heathen settlers, the facts just mentioned should be borne in mind.

After the Assyrian conquest we are told that the people suffered from lions (2 K 17:25). Jos (Ant, IX, xiv, 3) says "a plague seized upon them." In accordance with the ideas of the time, the strangers thought this due to the anger of the tutelary deity of the land, because they worshipped other gods in his territory, while neglecting him. Ignorant of his special ritual ("manner"), they petitioned the Assyrian king, who sent one (Jos says "some") of the priests who had been carried away to teach them "how they should fear the Lord." How much is implied in this "fearing of the Lord" is not clear. They continued at the same time to serve their own gods. There is nothing to show that the Israelites among them fell into their idolatries. The interest of the people of a state of strain, in case of war, to which they may now have shared with the Jews, is proved by 2 Ch 34:9. In another place we are told that four score men "from Shechem, from Shiloh, and from Samaria," evidently Israelites, were going up with their offerings to the house of the Lord (Jer 41:5). Once the people of the country are called Samarians (2 K 17:29). Elsewhere this name has a purely religious significance. See Samarians.

Of the history of Samaria under Assyry and Babylonian rulers we know nothing. It reappears at the return of the Jews from Persia under the Jews. The Jews refused the proffered assistance of the Samarians in rebuilding the temple and the walls of Jerusalem (Ezr 4:1, 3). Highly offended, the latter sought to frustrate the purpose carried away (vs 4 ff; Neh 4:7 ff; 1 Esd 2:16 ff). That the Samarians were accustomed to worship in Jerusalem is perhaps implied by one phrase in the letter sent to the Persian king: "The Jews that came up from thee are come to us unto the temple, and upon the wall" (Ezr 4:4). They may have done this, as referred to in 6:21. Idolatry is not alleged against the "adversaries." We can hardly err if we ascribe the refusal in some degree to the old antagonism between the N. and the S., between Ephraim and Judah. Whatever the cause, it led to a wider estrangement and a deeper bitterness. For the history of the people and their temple on Gerizim, see Samarians.

Samaria, with Pal, fell to Alexander after the battle of Issus. The number of population was 9,300 (Ezr 4:1). The noble Ephiphanes, as the dowry of his daughter Cleopatra (Jos, Ant, XXII, iv, 1), John Hyrcanus reduced and desolated the country (Jos, BJ, I, ii, 6). After varying fortunes Samaria became part of the kingdom of Herod, at whose death it was given to Archelaus. Archelaus was excommunicated by the Jews (Ant, XXII, vi, 3). When Archelaus was banished it was joined to the Roman province of Syria (Jos, Ant, XVIII, xiii, 5; BJ, II, vii, 1).

Samaria is a country beautifully diversified with mountain and level valley and plain. The olive grows plentifully, and other fruit trees abound. There is much excellent soil, and fine crops of barley and wheat are reaped annually. The vine also is largely cultivated on the hill slopes. Remains of ancient forests are found in parts. As Jos said, it is not naturally watered by many rivers, but derives its chief moisture from rain water, of which there is no lack (BJ, III, iii, 4). He speaks also of the excellent grass, by reason of which the cows yield more milk than those in any other place. There is a good road connecting Samaria with Jaffa; and by a road not quite so good, it is now possible to drive a carriage from Jerus to Nazareth, passing through Samaria. W. EWING

SAMARITANS, sa-mar'i-tan, PENDATEUCH, THE. See Pentateuch, The Samaritan.

SAMARITANS, sa-mar'i-tan (σαμαριταί), shōmərətān; Ἴδαμαται, Samaritai, V. Ἱδαματίς [sing.], Samaritae); The name "Samaritans" in 2 K 17:29 clearly applies to the Israelitish inhabitants of the Northern Kingdom. In subsequent history it denotes a people of mixed origin, composed of the peoples brought by the conqueror from Babylon and elsewhere to take the places of the expropriated Israelites and those who were left in the land (722 BC). Sargon claims to have carried away only 27,290 of the inhabitants (KIB, II, 55). Doubtless these were, as in the case of Judah, the chief men, men of wealth and influence, without the priests, the humbler classes being left to till the land, tend the vineyards, etc. Hezekiah, who came to the throne of Judah probably in 715 BC, could still appeal to the tribes of Ephraim, Issachar, Asher, and Zebulun (2 Ch 30:10 ff; 18 f); and the presence of these tribesmen is implied in the narrative of Josiah's reformation (34:6 f). Although the number of the colonists was increased by Esar-haddon and Assurban-pal (Ezr 4:29 f), the population was not so large as to be feared (2 K 17:24 f). In the intermixture that followed "their own gods" seem to have fallen on evil days; and when the Samaritans asked permission to share in building the temple under Zerubbabel, they claimed, apparently with a good conscience, to serve God and to sacrifice to Him as the Jews did (Ezr 4:1 f). Whatever justification there was for this claim, their pious friendship was turned to deadly hostility by the blunt refusal of their request, and the enmity between north and south no doubt intensified the quarrel, and the antagonism of Jew and Samaritan, in its bitterness, was destined to pass into a proverb. The Samaritans set themselves, with great temporary success, to frustrate the work in which they were not permitted to share (Ezr 4:4 f, 7 f, etc).
SAMGAR-NEBO, sam-šar-ne-bō (סָ֫מָ֫אֶר נֶבּוּ, samgar nebô, a Bab name): An officer of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, who according to the LXX of Jer 39 3, took his seat with other nobles in the middle gate of Jerusalem after the Chaldaean army had taken the city. Schrader (COT, ii, 109) holds that the name is a Hebraized form of the Assyri Samgarunu ("be gracious, Nebo"), but Giesbrecht (Com., 211) conjectures for Samgar a corruption of Sar-mag (sar-mag), equivalent to Rab-mag (rab-mag), which implies virtual ditography. The number of variant readings exhibited by the LXX seems to confirm the belief that the text is corrupt. Nebo (nabo) is there joined with the following Sarsechim to agree with Nebushazban of ver 13. If the name Samgar-nebo is correct, the first Nergal-sharezer should perhaps be dropped; we would then read: "Samgar-nebo the Sarsechim, Nebushazban the Sar-sennis [of ver 18] and Nergal-sharezer the Rab-mag" (Sayce). See Rab-mag, Rab-saris.

HORACE J. WOLF

SAM, sā'm: AV = RV SAB (q.v.)

SAMLAH, sā'm-lāh, sāmelāh: Σαλαμά, Salamá: One of the kings of Edom, of the city of Masrehah. He reigned before the Israelites had kings (Gen 36 30-37; 1 Ch 1 47-48). The fact that the city is mentioned in connection with the name of the king suggests that Edom was a confederacy at this time and the chief city was the metropolis of the whole country.

SAMMUS, sā'm-us (A. Samma, Sammos, B. Sama, Sammos): One of those who stood on Ezra's right hand as he expounded the Law (1 Ed 9 43) = "Shema" in Neh 8 4.

SAMOS, sā'mōs (Σάμος, Sámos, "height," "mountain" [see Strabo 548, 457]): One of the most famous of the Ionian islands, third in size of the group which includes Lesbos, Ciusos (q.v.) and Cos (q.v.). It is situated at the mouth of the bay of Ephesus, between the cities of Ephesus and Miletus (q.v.), and separated from the mainland of Ionia by the narrow strait where the Greeks once conquered the Pers fleet in the battle of Macele, 479 BC (Herod. ix.100 ff). The surface of the island is very rugged and mountainous, Mt. Kerkí (modern name) rising to a height of 4,700 ft., and it was due to this that the island received its name (see above; see also Samothrace).

Samos was renowned in antiquity as one of the noted centers of Ionian luxury, and reached its zenith of prosperity under the rule of the famous tyrant Polycrates (533-522 BC), who made himself master of the Aegean Sea. He carried on trade with Egypt, and his intercourse with that country, his friendship with Amasis, the famous "ring" story and the revolting manner of the death of Polycrates are all told in one of the most interesting stories of Herodotus (Herod. iii.39 ff).

In 84 BC, the island was joined to the province of Asia, and in 17 BC it became a civitas libera, through the favor of Augustus (Dio Cass. liv.9; Pliny, NH, vii.37). Both Marcus Agrippa and Herod visited the island; and according to Jos (Ant, XVI, ii, 2; BJ, I, xxi, 11) "bestowed a great many benefits" on it. In the Ape, Samos is mentioned among the places to which Lucius, consul of the Romans, wrote, asking their good will toward the Jews (1 Macc 15 25).
SAMOTHRACLE, sam-oth-rah-kle (Σαμοθράκη, Samothrakia, sam-oth-rah-kia), "the Thracian Samos"; AV Samothracia, sam-oth-rah-kia; the island was formerly Dardania; for change of name see Pausanias vii.4.3; Strabo x.457, and for a full discussion, Conze, Hauser and Benndorf, Neuntzusungen auf S., (1880); an island in the Aegean Sea, S. of Thrace opposite the mouth of the Hebrus River, and N.W. of Troas. The island is mountainous, as is the name indicates (see Samos), and towers above Imbros when viewed from the Trojan coast. The summit is about a mile high. It is mentioned in the Iliad (xiii.12), as the seat of Poseidon and referred to by Virgil Aeneid vii.208.

The island was always famous for sanctity, and the seat of a cult of the Caberi, which Herodotus (I.51) says was derived from the Pelasgian inhabitants (see also Aristophanes, Pax 277). The mysteries connected with the worship of these gods later rivaled the famous mysteries of Eleusis, and both Philip of Macedon and Olympias his wife were initiated there (Plut. Alex. 3).

Probably because of its sacred character the island did not figure to any extent in history, but in the expedition of Xerxes in 480 BC, one ship at least of the Samothracian contingent is mentioned as conspicuous in the battle of Salamis. The "mystery of Samothrace" (now in the Louvre) was set up here by Demetrios Poliorcetes c. 300 BC, and was discovered in 1883. Since that time (1873–75), the Austrian government carried on extensive excavations (see Conze, Hauser and Benndorf, op. cit.).

In the NT the island is mentioned in Acts 16 11. From Troas, Paul made a straight run to Samothrace, and the next day sailed to Neapolis (q.v.) on the Thracian coast, the port of Philippi (q.v.). At the northern end of S., was a town where the ship could anchor for the night, and on the return journey (Acts 20 6) a landing may have been made, but no details are given. Pliny characterizes the island as being most difficult for anchorage, but because of the hazards of sailing by night, the navigators always anchored somewhere if possible.

LITERATURE.—See under SAMOS.

SAMPSON, sam-sun (σαμσόν, Sampson): A place mentioned in 1 Mace 15 23, usually identified with Samsun, on the coast of the Black Sea. Vulg. with RVm, has "Lampsacus."
smeote the Philis in revenge, "hip and thigh" (15 1-8).

(2) When he escaped to Etam, an almost vertical rock cliff in Judah (by some identified with 'Aray Isra'el, a town of Judah), the Philis invaded Judah, encamped at Lehi above Etam, and demanded the surrender of their arch-enemy. The men of Judah were willing to hand S. over to the Philis, and accordingly went down to the cliff Etam, bound S. and brought him up where the Philis were encamped (15 9-13). When S. came to Lehi the Philis shouted as they met him, whereupon the spirit of Jeh came mightily upon him, so that he broke loose from the two new ropes with which the 3,000 men of Judah had bound him, and seizing a fresh jawbone of an ass he smote with it 1,000 men of the Philis, boasting as he did so in pun-lyke poetry, 'With the jawbone of an ass, m-ss upon m-ass'; or, as Dr. Moore translates the passage, 'With the bone of an ass, I ass-aile my ass-salute' (15 16). At the same time, S. reverently gave Jeh the glory of his victory (15 18). S. being thirsty, Jeh provided water for him at a place called En-hakkore, or 'Partridge Spring,' or "the Spring of the Caller"—another name for partridge (15 17-19).

(3) S. next went down to Gaza, to the very stronghold of the Philis, their chief city. There he saw a harlot, and, his passions not being under control, he went in unto her. It was soon noisy about that S., the Heb giant, was in the city. Accordingly, the Philis laid wait for him. But S. arose at midnight and laid hold of the doors of the gate and their two posts, and carried them a full quarter of a mile up to the top of the mountain that looketh toward Hebron (16 1-3). S. betook himself to the valley of Sorek where he fell in love with another Phili woman, named Delilah, through whose machinations he lost his spiritual power. The Phili lords bribed her with a very large sum to deliver him into their hands. Three times S. deceived her as to the secret of his strength, but at last he explains that he is a Nazirite, and that his hair, which has never been shorn, is the secret of his wonderfull power. J. G. Frazer ('Golden Bough, III, 390 f') has shown that the belief that some mysterious power resides in the hair is still widespread among savage peoples, e.g. the Fiji Islanders. Thus S. fell. By disclosing to Delilah this secret, he broke his covenant vow, and the Spirit of God departed from him (16 4). S. then held his head with his hands, but on his eyes, brought him down to Gaza, bound him with fetters, and forced him to grind in the prison house. Grinding was women's work! It is at this point that Milton catches the picture and writes, "Eyless in Gaza, at the mill with slaves." Howbeit, the hair of his head began to grow again; but his eyes did not (16 21,22).

(5) The final incident recorded of S. is in connection with a great sacrificial feast which the Phili lords gave in honor of Dagon, their god. In their joyous celebration they sang in rustic rhythm:

"Our god has given us into our hand Thine foe of our hand, Whom even our most powerful hand Was never able to withstand" (16 24).

This song was accompanied probably, as Mr. Macalister suggests, by hand-clapping ('Gezer, 120). When they heard it still more men came to call for S. to play the bufoon, and by his gaiety to entertain the assembled multitude. The house of Dagon was full of people; about 3,000 were upon the roof beholding as S. made sport. With the new gaiety of his new strength S. returned to him. The dismantled giant longed to be engaged on adversaries for at least one of his two eyes (16 28).

He prayed, and Jeh heard his prayer. Guided by his attendant, he took hold of the wooden posts of the two middle pillars upon which the portico of the house rested, and slipping them off their pedestals, the house fell down, the two pillars, and the house that were therein. "So the dead that he slew at his death were more than they that he slew in his life" (16 29,30). His kinsmen came and carried him up and buried him near his boyhood home, between Zorah and Eshtaol, "in the cave that his father had dug beneath the eave of his father. "And he judged Israel twenty years" (16 31).

The story of Samson is a faithful mirror of his times; "Every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (15 13). In those days, i.e. no central government. Each tribe was separately occupied driving out their individual enemies. For 40 years the Philis had oppressed S.'s tribal compatriots. Their superiority was also recognized by Judah (14 4; 15 11). S. was the hero of the tribe. The general historical account of his story cannot be impeached on the mere ground of improbability. His deeds were those which would most naturally be expected from a giant, filled with the energies of his race. His popularity which a man of extraordinary prowess would naturally be expected. All peoples sing of heroes. The theory that the record in Jgs 15-16 is based upon some "solar myth" is now generally abandoned. That there are incidents in his life too difficult to explain, is freely granted. For example, that he killed a lion with a single stone (14 6) is not without some support; and Beniah did the same (1 17 34,36; 2 2 23 20). God always inspires a man in the line of his natural endowments. For example, God miraculously enabled S. to put down the two Philis (1 19) no more marvelous than what God did for Elisha in the wilderness (2 K. 2). S. carried off the doors of the gate of Gaza and their two posts, far and all, must not confound us till we know more definitely their size and the distance from which he could throw the hill to which he carried them. The fact that he pulled down the roof on which there were 3,000 men and women is not at all impossible, as Mr. Macalister has shown. If we suppose that there was an immense portico to the temple of Dagon, as is outlome, it could be supported by two main pillars of wood resting on bases of stone, like the circular pillars of Solomon's temple (1 K. 7,2), all that S., therefore, necessarily did, was to push the wooden beams so that their feet would slide over the stone base on which they rested, and the whole portico would collapse. Moreover, it is not said that the whole of the 3,000 on the roof were destroyed (16 30). Many of those in the temple proper probably perished in the number (R. A. S. Macalister, 'Bible Side-Lights from the Mound of Gezer, 1906, 127-33).

Not a few important and suggestive lessons are deductible from the hero's life: (1) S. was the object of parental solicitude from even before 5. Religious his birth. One of the most suggestive Value and beautiful prayers in the OT is that child of the mind of his yet unborn child (13 8). Whatever our estimate of his personality is, S. was closely linked to the covenant. (2) He was endowed with the spirit of Jeh—the spirit of personal patriotism, the spirit of vengeance upon a foe of 40 years' standing (13 1,25; 14 6 19; 15 14). (3) He also prayed, and Jeh answered him, though in judgment (16 30). But he was prodigal of his strength. S. had spiritual power and performed feats which an ordinary man would hardly perform. But he was unconscious of his high vocation. In a moment of weakness he yielded to Delilah and divulged the secret of his strength. He was careless of his personal endowment. He did not realize that physical endowments may be used for spiritual purposes, and that to retain them we must be obedient. (4) He was passionate and therefore weak. The animal of his nature was never curbed, but rather ran unchained and free. He was given to sudden fury. S. was a wild man of Passion ruled. He could not resist the blandishments of women. In short, he was an overgrown schoolboy, without self-mastery. (5) He accordingly wrought no permanent deliverance for Israel; he lacked the spirit of cooperation. He undertook a task far too great for even a giant single-handed. Yet, it must be
allowed that S. paved the way for Saul and David. He began the deliverance of Israel from the Philis. He must, therefore, be judged according to his times. In his days there was unrestrained individual independence on every side, each one doing as he pleased. The circumstances differed from his contemporaries in that he was a hero of faith (He 11:32). He was a Nazirite, and therefore dedicated to God. He was given to revenge, yet he was ready to sacrifice himself in order that his own and his people's enemies might be overthrown. He was willing to lay down his life for the sake of his fellow tribesmen—not to save his enemies, however, but to kill them. (Cf Mt 5:43f; Rom 5:10.)

LITERATURE.—(1) Comms. on Jgs, notably those by G. F. Moore, Igs, 1865; Budde, Kurzer Handkommentar, 1897; Nowack, Handkommentar, 1900; E. L. Curtis, The Bible for Home and School, 1913; Bachmann, 1868; Keil, 1865; Farrar in "Silicott's Comm."; Watson, Expositor's Bible. (2) Arts. on "Samson" in the various Bible Dicts., and Encs; in particular those by Budde, HDB; C. W. Emmet, in "vol. HDB"; S. A. Cook, New Enc Brt; Davis, Dict. of the Bible.

GEORGE L. ROBINSON

SAMUEL, sam'ā-ēl (שָׂמַע, Sh'ma,' El), Sam'ud (שָׂמוּד, Sh'mud, Samud'); The word "Samuel" signifies "name of God," or "his name is El" (God). Other derivations of the name that have been offered are almost certainly mistaken. The play upon the name in 1 § 20 is not intended of course to be an explanation of its meaning, but is similar to the play upon Saul in Ex 6:19 and frequently elsewhere in similar instances. Thus by the addition of a few letters sh'maēl becomes shā'al maēl (שָׁאָל, māel), "asked of God," and recalls to the mother of Samuel the circumstances of the Divine gift to her of a son. Outside of the 1st Book of 8 the name of the great judge and prophet is found in I 11:21; Ps 99:6 a prophecy in I and frequently elsewhere in similar instances. The reference in Jer seems intended to convey the same impression that is given by the narrative of 1 S, that in some sense Samuel had come to be regarded as a second Moses, upon whom the mantle of the latter had fallen, and who had been once again the deliverer and guide of the people at a great national crisis.

The narrative of the events of the life of Samuel appears to be derived from more than one source (see Samuel, Books). The narrative is characterized by the combined into a single consecutive History. The completed picture of the prophet's position and character which is thus presented is on the whole harmonious and consistent, and gives a very high impression of his piety and loyalty to Jeh, and of the wide influence for good which he exerted. There are divergences apparent in detail and standpoint between the sources or traditions, some of which probably be due merely to misunderstanding of the true nature of the events recorded, or to the failure of the modern reader rightly to appreciate the exact circumstances and time. The greater part of the narrative of the life of Samuel, however, appears to have come from a single source.

In the portion of the general history of Israel contained in 1 S are narrated the circumstances of the future prophet's birth (ch 1); of his childhood and of the custom of his parents to present him to the sanctuary at Shiloh (2 11:18—21:26); of his vision, and the universal recognition of him as a prophet enjoying the special favor of Jeh (3—4 1). The narrative is then interrupted to describe the conflicts with the Philis, the fate of Eli and his sons, and the capture of the ark of God. It is only after the return of the ark, and apparently at the close of the 20 years during which it was retained at Kirjath-jearim, that Samuel again comes forward publicly, exhorting the people to repentance and promising them deliverance from the hand of their enemies. The narrative is then given of the summoning of a national council at Mizpah, at which Samuel "judged the children of Israel," and offered sacrifice to the Lord, and of Jeh's response in a great thunderstorm, which led to the defeat and panic-stricken flight of the Philis. Then follows the narrative of the erection of a commemorative stone or pillar, Eben-ezer, "the stone of help," and the recovery of the Israelite cities which the Philis had captured (7 5—14). The narrator adds that the Philis came no more within the border of Israel all the days of Samuel (7 13); perhaps with an intentional reference to the troubles and disasters of which this people was the cause in the time of Saul. A brief general statement is appended of Samuel's practice as a judge of going on annual circuit through the land, and of his home at Ramah (7 15—17).

No indication is given of the length of time occupied by these events. At their close, however, Samuel was an old man, and his sons who had been appointed judges in his place by the office proved unworthy (8 1—3). The elders of the people therefore came to Samuel demanding the appointment of a king who should be his successor, and should judge in his stead. The request was regarded by Samuel as the act of disloyalty to Jeh, but his protest was overruled by Divine direction, and at Samuel's bidding the people dispersed (8 4—22).

At this point the course of the narrative is again interrupted to describe the family and origin of Saul, his personal peculiar origin of the search for the lost asses of his father (9 1—5); his meeting with Samuel in a city in the land of Zuph, in or on the border of the territory of Benjamin (Zuph is the name of an ancestor of Elkanah, the father of Samuel, in 1 S 1), a meeting of which Samuel had received Divine pre-intimation (9 15f); the honorable place given to Saul at the feast; his anointing by Samuel as ruler of Israel, together with the announcement of three 'signs' which should be given in the case of the king, whereby is explained a proverbial saying which classed Saul among the prophets; and his silence which referred to what had passed between himself and Samuel on the subject of the kingdom (9 6—10 16).

It is usually, and probably rightly, believed that the narrative of these last incidents is derived from a different source from that of the preceding chapters. Slight differences of inconsistancy or disagreement lie on the surface. Samuel's home is not at Ramah, but a nameless city in the land of Zuph, where he is priest of the high place, with a local but, as far as the narrative goes, not a national influence or reputation; and it is anticipated that, while he will require the customary present at the hands of his visitors (9 6—8). He is described, moreover, not as a judge, nor does he discharge judicial functions, but expressly as a "seer," a name said to be an earlier title equivalent to that of a prophet in the later "prophets" sense; but, however, from the apparently different position which Samuel occupies, the tone and spirit of the narrative is altogether distinct from that of the preceding chapters. It suggests, both in its form and in the religious conceptions which are assumed or implied, an older and less elaborated tradition than that which has found expression in the greater part of the book; and it seems to represent events as it were from a more primitive standpoint than the highly religious and monothestic view of the later accounts. In this it differs from the previous unimpaired, but perhaps rather enhanced by its separate and independent position.

The narrative of the life of Samuel is contained as a whole in his completed narrative at the point at which he judged most suitable. To the same source and possibly to the same event attributed the announcement of Saul's rejection in 13 8—15.

The course of the narrative is resumed at 10 17 ff,
where, in a second national assembly at Mizpah, Saul is selected by lot and accepted by the people as king (10:17-24); after which the people dispersed, and Saul returned to his home at Gibeah (vs. 25-27). At a solemn assembly at Gilgal, at which the king was again formally conferred upon Saul, Samuel delivered a farewell address to his fellow-countrymen. A thunderstorm terrified the people; they were reassured, however, by Samuel with promises of the protection and favor of Jeh, it being continued to clear and serve Him (11:12-15). A song of rejoicing on the occasion of the anointing of Samuel was composed, or sung, by Samuel (13:8-15). The commission to destroy Amalek is delivered to Saul by Samuel; and the rejection of the king is again pronounced because of his failure to carry out the command. Agag is then slain by Samuel with his own hand; and, the latter having returned to his home at Ramah, the narrator adds that he remained there in seclusion until the day of his death, "mourning" for Saul, but refusing to meet him again (ch. 31). Finally the death and burial of Samuel at Ramah, together with the lamentation of the people for him, are briefly recorded in 25:1, and referred to again in 28:3. Thus Samuel's life remain, in which he is brought into relation with the future king David.

No indication of date or circumstance is given except that the first incident apparently follows immediately upon the second and final rejection of Saul. In 16:1-13 is narrated the commission of Samuel to anoint a successor to Saul, and his fulfilment of the commission by the choice of David the son of Jesse, the Bethlehemite. And, in a later chapter (19:18-24), a second commission, namely on which the compelling spirit and prophecy came upon Saul, and again the proverbial saying, "Is Saul also among the prophets?" is quoted (19:2; of 10:11,12), and is apparently regarded as taking its origin from this event.

The anointing of David by Samuel is a natural sequel to his anointing of Saul. Saul, when the latter has been rejected and his authority and rights as king have ceased. There is nothing to determine absolutely whether the narrative is derived from the same source as the greater part of the preceding history. Slight differences of style and tradition appear to distinguish the composition of the latter from the former. The latter have among the most scholars to the conclusion that it has a distinct and separate existence. But the compiler of the Books of Samuel drew upon a third source for his narrative of the life of the seer, a source which there is no reason to regard as of later composition and independent. With the second incident related in 19:18-24, the case is different. In 19:18-20, Samuel was the direct author of the words he spake and penned into the book; in 19:21-24, the narrative is taken from the Book of Samuel, and there is not the slightest indication that Samuel's words were intended to be written down and committed to writing. Saul's death is the connecting link between the last two incidents. In the final composition of the book both accounts were then inserted, without notice being taken of the inconsistency which was apparent between them.

Yet later in the history Samuel is represented as appearing to Saul in a vision at Eeonor on the eve of his death (28:11-20). The witch also sees the prophet and is stricken with fear. He is described as in appearance an old man "covered with a robe" (ver. 14). In characteristic grave and measured tones he relates the death of Saul at Gilgal, the king for his disobedience to Jeh, and announces its execution on the morrow; Saul's sons also will die with him (ver. 19), and the whole nation will be involved in the penalty and suffering, as they all had been in sin. The high place which Samuel occupies in the thought of the writers and in the tradition and esteem of the people is manifest throughout the history. The different sources from which the narrative is derived are at one in this, although perhaps not to an equal degree. He is the last and greatest of the judges, the first of the prophets, and inaugurates under Divine direction the Israelite kingdom and the Davidic line. It is not without reason, therefore, that he has been regarded as in dignity and importance the occupying position of Samuel a second Moses in relation to the people. In his exhortations and warnings the Deuteronomic discourses of Moses are reflected and repeated. He delivers the nation from the hand of the Philistines, as Moses from Pharaoh and the Egyptians, and opens up for them a new national era of progress and order under the rule of the kings whom they have desired. Thus, like Moses, he closes the old order, and establishes the people with brighter prospects upon more assured foundations of a new and greater greatness. In nobility of character and utterance also, and in fidelity to Jeh, Samuel is not unworthy to be placed by the side of the older lawgiver. The record of his life is not marred by any act or word which would appear unworthy of his office or preceptive. And the few references to him in the later literature (Ps. 99:6; Jer. 15:1; 1 Ch. 6:28; 9:22; 11:3; 26:28; 29:29; 2 Ch. 35:18) show how high was the estimation in which his name and memory were held by his fellow-countrymen in subsequent ages.

LITERATURE.—The literature is given in the art. SAMUEL, BOOKS OF (q.v.).

A. S. GEDEN

SAMUEL, BOOKS OF:

I. Place in the Canon.—In the Heb Canon and enumeration of the sacred books of the OT, the two Books of Samuel were reckoned as one, and formed the third division of the earlier Prophets (ם"שנ, 'ם"שנ, n'b'hi'n r'sh'k'n). The one book bore the title "Samuel" (ם"שנ, sh'ma'el), not because the book was written by Samuel, but because his life and acts formed the main theme of the book, or at least of its earlier part. Nor was the Book of Samuel separated by any real division in subject-matter or continuity of style from the Book of Kings, which in the original formed a single book, not two as in the Eng. and other modern VSS. The history was carried forward without interruption; and the record of the life of David, begun in S, was completed in K. This continuity in the narrative of Israelite history was made more prominent in the LXX, where the four books were comprised under one title and were known as the four "Books of the Kingsdom" (βίβλοι βασιλείων, βιβλίοι βασιλείων). This name was probably due to the translators or scholars of Alexandria. The division into four books, but not the Or title, was then adopted in the Lat tr. where, however, the influence of Jerome secured the restoration of the Heb names, 1 and 2 S, and 1 and 2 K (Regum). Jerome's example was universally followed, and the fourfold division with the Heb title and a place in all subsequent VSS of the OT Scriptures. Ultimately the distinction of the first and second Books of Samuel, as well as the place of the first in the old Latin text, was received and printed editions of the Heb Bible. This was done for the first time in the editio princeps of the Rabbinic Bible, printed at Venice in 1516-17 AD.
II. Contents and Period of the History.—The narrative of the two Books of S covers a period of about a hundred years, from the close of the unsettled era of the Judges to the establishment and consolidation of the kingdom under David. It is therefore a record of the changes, national and constitutional, which accompanied this growth and development of the national life, at the close of which the Israelites found themselves a united people under the rule of a king to whom allowed allegiance, controlled and guided by more or less definitely established institutions and laws. This may be described as the general purpose and main theme of the books, to trace the advance of the people under Divine guidance to a state of settled prosperity and unity in the promised land, and to give prominence to the theocratic rule which was the essential condition of Israel’s life as the people of God under all the changing forms of early government. The narrative therefore centers itself around the lives of the three men, Samuel, Saul and David, who were chiefly instrumental in the establishment of the monarchy, and to whom it was due more than to any others that Israel emerged from the depressed and disunited state in which the tribes had remained during a period of the rule of the Judges, and came into possession of a combined and effective national life. If the formal separation therefore into two books be disregarded, the history of Israel as it is narrated in ‘Samuel’ is most naturally divided into three parts, which are followed by an appendix recording words and incidents which for some reason had not found a place in the general narrative:

A. The life and rule of Samuel (1 S 1-15) (death 1 S 8:2)
B. The life, reign and death of Saul (1 S 16-2 S 1)
C. The reign and acts of David to the suppression of the Ammonites and Philistines (2 S 2-25)
D. Appendix; other incidents in the reign of David, the names of David’s warriors and his Song or Psalm of Praise (2 S 21-34).

III. Summary and Analysis.—To present a brief and clear analysis of these Books of S is not altogether easy. For as in the Pent and the earlier historical Books of Josh and Jgs, repetitions and apparently duplicate accounts of the same event are an inevitable concomitant of the chronological development of the narrative. Even the main divisions, as stated above, to a certain extent overlap.

1. Life of Samuel (1 S 1-15)

27-30). Samuel’s vision at the sanctuary and his induction to the prophetic office (3 1-4).
2. Death of Jonathan and Saul (ch 14).
3. The death of Saul and Samuel (ch 28-31).
4. The destruction of the Philistines and of the temple (ch 29-30).
5. Assembly of Israel under Samuel at Mizpah, and victory over the Philistines (7 1-14).
6. Assembly of Israel under Samuel at Mizpah, and victory over the Philistines (7 1-14).
7. Assembly of Israel under Samuel at Mizpah, and victory over the Philistines (7 1-14).
8. Assembly of Israel under Samuel at Mizpah, and victory over the Philistines (7 1-14).
9. Assembly of Israel under Samuel at Mizpah, and victory over the Philistines (7 1-14).
10. Victory of Saul over the Ammonites and deliverance of Jabesh-gilead (11 1-15); Saul made king in Gath (vs 14-15).
11. Samuel’s address to the people in Gilgal, defending his own life and action, and exhorting them to fear and serve the Lord (ch 12).
12. Saul at Gilgal offers the burnt offering in Samuel’s absence; gathering of the Philistines to battle at Michmash; the brazen plates of the Philistines for weapons of iron (ch 13).
13. Jonathan’s surprise of the Philistines, and their sudden panic (14 1-23); Saul’s vow, unwittingly broken by Jonathan, with the people and the Philistines after its effects (14 24-25); victories of Saul over his enemies on every side (14 26-52).
14. War against Amalek, and Saul’s disobedience to the Divine command to exterminate the Amalekites (15).

(1) Anointing of David as Saul’s successor (16 1-13); his summons to the court of Saul as act as minstrel before the king (vs 14-23).
2. Reign of David (ch 17).
(2) David and Goliath (ch 17).
(3) The love of Jonathan and Saul (18 1-4); the former’s advancement and fame, the jealousy of Saul, and his attempt to kill David (18 5-16, 29-30); David’s marriage to the daughter of Saul (vs 17-25).
(4) Death of Saul (2 S 1). The second attempt to kill him (19 17-19).
2. Saul’s escape to Ramah, whither the king followed (vs 18-24).
(5) Jonathan’s warning to David of his father’s resolve and their parting (ch 20).
(6) David at Nob (21 1-9); and with Achish of Gath (vs 10-15).
(7) David’s band of outlaws at Adullam (22 1-3); his provision for the safety of his father and mother in Moab (vs 3-9); vengeance of Saul on those who had helped David (vs 6-23).
(8) Repeated attempts of Saul to take David (ch 23). Death of Saul (23 15); Abigail becomes David’s wife, after the death of her husband (ch 24).
(9) Saul’s further pursuit of David (ch 26).
(10) David’s return with Bahul of the men of Engedi (27 1-28).
(11) Saul and the witch of Endor (28 3-25).
(12) David’s pursuit of the Amalekites who had raided Ziklag, and victory over them (ch 30).
(13) Battle between the Philistines and Israel in Mt. Gilboa and the death of Saul (ch 31).
(14) News of Saul’s death brought to David at Ziklag (2 S 1 1-16); David’s lamentation over Saul and Jonathan (ch 32).
(15) David’s seven and a half years’ reign over Judah in Hebron (2 S 1 1-53).
(16) Consecration of David as king in 3. Reign of Hebron (2 S 1 4-45); message to the men of David (ch 2).
(17) Death of Abner and death of Asahel (ch 22).
(18) Increase of the fame and prosperity of David, and the names of his sons (3 1-5); Abner’s submission to David, and treacherous murder of the former by Joab (vs 6-39).
(19) Murder of Ish-bosheth and David’s vengeance upon his murderers (4 1-3,5-12); notice of the escape of Mephibosheth when Saul and Jonathan were slain at Jezreel (ver 4).
(20) David’s acceptance as king over all Israel (5 1-3).
(21) Reign of David in Jerusalem over United Israel (5 4-26).
(22) Taking of Jericho and victories over the Philistines (5 4-25).
(23) Return of the ark to the city of David (ch 6).
(24) David’s purpose to build a temple for the Lord (7 1-3); the Divine answer by the prophet Nathan, and the king’s prayer (vs 4-29).
(25) Victories over the Philistines, Syrians, and other peoples (ch 8).
(26) David’s reception of Mephibosheth (ch 9).
(27) Defeat of the Ammonites and Syrians by the men of Israel under the command of Joab (10 1-11).
(28) David and Uriah, the latter’s death in battle, and David’s marriage with Bath-sheba (ch 11).
(29) Nathan’s parable and David’s conviction of sin (12 1-16); the king’s grief and intercession for his sick son (vs 16-25); siege and capture of Rabbah, the Ammonite capital (vs 26-31).
(30) Amnon’s murder of Absalom (13 1-22); Absalom’s vengeance and murder of Amnon (vs 23-30); flight of Absalom (vs 37-39).
(31) Return of Absalom to Jerusalem (14 1-24); his beauty, and reconciliation with the king (vs 25-33).
(32) Absalom’s method of ingratiating himself with the people (15 1-6); his revolt and the flight of the king from Jerusalem (vs 7-31); meeting with Hushai (vs 32-37a); Absalom in Carmel (vs 38-44).
(33) David’s meeting with Zilpa (16 1-4), and Shimel (vs 5-14); counsel of Ahithophel and Hushai (16 15-17); the king carried to Mahanaim (17 23-27); death of Ahithophel (ver 23).
(34) David’s flight from Absalom (17 24-29).
(35) The revolt subdued, death of Absalom, and reception by David of the tidings (18 1-19 8e).
(36) Return of the king to Jerusalem, and meetings with Shimel, Mephibosheth, and Barzillai the Gileadite (19 85-49).
THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

Samuel, Books of

Sanctification

(pp) Revolt of Sheba the Benjamite, and its suppression by Joab with the death of Amasa (20:1.2-4; 22); the plot against the life of Solomon left at Jorus (ver 5); the names of his officers (vs 23-26).

(1) Seven male descendants of Saul put to death at the instance of Ahimelech the priest; the incidents of wars with the Philis (vs 15-22). "

4. Appendix (David’s song of thanksgiving and praise) (2 S 21-24)


(4) The king’s numbering of the people, the resulting plague, and the dependences of the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite (ch 24).

IV. Sources of the History.—The natural inference from the character and contents of the Books of S, as thus reviewed, is that the writer has made use of authorities, ‘sources’ or ‘documents,’” from which he has compiled a narrative of the events which it was his desire to place on record. The same characteristics are noticeable here which are found in parts of the Pentateuch and of the Books of Josh and Jgs, that in some instances duplicate or parallel accounts are given of one and the same event, which seems to be regarded from different points of view and is narrated in a style which is more or less divergent from that of the companion record. Examples of this so-called duplication are more frequent in the Books of S than in the later. There are presented, for instance, two accounts of Saul’s election as king, and an act of disobedience is twice followed, apparently quite independently, by the sentence of rejection. Independent also are the narrative accounts of Saul’s introduction to Saul (1 S 16 14-23; 17 31 f. 55 f); and the two accounts of the manner of the king’s death can be imperfectly reconciled only on the hypothesis that the young Amalekite actually sent forth to David to murder his own part in the matter. In these and other instances little or no attempt seems to be made to harmonize conflicting accounts, or to reconcile apparent discrepancies. In good faith the writer set down the records as he found them, making extracts or quotations from his authorities on the several events as they occurred, and thus building up his own history on the basis of the freest possible use of the materials and language of those who had preceded him.

However alien such a method of composition may appear to modern thought and usage in the West, it is characteristic of all early oriental writing. It would be almost impossible to find in any eastern literature a work of any long duration which was not thus silently indebted to its predecessors, and had incorporated their utterances, and had itself in turn suffered interpolation at the hands of later editors and transcribers. Accordingly, early Heb historical literature also, while unique in its spirit, conformed in its methods to the practice of the age and country in which it was composed. It would have been strange if it had been otherwise.

Apart from the appendix and minor additions, of which Hannah’s song on the birth of Samuel in 1 S 2:1-10 is an example, the bulk of the book is derived from two independent sources, which themselves in all probability formed part of a still larger, more or less consecutive history or histories that have now been lost. These source materials, however, have been, as others think, rather of a biographical nature, presenting and enforcing the teaching of the acts and experience of the great leaders and rulers of the nation. The predominance of the narrative is perhaps most evident in the history of Saul. The broad lines of distinction between the two branches of the book are defined without much difficulty or uncertainty. The greater part of the first eight chapters is in all probability derived from the one source, the earlier of the two, which has assigned more or less completely vs 10-12, 15, 17-19, 21-25 and 28. The other part has contributed 1 S 8 with parts of chs 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 20 and considerable portions of chs 22, 23, 26-27, 28-31, 2 S 1 (in part), 2-6, 9-20. Some details have probably been derived from other sources, and additions made by the editor or editors. This general determination of sources rests upon a number of texts, upon the evidence of repetition and exception, and upon simpler varieties of style which are neither so pronounced nor so readily distinguished as in the books of the Law. The writer’s own mind that a close and exact division or line of demarcation in evidence is not to be found.

V. Character and Date of Sources.—Attempts which have been made to determine the date of these two sources, or to identify them with one or other of the existing authorities from which the historical narratives of the Pentateuch are derived, have not been without some judgment of some, however, the later of the two sources should be regarded as a continuation of the narrative of the document known as E, and the earlier is ascribed to J. The style of the latter has much in common with the style of J, and is clear, vigorous and poetical; the religious connotations also that are apparent are of a simple and early type. The later writing has been supposed to give indications of the influence of the prophetic teaching of the 8th century. The indications, however, are not sufficiently decisive to enable this to be determined. If it be determined that J and E represent rather schools of teaching and thought than individuals, the characteristics of the two sources of the Books of S would not be out of harmony with the view that from those two schools respectively were derived the materials out of which the history was compiled. The “sources” then, would, according to the usual view, belong to the 9th century before the Christian era; and to a period not more than a century or a century and a half later should be assigned the final compilation of the complete form of the history as contained in the Heb Canon of Scripture.

VI. Greek Text.—The Hellenistic translation of the Hebrew Scriptures is represented in the LXX and in several other versions. The LXX had a great deal in common with the Massoretic text, and it is probable that in the course of transmission the Gr text has been exposed to much corruption in a very considerable extent. At least two recensions of the Gr text are in existence, represented by the Vatican and Alexandrian canons respectively, of which the former is nearer to the Heb original, and has apparently been corrupted to it at a later period with a view to remove discrepancies; and this process has naturally impaired its value as a witness to the primary shape of the Gr text itself. A few passages are entirely lost in the text of S; the Massoretic Heb and Gr and A in the Greek. The original form of the text as first recovered, would represent a text anterior to the Massoretic recension, differing from, but not necessarily superior to, the latter. For the restoration of this text, the Old Lat., where it is available, affords valuable help. It is evident then that in any given instance the agreement of these three types or recensions of the text is the strongest possible witness to the originality and authenticity of a reading; but that the weight attaching to the testimony of A will not in general, on account of the history of this text, be equivalent to that of either of the other two.

VII. Ethical and Religious Teaching.—The religious teaching and thought of the two Books of S it is not difficult to summarize. The books are in form a historical record of events; but they are intended by the same time that in addition they conformed to a definite purpose, and made to subsist a definite moral and religious aim. It is not a narrative of events solely, or the preservation of historical detail, that the writer has in view, but rather to elucidate and enforce from Israel’s experience the significance of the Divine and moral government of the nation. The duty of king and people alike is to obey Jah, to render strict and willing deference to His commands, and on this path of obedience and truth the nation’s independence and prosperity be secured. With this presupposition, and with uncompromising severity, sin even in the highest places is condemned; and an ideal of righteousness is set forth in language and with an earnestness which may be regarded as the consummation of Dt.

Thus the same is true of the Books of S; and in the earliest of the preceding books of the canonical OT: they are composed with a didactic aim. The experience of the past is made to afford lessons of warning and encouragement for the present. To the writer or writers the source materials, the legend and upbuilding of the Israelite kingdom is pregnant with a deeper meaning than lies on the surface, and this meaning he endeavors to make plain to his readers through the record. The issues of the events
and the events themselves are under the guidance and control of Jeh, who always condemns and punishes wrong, and approves and rewards righteousness. Thus the narrative is history utilized to convey moral truth. And its value is to be estimated, not primarily as recording the great deeds of the past, but as conveying ethical teaching; that by means of the history, the moral and spiritual interest the people may be recalled to a sense of their high duty toward God, and be warned of the inevitable consequences of disobedience to Him.

LITERATURE.—Upon all points of introduction, criticism, interpretation, text, and apparatus, see especially: A. S. Geden, _Saniasib, Zerubbabel, and the Sons of Sannah_ (London 1874) in English; and _New Century Bible_ (New York, Freewill, 1895; in German by R. Budde, 1902. W. Nowack, 1905; A. Klostermann, 1887. See also the arts. "Samuel" in _IDB, SB and JE.

SANAAS, san’a-as (A and Fritzsche, _Zedas, Sandas, B, Zaq, Sandi; AV Annaas): The sons of Sannah returned in large numbers with Zerubbabel (1 Es 2 12.15), and appear most prominently in 1 Es 5 18.10, a name appearing in many variations. Always reading Sanaasibop, Sanahassaros, B, Sanaasibarasi, Sanamassar, in 2 12[1] [RVZ Samannasar] Saan-avaspas, Samansaros, in 2 13[4], but Sanabaspas, Sanaasib, in 6 20[19]: He was "governor of Judaea" under Cyrus, conveyed the holy vessels of the temple from Babylon to Jerusalem 1 Es 6 7, and laid the foundations of the house of the Lord 1 Es 6 12. 15; 6 18–20) "Sennacherib [q.v.] the prince of Judah" (Ezr 1 8).

Some identify him with Zerubbabel as ATY in 1 Es 5 18: "Z., which is also S., the ruler." This view appears to be favored by the order of the words here, where, in the case of two persons, one might expect "S., the ruler," to come first. Zerubbabel appears as "governor of Judaea," also in 1 Es 6 27–29. Ezr 3 10 speaks of the foundation of the temple under Zerubbabel and 5 16 as under Zerrobai: Ezr 2 23. The name Sannah is interpreted as Ze- rub-ibael in Ez 10. 5, 40, where Nehemiah and Atharias refer to the same person. The name Sannah appears in the LXX with the same person, even with the same identification. Zerubbabel is not a styled ruler or governor either in Neh or Ezr, but in Hag 1 14, 22–21 he is pehul or governor of Jerusalem; no exact parallel to the double monarchy as in the text has survived. The name Sannah or Sannah is found as e.g. Daniel, Belteshazzar: the language of Ez 5 14 seems to refer to the position of a different person than Zerubbabel. Nor is there any reason against supposing a first return under Sheshbazzar (see above), and a foundation of the temple previous to the time of Zerubbabel—an undertaking into which the Jews did not enter heartily, perhaps because Sannah may have been a foreigner (though it is uncertain whether he was a Babylonian, a Persian, or a Jew). A later proposal is to identify Saniasib with Sheshbazzar, the uncle of Zerubbabel in 1 Ch 3 18. But either of these identifications must remain doubtful. See Sennacherib; Zerubbabel.

S. ANGUS

SANASIB, san’a-sib (Fritzsche, _Zedas, Sandas, B, and Swete, _Zedas, Sandas, A, **Avadis, A, **Avadis, **Avadis, Anasib): Found only in 1 Es 5 24, where the sons of Jedu, the sons of Jesus, are a priestly family returning "among the sons of Sanasib." The name is not found in 1 Es 2 36; Neh 7 30; and is perhaps preserved in the Vulg. "Eliasib." The name is the leading opponent of the Jews at the time when Nehemiah undertook to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem (Neh 2 10; 4 1: 6 1). He was related by marriage to the son of Eeliashib, the high priest at the time of the annulment of the mixed marriages forbidden by the Law (Neh 13 28).

Renewed interest has been awakened in Sanballat from the fact that he is mentioned in the papyri I and II of Sachau (Die olympischen Papyrusurkunden aus Elephantine, Berlin, 1908, and in his later work, _Arachneae Papyri und Ostaka, Leipzig, 1911;_ cf. Sturck's convenient ed in _Lituanus_(Kleina Texte zu Handbuch der Geschichte des Judentums, i3, 3, 4). In the OT, he acts as successor to the governor (pahath) of Samaria some time before the 17th year of Darius (Nothus), i.e., 408–407 BC, when Bagohi was governor of Judah. His two sons, Deliah and Shelemiah, received a letter from the king of Judah and his companions the priests who were in Yeb (Elephantine) in upper Egypt. This letter contained information concerning the state of affairs in the Jewish colony of Yeb, esp. concerning the destruction of the temple or synagogue _agora _which had been erected at that place.

The address of this letter reads as follows: "To our lord Bagohi, the governor of Judaea, his servants Jodinah and his companions, the priests in the fortress of Yeb [Elephantine], we say the God of heaven has inquire much at every time after the peace of our lord and put thee in thine favor before Darius the king, etc." The conclusion of the letter reads thus: "Now, therefore, the king and his companions and the Jews, all citizens of Yeb, may thus: If it seems good to the king and the king's council to think on the rebuilding of that temple the _agora _which had been destroyed by the Egyptians, since it has not been permitted since then to do those receivers of thy benefactions and favors here in Egypt. Let a letter with regard to the rebuilding of the temple of the God Jaho in the fortress of Yeb, as it was formerly built, be sent from thee. In thy name will they offer the meal offerings, the incense, and the burnt offerings upon the altar of the God Jaho; and we shall always pray for thee and thank thee and for the kingdom of the God Jaho in the fortress of Yeb. If it seems good to thee, do the Jews find here, until the temple has been rebuilt. And it will be to thee a meritorious work [mashikah] in the sight of Jaho, the God of Heaven, greater than the meritorious work of a man who offers to him a burnt offering and a sacrifice of a value equal to the value of 1,000 talents of silver. And as to the gold [probably that which was sent by the Jews to Bagohi as a bribe] we have sent word and given knowledge. Also, we have in our name communicated in a letter all [these] matters unto Deliah and Shelemiah, the sons of Sanballat, governor of Samaria. Also, from all that has been done thus far, Asram (the satrap of Egypt) has learned nothing. The 20th of Marcheshvan in the 17th year of Darius the king."

Sanballat is the Bab Sin-bubaili, "may Sin give him life," a name occurring a number of times in the contract tablets from the time of Nebuchadnezzar, Nabonidus, and Darius Hystaspis. (See Tellquast, _Newbablysionisches Namensbuch, 183_.)

R. DICK WILSON

SANCIFICATION, sank-ti-di-kh shun:

Etymology

1. The Formal Sense
2. In the NT

II. The Ethical Sense
1. Transformation of Formal to Ethical Idea
2. Our Relation to God as Personal: NT Idea
3. Sanctification as Person's Life
4. Questions of Time and Method
5. An Element in All Christian Life
6. Fellowship: Personal and Voluntary
7. Is It instantaneous and Entire?
8. Sanctification as Man's Task

LITERATURE

The root is found in the OT in the Heb vb. _yadhash, _in the NT in the Gr vb. _aydaze, _agiasz. The noun "sanctification" does not occur in the OT, but the roots noted above appear in a group of important words which are of very frequent occurrence. These words are "holy," "hallow," "hallowed," "holiness," "consecrate," "saint, "sanctify,"
"sanctification." It must be borne in mind that these words are all tr of the same root, and that therefore one of them can be treated adequately without reference to the others. All have undergone a certain development. Broadly stated, this has been from the formal, or ritual, to the ethical, and these different meanings must be carefully distinguished.

1. The Formal Sense.—By sanctification is ordi-

narily meant that hallowing of the Christian believer by which he is freed from sin and enabled to realize the will of God in his life. This is not, however, the first or common meaning in the Scriptures. To sanctify is a common term of the Old Testament, that is, to separate from the world and consecrate to God.

To understand this primary meaning we must go back to the word "holy" in the OT. That is holy which belongs to Jehovah. There is an Ot character. It may refer to days and seasons, to places, to objects used for worship, or to persons. Exactly the same usage is shown with the word "sanctify." To sanctify something is to declare it as belonging to God, "Sanctify unto me all the first-born . . . it is mine" (Ex 13:2; cf Nu 3:13; 8:17). It applies thus to all that is connected with worship, to the Levites (Nu 3:12), the priests and the tent of meeting, the ark, and that touched it (Ex 29:362), and the offering (Ex 29:27; cf 2 Mace 2:18; 1 Esd 7:31). The feast and holy days are to be sanctified, that is, set apart from ordinary business as belonging to Jehovah (the Sabbath, Nu 15:29; Neh 1:14). One part of the nation as a whole is sanctified when Jehovah acknowledges it and receives it as His own, as "a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation" (Ex 19:5-6). A man may thus sanctify his house or his field (Lev 27:14-16), but not the firstling of the flock, for this is already Jehovah's (Lev 27:26).

It is this formal usage without moral implication that explains such a passage as Gen 38:21. The word tr meaning it, as elsewhere, the sanctified or consecrated one (kedashah); see margin and cf Dt 23:18; 1 K 14:24; Hos 4:14). It is the hierodule, the familiar figure of the old pagan temple, the sacred slave consecrated to God and the temple for immemorial purposes. The practice is protested against in Israel (Dt 23:17), but the use of the term illustrates clearly that it is essentially the same in its primary meaning (cf also 2 K 10:20, "and Jehu said, Set him a solemn assembly for Baal and they proclaimed it"); cf Joel 1:14).

Very suggestive is the transitive use of the word in the phrase, "to sanctify Jehovah." To understand this we must note the use of the word "holy" as applied to Jehovah in the OT. Its meaning is not primarily ethical. Jehovah's holiness is His supremacy, His sovereignty, His glory, His essential being as God. To say the Holy One is simply to say God. Jehovah's holiness is seen in His might, His manifested glory; it is that before which peoples tremble, which makes the nations dread (Ex 15:11-18; cf 1 S 6:20). Ps 68:1; 89:7; 95:3. Significance is in the way in which "jealous" and "holy" are almost identified (Jos 24:19; Ezek 38:23). It is God asserting His supremacy, His unique claim. To sanctify Jehovah, therefore, to make Him holy, is to assert or acknowledge or bring forth His being as God, His supreme power and glory, His sovereign claim. Ezekiel brings this out most clearly. Jehovah has been profaned in the eyes of the nations through Israel's defeat and captivity. True, it was because of Israel's sins, but the nations thought it was because of Jehovah's weakness. The ethical is not wanting in these passages. The people are to be separated from their sins and given a new heart (Ezek 36:25; 20:33). But the word "sanctify" is not used for this. It is applied to Jehovah, and it means the assertion of Jehovah's power in Israel's triumph, the vindication of her foes (20:41; 28:25; 36:23; 38:16; 39:27).

The sanctification of Jehovah is thus the assertion of His being and power as God, just as the sanctification of a person or object is the assertion of Jehovah's right and claim in the same.

The story of the waters of Meribah illustrates the same meaning. Mose's failure to sanctify Jehovah in his failure to declare Jehovah's glory and power in the miracle of the waters (Ex 15:22-23; cf Dt 32:10; Ps 95:1) has repeatedly been pointed out in the story of Nadab and Abihu points the same way. Here "I will be sanctified" is the same as "I will be glorified" (Lev 10:1-3). Jehovah is essentially the same in Ex 3:18; "Jehonathan is exalted in justice, and Jehovah the Holy One is sanctified in righteousness." Holiness again is the exaltedness of God, His supremacy, which is seen here in the judgment (justice, righteousness) rooted out to the disobedient people (cf the recurrent refrain of 5:26; 9:12-17:21; 10:4; see Justice; Justice of Pss. Isa 8:13; 29:22 suggest the same byes by which they "sanctify" to fear and awe. One NT passage brings us the same meaning (1 Pet 3:15): Sanctify your hearts in Christ as Lord, that is, exalt Him as supreme.

In a few NT passages the OT ritual sense reappears, as when Jesus speaks of the temple sanctifying the gold, and the altar the gift (Mt 21:13; cf 1 Tim 1:5). The prevailing meaning is that which we found in the OT. To sanctify is to consecrate or set apart. We may first take the few passages in the Fourth Gospel. As applied to Jesus in 10:36-39, to sanctify means to make holy in the ethical sense. As the whole context shows, it means to consecrate for His mission in the world. The reference to the disciples, "that they themselves also may be sanctified in truth," has much meaning. That they may be set apart (for Jesus sends them, as the Father sends Him), and that they may be made holy in truth.

This same meaning of consecration, or separation, appears when we study the word saint, which is the same as "sanctified one." Aside from its use in the NT, the word is found mainly in the OT. Outside the Gospels, where the term "disciples" is used, it is the common word to designate the followers of Jesus, occurring some 561. By "saint" is not meant the morally perfect, but the one who belongs to Christ, just as the sanctified priest or offering belonged to Jehovah. This Paul can salve the disputes at Corinth as saints and a little later rebuke them as carnal and babes, as those among whom are jealous and strife, who walk after the manner of men (1 Cor 1:2; 3:1-3). In the same way the phrase "the "holy" one" or "those sanctified" is used to designate the believers. By "the inheritance among all them that are sanctified" is meant the heritage of the Christian believer (Acts 20:32; 26:18; of 1 Cor 1:2; 6:11; Eph 1:18; Col 1:12). This is the meaning in which, which speaks of the believer as being sanctified by the blood of Christ. In 10:29 the writer speaks of one who has fallen away, who "hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing." Evidently it is not the inner and personal holiness of this apostate that is referred to. It is the fullness of the tene, but that he had been separated unto God by this sacrificial blood and had then counted the holy offering a common thing. The contrast is between the sacred and common, not between moral perfection and sin (cf 10:10; 13:12). The formal meaning appears again in 1 Cor 7:12-14, where the unbelieving husband is said to be sanctified by the wife, and vice versa. It is not moral character that is meant here, but a certain separation from the profane and unclean and a certain relation to God. This is made plain by the reference to the children: "Else were your children unclean; but now are they holy." The formal sense is less certain in other...
1. **Transfiguration of Formal Scriptures stand as a monument.** The ethical idea is not wanting at the beginning, but the supremacy of the moral and spiritual over against the formal, the ritual, the ceremonial, the national, is the clear direction in which life is to go. Now the pivot of this movement is the conception of God. As the thought of God grows more ethical, more spiritual, it molds and changes all other conceptions. Thus what it means to belong to God (homoio, sanctification) depends upon the nature of the God to whom man belongs. The hierodules of Corinth are women of shame because of the nature of the goddess to whose temple they belong. The prophets caught a vision of Jehovah, not jealous for His prerogative, not craving for His temple or puerile and pantheistic ceremonial, but with a gracious love for His people and a passion for righteousness. Their great message is: This now is Jehovah; hear what it means to belong to such a God and to serve Him. "What unto me is the multitude of your sacrifices? Wash you, make you clean; seek justice, relieve the oppressed" (Isa 11.16-17).

"When Israel was a child, then I loved him . . . I desire goodness, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings" (Hos 11.6).

In this way the formal idea that we have been considering becomes charged with moral meaning. To belong to God, to be His servant, His son, is no mere external matter. Jesus' teaching as in the Synoptic Gospels at all, but "sonship" with the Jews expressed this same relation of belonging. For them it meant a certain obedience on the one hand, a privilege on the other. Jesus declares that belonging to God means likeness to Him, sonship is sharing His spirit of loving good will (Mt 5.45-48). Brother and sister for Jesus are those who do God's will (Mk 3.35). Paul takes up the same thought, but joins it definitely to the words "sanctify." The religious means the ethical, those that are sanctified are called to be saints" (1 Cor 1.2). The significant phrase is the same as in Rom 1.1, "Paul . . . called to be an apostle."

In this light we read Eph 4.1, "Walk worthy of the calling wherewith ye were called." Eph 1.3, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you; who verily did foreordain us unto the adoption of sons by Jesus Christ to himself according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved."

2. **Relation of Sanctification to God**

**Personal:** should be thought of in a negative or passive way. Now the Christian's surrender is not to an outer authority but to an inner living fellow being. The sanctified life is thus a life of personal fellowship lived out with the Father in the spirit of Christ in loving trust and obedient service. This positive and vital meaning of sanctification dominates Paul's thought. He speaks of living unto God, of living to the Lord, and, most expressively of all, of being alive unto God (Rom 14.8; cf 6.13; Gal 2.19). So completely is his life filled by this fellowship that he can say, "It is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal 2.20). But there is no quietism here. It is a very rich and active life, this life of fellowship to which we are surrendered. It is a life of sonship in trust and love, with the spirit that enables us to say, "Abba, Father" (Rom 8.15; Gal 4.6). Sanctification is not, therefore, a limited ethical, good will (Mt 5.43-48). It is a life of "faith working through love" (Gal 6), it is having the mind of Christ (Phil 3.5). The sanctified life, then, is the life so fully surrendered to fellowship with Christ day by day, not the inner spirit and outward expression are ruled by His spirit.

We come now to that aspect which is central for Christian interest, sanctification as the making holy of life, not by our act, but by God's act. Sanctification is no longer the work of the Christian, but the work of God. Sanctification as God's Gift in conformity with God's will, then sanctification is the deed or process by which that state is wrought. And this deed we are to consider now as the work of God. Jesus prays that the Father may sanctify His disciples in truth (John 17.17). So Paul prays for the Thessalonians (1 Thess 5.23), and declares that Christ is to sanctify His church (cf Rom 6.22; 2 Thess 3.3; 2 Tim 2.21; 1 Pet 1.2). Here sanctification means to make clean or holy in the ethical sense, though the idea of consecration is not necessarily lacking. But aside from special passages, we must take into account the whole NT teaching, according to which every part of life, soul, spirit, and body (1 Cor 6.20), is to be consecrated to God, that is, to be given over to the Spirit of God and wrought by His Spirit. "If I be the Lord that worketh in you both to will and to work" (Phil 2.13; cf Rom 8.12-14.16-26; Gal 5.22). Significant is the use of the words "creature" ("creation," see margin) and "workmanship" with Paul (2 Cor 5.17; Gal 6.15; Eph 2.10; 4.24). The new life is God's second work of creation.

When we ask, however, when and how this work is wrought, there is no such clear answer. What we have is on the one hand uncompromising ideal and demand, and on the other absolute confidence in God. By adding to these two the evident fact that the Christian believers seen in the NT are far from the attainment of such Christian perfection, some writers have assumed to have the foundation here for the doctrine that the state of complete holiness of life is a special experience in the Christian life wrought in a definite moment of time. It is well to realize that no NT passages give answer to these questions and time and method, and that our conclusions must be drawn from the general teaching of the NT as to the Christian life.

First, it must be noted that in the NT view sanctification in the ethical sense is an essential element.
and inevitable result of all Christian life and experience. Looked at from the religious point of view, we find two aspects of regeneration. Regeneration is the implanting of a new life in man. So far as that is a new life from God it is ipse facto Life. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit teaches the same (see HOLY SPIRIT).

There is no Christian life from the very beginning that is not the work of the Spirit. "No man can [even] say, Jesus is Lord, but in the ... Spirit!" (1 Cor 12:3). But this Spirit is the Holy Spirit, whether with Paul we say the Holy Spirit or Spirit of God (Rom 8:9). His presence, therefore, in our far forth means holiness of life. From the ethical standpoint the same thing is constantly declared. Jesus builds here upon the prophets: no religion without righteousness; clean hands, pure hearts, deeds of mercy are not mere conditions of worship, but joined to humble hearts are themselves the worship that God desires (Am 6:21-25; Mic 6:6-8). Jesus deepened the conception, but did not change it, and Paul was true to this succession. "If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ is in you, ... the spirit is life because of righteousness" (Rom 8:9,10). There is nothing in Paul's teaching to suggest that sanctification is the special event of a unique experience, or that there are specific conditions or qualities for sanctification. All Christian living meant for him clean, pure, right living, and that was sanctification. The simple, practical way in which he attacks the bane of sexual impurity in his pagan congregations shows this. "This is the way of the ungodly. But you, having the Spirit of God, even the Spirit that makes you free from fornication; that each one of you know how to possess himself of his own vessel in sanctification and honor. For God called us not for uncleanness, but for sanctification" (1 Thess 4:4,7). The strength of Paul's teaching, indeed, lies here in this combination of moral earnestness with absolute dependence upon God.

The second general conclusion that we draw from the NT teaching is that Christian life is this: the sanctification which is a part of all that which we know as the Spirit of Christ. Such a fellowship is the supreme moral force for the molding of life, for the development of regeneration. It is an analogue of this, and we know with what power it works on life and character. It cannot, however, set forth either the intimacy or the power of this supreme and final relation where our Friend is not another but Himself inperson. So much we know: this fellowship means a new spirit in us, a renewed and daily renewing life.

It is noteworthy that Paul has no hard-and-fast forms for this life. The reality was too rich and great, and he uses his examples and illustrations upon theological forms which may serve to compress the truth instead of expressing it. Here are some of his expressions for this life in us: to "have the mind of Christ" (1 Cor 2:16; Phil 2:5), "the Spirit of Christ" (Rom 8:9), "Christ is in you" (Rom 8:10), "the spirit which is from God" (1 Cor 12:3), "the Spirit of God" (1 Cor 6:19), the Holy Spirit (Gal 4:6), the Lord of the Hosts (1 Cor 16:23), and the Lord the Spirit (2 Cor 3:18). But in all this one fact stands out, this life is personal, a new spirit in us, and that spirit is one that we have in personal fellowship with God; it is His Spirit. Especially significant is the way in which Paul relates this new life to Christ. We have already noted that Paul uses indifferently "Spirit of God" and "Spirit of Christ" (Rom 8:9). His great contribution to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit lies here. As he states it in 2 Cor 3:17: "Now the Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom. Conception of the Spirit gains moral content and personal character. The Spirit is light, life, love, nor some strange and magical power. The Spirit is ethical; there is a definite moral quality which is expressed when the Spirit is present in a man. Whether you call it the light of the mind or the light of the heart, the light of enthusiasm, the ecstatic utterance of the enthusiast, or some strange deed of power, but in the workaday qualities of kindness, compassion is the divine self-restraint (Gal 5:22f)."

With this identification of the Spirit and the Christ in mind, we can better understand the passages in which Paul brings out the relation of Christ to the sanctification of the believer. He is the goal (Rom 8:29). We are to grow up in Him to be formed in us (Gal 4:19). We are to behold Him and be changed into His image (2 Cor 3:18). This deepens into Paul's thought of the mystical relation with Christ. The Christian dies to sin with Him that he may live with Him a new life. Christ is now his real life. He dwells in Christ, Christ dwells in him. He can say Christ's thoughts. His mind can be known. See Rom 6:5-11; 8:9,10; 1 Cor 2:16; 15:22; Gal 2:20.

This vital and positive conception of the sanctification of the believer must be asserted against some popular interpretations. The symbols of fire and water, as suggesting cleansing, have some import as forming a hard-and-fast basis for a whole superstructure of doctrine. For the former, note Isa 6:6f; Lk 3:16; Acts 2:3; for the latter, Acts 5:32; Tit 3:5; He 10:22; Rev 1:5; 7:14.) There is a two-fold danger here from which we have escaped. The symbols suggest cleansing, and their over-emphasis has meant first a negative and narrow idea of sanctification as purification or defilement. This is a falling back to certain OT OT levels. Secondly, these symbols have been much literalized, and the result has been a sort of mechanical or magical conception of the work of the Spirit. But the soul is not a substance for mechanical action, however sublime. It is personal life that is to be hallowed, thought, affections, motives, desires, will, and only a personal agent through personal fellowship can work this end.

The clear recognition of the personal and vital character of sanctification will help us with another difficulty in the life of the Christian. Is it not possible for the Christian to maintain a high spiritual standard while he is not a Christian in his nature, as the phrase is? It is equally possible for the Christian to maintain this standard while he is in grace. The Christian is not in Christ, but he is in the Christ, and so the answer to the popular question "What is the Christian's standard?" is "He is in Christ!" Our whole Bible answers the question in the affirmative for the Christian: "What is the Christian's standard?" "He is in Christ!"

7. Is It Immediate or in the Same Time? His instantaneous deed, why should not this sanctification and Entire? be instantaneous and entire? And does not Paul imply this, not merely in his demands in his prayer for the Thessalonians, that God may establish their love, but that He may sanctify them wholly and preserve spirit and soul and body entire, without blame at the coming of Our Lord Jesus Christ (1 Thess 3:13; 5:23)?

In answer to this we must first discriminate between the ideal and the empirical with Paul. Like John (1 Jn 1:6; 3:9), Paul insists that the life of Christ and the life of sin cannot go together, and
he knows no qualified obedience, no graduated standard. He brings the highest Christian demand to the highest degree of his pagan convert. Nor have we any finer proof of his faith than this uncompromising idealism. On the other hand, how could he ask less than this? God cannot require less than the highest, but it is another question how the ideal is to be achieved. In the gospel of the ideal it is always either . . . or. In the realm of life there is another category. The question is not simply, Is this man sinner or saint? It is rather, What is he becoming? This matter of becoming is the really vital issue. Is this man turned the right way with or without his own doing? Is he in the Divine fellowship? Not the degree of achievement, but the right attitude toward the ideal, is decisive. Paul does not stop to resolve paradoxes, but practically he reckons with this idea. Side by side with his prayer for the Thessalonians are his admonitions to growth and progress (1 Thess 3 12; 5 14). Neither the absolute demand or the promise of grace gives us the right to conclude how the consummation shall take place.

That conclusion we can reach only as we go back again to the fundamental principle of the personal character of the Christian life and the religious and the religious, All Christian life is work out your own salvation . . . for it is God who worketh in you” (Phil 2 12 f). All is from God; we can only live what God gives. But there is a converse to this: only as we live it out can God give it to us-what He gives is only as we take it as an offering to God. This appears in all Paul’s teaching as to sanctification. It is not only God’s gift, but our task. “This is the will of God, even your sanctification” (1 Thess 4 3). “Having therefore these promises let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness” (1 Pet 1:19). Significant is Paul’s use of the word “walk.” We are to “walk in newness of life,” “by [or in] the Spirit,” “in love,” and “in Christ Jesus the Lord” (Rom 6:4; Gal 5:16; Eph 5:2; Col 2:6). The gift in each case becomes the task, and indeed becomes real and effective only in this activity. It is only as we walk by the Spirit that this becomes powerful in overcoming the lusts of the flesh (Gal 5:16; cf. 5:25). But the ethical is the task that ends only when God gives it to us. If we cannot give all at once. Sanctification is then the matter of a life and not of a moment. The life may be consecrated in a moment, the right relation to God assumed and the man stand in saving fellowship with Him. The life is thus made holy in principle. But the real making holy is coextensive with the whole life of man. It is nothing less than the constant in-forming of the life of the inner spirit and outer deed with the Spirit of Christ until we speak truth in love and grow up in all things into Him, who is the Head” (Eph 4:15). Read also Rom 6; that the Christian is dead to sin is not some fixed static fact, but is true only as he refuses the lower and yields his members to a higher obedience. Note that in 1 Cor 5:7 Paul in the same verse denies “d_Game uncleaned,” and then exalts “Purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump”; of else 1 Thess 5 5–10.

We may sum up as follows: The word “sanctify” is used with two broad meanings: 1. To devote, to make holy, to recognize as holy, that which is, as belonging to God. This is the regular OT usage and is most common in the NT. The prophets showed that this belonging to God demanded righteousness. The NT deepens this into a whole-hearted surrender to the fellowship of God and to the rule of His Spirit. (2) Though the word itself appears in but few passages with this sense, the NT is full of the thought of the making holy of the Christian life by the Spirit of God in that fellowship into which God lifts us by His grace and in which He gives Himself to us. This sanctifying, or hallowing, is not mechanical or magical. It is wrought out by God’s Spirit in a daily fellowship to which man gives himself in aspiration and trust and obedience, receiving with open heart, living out in obedient life. It is not negative, the mere separation from sin, but the progressive hallowing of a life that grows constantly in capacity, as in character, into the stature of full manhood as it is in Christ. Only open this for us. We, its actual nature it is not momentary, but the deed and the privilege of a whole life. See also Holy Spirit and the following article.

LITERATURE—The popular and special works are usually too indiscriminating and unhistorical to be of value for the Bib. study. An exception is Beet, Holiness Symbolic and Real. Full Bib. material in Cremer, Bib. Theol. Lex., but treated from special points of view. See Systematic Theologies. OT Theologies (cf esp. Smend), and NT Theologies (cf esp. Holtzmann).
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WESLEYAN DOCTRINE

1. Doctrine Stated
2. Objections Answered
3. Importance for the Preacher
4. Remarks
5. Its Glorious Results
6. Wesley’s Personal Testimony

Christian perfection, through entire sanctification, by faith, here and now, was one of the doctrines by which John Wesley gave

1. Doctrine great offence to his clerical brethren

Stated in the Anglican church. From the

beginning of his work in 1739, till 1760, he was formulating this doctrine. At the last date there suddenly arose a huge number of witnesses among his followers. Many of these he questioned with Baconian skill, the result being a confirmation of his theories on various points.

In public address he used the terms “Christian Perfection,” “Perfect Love,” and “Holiness,” as synonymous, though there are differences between them when examined critically. With St. Paul he taught that all regenerate persons are saints, i.e. holy ones, as the word “saint,” from Lat sanctus, signifies through the singular (1 Cor 1 2; 2 Cor 1 1). His theory is that in the normal Christian the principle of holiness, beginning with the new birth, gradually expands and strengthens as the believer grows in grace and in the knowledge of the truth, by a final or all-sacrificing act of faith in Christ, it reaches an instantaneous completion through the act of the Holy Spirit, the sanctifier: 2 Cor 7 1, “perfecting holiness,” etc; Eph 4 13, AV Till we all come . . . into a perfect man.” Thus sanctification is gradual, but entire sanctification is instantaneous (Rom 6 “our old man was crucified,” etc, a sudden death; Gal 2 20, “I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I that live!”). In 1 Thess 2 5, the word “sanctify” is a Gr. sin (I, signifies an act and not a process, as also in Jn 17 19, “that they . . . may be sanctified in truth,” or truly. (See Meyer’s note.) Many Christians experience this change on their deathbeds. If death suddenly ends the life of a growing Christian before he inverts, then, Holy Spirit perfects the work. Wesley’s advice to the preachers of this evangelical perfection was to draw and not to drive, and never to quote any threatenings of God’s word against God’s children. The declaration, “Without sanctification no man shall see the Lord” (He 12 14), does not apply to the saints, “the holy ones.”
Wesley's perfection of love is not perfection of degree, but of kind. Pure love is perfect love. The gradual growth toward perfect purity of love is beautifully expressed in Mozod's hymn, 

"O to utter shame and sorrow!
All of self, and none of Thee.
But after a view of Christ on earth, the answer is faintly,
Some of self, and some of Thee.
Then, after a period of growing love, the cry is,
Less of self, and more of Thee.
After another period, the final cry is,
None of self, and all of Thee!"
as an aspiration for pure love, without any selfishness.

The attainment of this grace is certified by the total cessation of all servile fear (1 Jn 4 18). Wesley added to this the witness of the Spirit, for which his only proof-text is 1 Cor 2 12.

1. (Phil 3 12, declares that he is not "made perfect": (a) in verse 15, he declares that he is perfect; (b) "made perfect" is a term, borrowed from the ancient games, signifying a finished course. This is one of the meanings of telic, as seen also in Lk 13 32 m, "The third day I end my course.
Paul no more disclaims spiritual perfection in these words than does Christ himself, "my Son shall make you free, etc., and in all those texts in the NT declaring sins forgiven.
(b) Bishop Westcott says that the expression, "to have sinned," is distinguished from "to sin," as the sinful principle is conceived from without, as distinct from sin, as the moral spirit, which is always holy; and, therefore, though guilty of all manner of things by not doing Christ's will, because they were untouched by sin, which existed only in their bodies, as it does in all matter. When told that this is the Son of God, John denied the reality of His body, saying that it was only a phantom. Hence, in the very first verse of this Ps., John writes evidently against the gnostic error, quoting three of the five senses to prove the reality of Christ's humanity. (By all means, see "The Emp. of St. John." Cambridge Bible for Schools, etc., 17-21.)

The relation of this doctrine to the Methodist Episcopal church in the United States is seen in the following questions, which have been affirmatively answered in public by all its preachers on their admission to the Conferences: "Are you going on to perfection?"; "Do you expect to be made perfect in love in this life?"
"Are you earnestly striving after it?"
The hymns of the Wesley's, still universally sung, are filled with this doctrine, in which occur such expressions as:

"Take away our bent to sinning.
Let us find that second best,
Make and keep me pure within.
'Tis done! Thou dost this moment save,
The full salvation, Lord, bestow!"

To the preaching of Christian perfection Wesley ascribed the success of his work in the conversion, religious training and intellectual education of the masses of Great Britain. It furnished him a multitude of consecrated workers, many of them lay preachers, who labored nearly every hardest, and when carried the gospel into all the British colonies, including America. It is declared by secular historians that this great evangelical movement, in which the doctrine of entire sanctification was so prominent, saved England from a disastrous revolution, like that which drenched France with the blood of its royal family and its nobility, in the last decade of the 18th cent. It is certain that the great Christian and humanitarian work of William Booth, originally a Methodist, was inspired by this doctrine which he constantly preached. This enabled his followers in the early years of the Salvation Army to endure the persecutions which befell them at that time.

Wesley's own experience of this grace is found in his journal, May 1760: "I felt my soul was all love. I was so stayed on God as I never felt"

6. Wesley's experience of this grace is found in his journal, May 1760: "I felt my soul was all love.
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1. In the first stage all slaughter of domestic animals for food or purposes was sacrificial, and every layman could sacrifice locally at an altar of earth or unhewn stones. The law of JE is contained in Ex
20 24–26, providing for the making of an altar of earth or stones, and emphasis is laid on the words "he built the place" for "the place" (Jgs 21:19)." (Jgs 21:19)."

2. The Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis This, it is claimed, permits a plurality of sanctuaries. Illustrations are provided by the history. The patriarchs move about the country freely and build altars at various places. Later sacrifices or altars are mentioned in connection with Jethro (Ex 18:12), Moses (17:5, etc), Joshua (Josh 8:30), Gideon (Jgs 6:25 etc), Moses and Aaron (Num 18:19), and Elijah (1 K 18:32), to take but a few instances. Perhaps the most instructive case is that of Saul after the battle of Michmash. Observing that the people were eating meat with blood, he caused a large stone to be rolled to him, and we are expressly told that this was the first altar that he built to the Lord (1 S 14:35). While some of these examples might be accounted for by theophanies or other special circumstances, they are too numerous when taken together to explain them sufficiently. In many instances they represent the conduct of the most authoritative and religious leaders of the age, e.g. Samuel, and it must be presumed that such men knew and acted upon the Law of their own day. Hebrew and the Law are unison in permitting a multiplicity of sanctuaries. Wellhausen adds: "Altars as a rule are not built by the patriarchs according to their own private judgment whereover they please; on the contrary, a theophany calls attention to, or, at least afterward, confirms, the holiness of the place" (op. cit., 31).

(2) The second stage is represented by Dt, in the Law and Josiah's reformation in the history. Undoubtedly Dt 12 permits local non-sacrificial slaughter for the purposes of food, and enjoins the destruction of heathen places of worship, insisting with great vehemence on the central sanctuary. The narrative of Josiah's reformation in 2 K 23 tallies with these principles.

(3) The third great body of law (P) does not deal with the question (save in one passage, Lev 17). In Dt, "the unity of the cultus is commanded; in the PC it is presupposed. . . . What follows from this forms the question before us. To my thinking, this: the history and the Law of Ex 20 are in unison in permitting a multiplicity of sanctuaries.

Accordingly, this legislator strove to meet the difficulty by the new enactment. See Criticism (The Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis).

(1) Slaughter not necessarily sacrificial. The general substratum afforded by the documentary falls within the scope of the art. PENTATEUCH. The present discussion is limited to the legal and historical outline traced above. The view that all slaughter of domestic animals was in every place by the edict of Josiah is refuted by the evidence of the early books. The following examples should be noted: in Gen 18:7 a calf is slain without any trace of a sacrifice, and in 27:9–14 (Jacob's substitute for veneration) no altar or religious rite can fairly be postulated. In 1 S 21:9–14 the sacrifice is performed by a woman, so that here again sacrifice is out of the question. If Gideon performed a sacrifice when he "made ready the wood and the bullock, and said, Let all who be for the LORD come near me, and take part in the sacrifice; but let them go, every man to his house." (Judges 17:19)."
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Sanhedrin

loc.) and so does D2 in Josh 8:30 ff. There is no place for any of these passages in the Wellhausen theory; but again we find one house side by side with many layaltars.

(1) Lay, sojourn—The alternative view seeks to account for the whole of the facts noted above. In bald outline it is as follows: In pre-

4. The Alternative.

Mosaic times customary sacrifices were freely offered by laymen at altars of earth or stone which were not the procedure sanctuaries but places that could be used for the nonce and then abandoned. Slaughter, as shown by the instances cited, was not necessarily sacrificial. Moses did not forbid or discourage the custom he found. On the contrary, he regulated it in Ex 24:18—26; Dt 18:11 f. to prevent possible abuses. But he also superimposed two other kinds of sacrifice—certain new offerings to be brought by individuals to the religious capital and the national offerings of Nu 28, 29 and other passages. The reason is that this portion of the Law consists of teaching intrusted to the priests, embracing the procedure to be followed in these two classes of offerings, and does not refer at all to the procedure of lay sanctuaries, which was regulated by immemorial custom. Dt thunders not against the lay altars—which are never even mentioned in this connection—but against the Canaan-

It appears that the procedure of lay slaughter for food was due to the fact that the indi-

fidelity of the Israelites in the wilderness (Lev 17:5—7) had led to the universal prohibition of lay slaughter for the period of the wanderings only, while it appears to be continued by Dt for those who lived near the House of God. (see 12:17, limited to the case “if the place . . . be too far from thee’)

(2) Three pilgrimfage festivals in JE—The JE legis-

lation itself recognizes the three pilgrimage festivals of the House of God (Ex 34:22 f). One of these festivals is called “the feast of weeks, even of the bikkurim [a kind of first-fruits] of wheat harvest,” and as 20:11; 28:38 require these bikkurim to be brought to the House of God, and not to a temple altar, it follows that the pilgrimages are as firmly established here as in Dt. Thus we find a House (with a horned altar) served by priests and lay altars of earth or stone side by side in law and history till the all away. With the breaking of the continuity of tradition and practice paved the way for a new and artificial interpretation of the Law that was far removed from the intent of the lawgiver.

The Elephantine temple.—Papyri have recently been found at Elephantine which show us a Jewish community in Egypt which in 405 BC possessed a local temple. On the

5. The Elephantine.

Wellhausen hypothesis it is usual to assume that P and Dt were still unknown and not recognized as authoritative in this community at that date, although the Deuteronomistic law of the central sanctuary goes back at least to 621. It is difficult to understand how a law which had been recognized as Divine by Jeremiah and others could still have been unknown or destitute of authority. On the alternative view this phenomenon will have been the result of an interpretation of the Law to suit the needs of an age subsequent to the death of Moses, and in circumstances he never contemplated. The Pent apparently permits sacrifice only in the land of Israel: in the altered circumstances the choice lay between interpreting the Law in this way or abandoning worship in public altogether; for the synagogue with its non-sacrificial form of public worship had not yet been invented. All old legis-

lations have to be construed in this way to meet changing circumstances, and this example contains nothing exceptional or surprising.

LITERATURE.—J. Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Israel, vol. i, for the criticism of, H. G. de Vries, Wiener, BPC, ch vi. PS passim for the alternative view; POT, 173 ff.

Harold M. Wiener

SAND (סָנָד, הָדָד; ἡμός, ἀνήμος; a variant of the more usual ψάμμος, ψαμμίτης; cf ἡμός, ἀνήμος, ψάμμιτης)

Sand is primarily produced by the grinding action of waves. This is accompanied by chemical solution, with the result that the more soluble constituents of the rock diminish in amount or disappear, and the sands tend to become more or less purely silicious, silica or quartz being a common constituent of rocks and very insoluble. The rocks of Pal are so largely composed of limestone that the shore and dune sands are unusually calcareous, containing from 10 to 20 per cent of calcium carbonate. This is subject to solution and redeposition as a cement between the sand grains, binding them together to form the porous sandstone of the seashore, which is easily worked and is much used in building. See ROCK, III, (5).

Figurative: (1) Used most often as a symbol of countless multitude; esp. of the children of Israel (Gen 22:17; 32:12; 2 S 17:11; 1 K 4:20; Isa 10:22; 48:19; Jer 33:32; Hos 1:10; Rom 9:27; He 11:12); also of the enemies of Israel (Josh 11:4; Jgs 7:12; 1 S 13:5; cf Rev 20:8). Joseph laid up grain as a kind of sand of the sea (Ps 78:27; the Psalms say the thoughts of God). They are number more than the sand” (Ps 139:18); Jeremiah, speaking of the deso-

lation of Judah, says that the number of widows is as the sand (Jer 15:8). (2) Sand is also a symbol of weight of Job 6:3; Prov 27:3), and (3) of instability (Mt 7:26).

It is a question what is meant by “the hidden treasures of the sand” in Dt 33:19.

SAND FLY, sand-fly ( böööö, kinnin [Ex 8:16 m; Wis 19:10 mm]; EV “lice.” See FLEA; GNAT; INSECTS; LICE.

SAND-GLOWING, gloö'ing. See MIRAGE.

SAND-LIZARD, sand-lizzard (סָנָד, ὁμέτ; LXX σαῦρος, σαῦρα; “lizard”; AV small): Ὁμέτ is 7th in the list of unclean “creeping things” in Lev 11:29,30, and occurs nowhere else. It is probably a skink or some species of Lacerta. See LIZARD; SNAIL.

SANDAL, san’dal. See DRESS, 6; SHOE; SHOE-

LATCHET.

SANHEDRIN, san’he’drin (סנֹּדהַרִין, sanhedrin), the Talmudic transcription of the Gr ἱερουσαλημίων, sunédria): The Sanhedrin was, at

1. Name and before the time of Christ, the name for the highest Jewish tribunal, of 71

members, in Jerusalem, and also for the lower tribunals, of 23 members, of which Jesus had two (Tégpfi) Ῥagascar 11 9; Ἰανός. 1 6; 11 2). It is derived from sín, “together,” and ἱερά, “seated.” In Gr and Rom literature the sestures of Sparta, Carthage, and even Rome, are so called (cf Pausan, iii.11, 2; Polyb, iii.22; Livy, 22 Cassius x.40). In Jos we meet with the word for the first time in connection with the governor Gabinius (67—55 BC), who divided the whole of Pal into 5 sunédria (Ant, XIV, v, 4; or sunanosity, BJ, i, vili, 5), and with the term sunéd-

trion for the high council in Jerusalem in Ant, XIV,

ALFRED ELY DAY
ix, 3-5, in connection with Herod, who, when a youth, had to appear before the sunedrin at Jerusalem to answer for his doings in Galilee. But before that date the word appears in the LXX version of Proverbs (c 130 BC), esp. in 22 10; 31 23, as an equivalent for the Mishnaic beth-din = "judgment-chamber."

In the NT the word sometimes, esp. when used in the pl. (Mt 10 17; Mk 13 9; cf Sanh 1 5), means simply "court of justice," i.e. any judicatory (Mt 5 22). But in most cases it is used to designate the supreme Jewish Court of Justice in Jerusalem, in which the processes against Our Lord was carried on, and before which the apostles (Peter, John, Stephen, and Paul) had to justify themselves (Mt 26 59; Mk 14 55; 16 1; Lk 22 66; Jn 11 47; Acts 4 15; 6 21 f; 12 16 f; 22 30; 23 1 f; 24 1). Sometimes prosbuterion (Lk 22 96; Acts 22 5) and gerousia (Acts 5 21) are substituted for sunedrin. See SANEDRIN.

In the Jewish tradition-literature the term "Sanhedrin" alternates with k'nlshta", "meeting-place" (M'phil'lah Ta'anith 10, compiled in the 1st cent. AD). The beth-din, "court of justice" (Sanh 11 134), as, according to Jewish tradition, there were two kinds of sunedria, viz. the supreme sunedrin in Jerusalem of 71 members, and lesser sunedria of 23 members, which were appointed by the supreme council, the "knesset g'dholah" (i.e. the "great Sanhedrin," or beth-din ha-g'dholah, "the great court of justice") (Midr. 5 4; Sanh 1 6), or sanhedrin g'dhol ha-yosheb b'-hashkhat ha-g'dol, "the great Sanhedrin which sits in the hall of hewn stone."

There is lack of positive historical information as to the origin of the Sanhedrin. According to Jewish tradition (cf Sanh 1 6) it was constituted by Moses (Nu 11 16-24 and History) and was reorganized by Ezra immediately after the return from exile (cf the Tg to Cant 6 1). But there is no historical evidence to show that previous to the Gr period there existed an organized aristocratic governing tribunal among the Jews. Its beginning is to be placed at the period in which Asia was convulsed by Alexander the Great and his successors.

The Hellenistic kings conceded a great amount of internal freedom to municipal communities, and Ptolemy was then practically under home rule, and was governed by the synagogues of Elders (1 Mac 12 6; 2 Mac 1 10; 4 44; 11 27; 3 Mac 1 8; cf Jos, Ant, XII, iii, 4; XIII, v, 8; M'phil'lah Ta'anith 10), the head of which was the hereditary high priest. The court was called Gerousia, which in Gr always signifies an aristocratic body (see Westermann in Paul's RE, III, 49). Subsequently this developed into the Sanhedrin.

During the Rom period (except for about 10 years at the time of Gabinus, who applied to Judea the Roman system of government; cf Marquart Römische Staatsverwaltung, 1, 501), the Sanhedrin's influence was most powerful, the internal government of the country being practically in its hands (Ant, XX, x), and it was religiously recognized as representing the Diaspora (cf Acts 9 25; 22 5; 25 13), according to Schürer (H.I.P., div.II, vol. 1, 171; GJV II, 236) the civil authority of the Sanhedrin, from the time of Archelaus, Herod the Great's son, was probably restricted to Judea proper, and for that reason, if true, this, it had no jurisdiction over Our Lord so long as He remained in Galilee (but see G. A. Smith, Jeros, 1, 416).

The Sanhedrin was abolished after the destruction of Jerusalem (70 AD). The beth-din (court of judgment) in Babatha (68-80); in Usah (80-116); in Shafrahn (140-63); in Seiphoris (163-93), in Tiberias (193-220), though regarded in the Talm (cf Rosh ha-shândib 32a) as having been the direct continuation of the Sanhedrin, had an essentially different character; it was merely an assembly of scribes, whose decisions had only a theoretical importance (cf Shâdh 9 11). The Great Sanhedrin in Jerusalem was formed (Mt 26 35-59; Mk 14 53; Acts 4 5 f; 5 21; 22 30) of high priests 3. Constitution (i.e. the acting high priest, those who had been high priests, and members of the privileged families from which the high priests were taken), elders (tribal and family heads of the people and priesthood), and scribes (i.e. legal assessors), Pharisees and Sadducees alike (cf Acts 4 1 f; 5 17-34; 23 6). In Mk 15 43; Lk 23 30, Joseph of Arimathea is called bouletou's, "councillor," i.e. member of the Sanhedrin.

According to Jos and the NT, the acting high priest was as such always head and president (Mt 26 35; Acts 5 17 f; 7 1; 9 1 f; 22 5; 23 24; 24 1; Acts, IV, vii, 17; XX, x). Caiphas is president at the trial of Our Lord, and at Paul's trial Annas is president. On the other hand, according to the Talm (esp. Hâghhâghâh 2 2), the Sanhedrin is represented as a judicial tribunal of scribes, in which one scribe acted as râšt, "prince," i.e. president, and another as abh-beth-din, father of the judgment-chamber i.e. vice-president. So far, it has not been found possible to reconcile these conflicting descriptions (see "Literature," below). Sanh 4 3 mentions the sôphrê-ka-dagaymin, "notaries," one of whom registered the reasons for acquittal, and the other those for condemnation. In the NT we read of huspârdâni, "constables" (Mt 5 25) and of the "servants of the high priest" (Mt 26 51; Mk 14 47; Jn 18 10), whom Jos describes as "enlisted from the rudest and most restless characters" (Ant, XX, viii, 8; ix, 2). Jos speaks of the "public whip," Matthew mentions "tormentors" (18 34), Luke speaks of "spies" (20 20).

The whole history of post-exilic Judaism circles round the high priests, and the priestly aristocracy always played the leading part in the Sanhedrin (cf Sanh 4 2). But the more the Pharisees grew in importance, the more were they represented in the Sanhedrin. In the time of Salome they were so powerful that "the queen ruling in name, but the Pharisees ruling in fact," (Ant, XIII, v, 6). In the time of Christ, the Sanhedrin was formally led by the Sadducean high priests, but practically ruled by the Pharisees (Ant, XVIII, i, 4)

In the time of Christ the Great Sanhedrin at Jerusalem enjoyed a very high measure of independence. It exercised not only civil jurisdiction, 4. Jurisdiction, according to Jewish law, but also, in some degree, criminal. It had administrative authority and could order arrests by its own officers of the Temple (Mt 26 47; Mk 14 43; Acts 4 3; 5 17 f; 9 2; cf Sanh 1 5). It was empowered to judge cases which did not involve capital punishment, which latter required the confirmation of the Roman procurator (Ant 19 31; cf Jeros Sanh 1 1; 7 2 p 24); Jos, Ant, XX, 15, 1. But, as a rule, the procurator arranged his judgment in accordance with the demands of the Sanhedrin.

For one offence the Sanhedrin could put to death, on their own authority, even a Rom citizen, namely, in the case of a Gentile passing the fence which divided the inner court of the Temple from that of the Gentiles (BJ, VI, ii, 4; Midr. 111 3; cf Acts 21 28). The only case of capital punishment in connection with which the superintendence of Our Lord. The stoning of Stephen (Acts 7 54 ff) was probably the illegal act of an enraged multitude.
The Talmudic tradition names "the hall of hewn stone," which, according to Middath 5,4, was on the south side of the great court, as the seat of the Great Sanhedrin (Peh ha-shem ha-bondim). But the last sittings of the Sanhedrin were held in the city outside the Temple area (Sanh. 141a; Shabath 15a; Peh ha-shem ha-bondim 31b; 'Ahadahb zarah 8c). Jos also mentions the place where the boulevards, "the councillors," met as the Beth ha-Ben, one of David's (2 S 21 18; 1 Ch 20 4). It is supposed by some that he was the son of the giant Goliath, but this is not proved. In 1 Ch 20 4, the same person is called "Sippai."

SAPH, saf, (�ח, saph, B; צח, safh, A, צוח, Saphh): A Philistine, one of the four champions of the race of Rapha ("giant") who was slain by the Shibeon, one of David's heroes (2 S 21 18; 1 Ch 20 4). It is supposed by some that he was the son of the giant Goliath, but this is not proved.

SAPHTIAH, saq-t'ia (צbestos, Saphthias), Saphthias, B, צbestos, Sapphatias; omitted in A: Name of one of the families of returning exiles (1 Esd 5 34) = "Shephatah" in Ezr 8 8. It Saphthas (1 Esd 5 34) = Saphat (6 9), as would appear, then part of the family went up with Zerubbabel and part with Ezra.

SAPPHIA, saq-t'ia (צbestos, Saphthias, B, צbestos, Sapphatias): Wife of Ananias (Acts 5 1-10). See ANANIAS, (1).

SAPPHIR, saq-t'ia (שַׁפָּר, shaphir). See SAPHIR.

SAPPHUTHI, saq-t'ia (שַׁפָּרְתִי, saft-thi) (A and Fritzsche, Saphethi, Saphthi, [B and Swete]; Saphethi; AV Sapheth): Name of one of the families of the sons of the servants of Solomon (1 Esd 5 33) = "Shephathia" in Ezr 2 57; Neh 7 59.

SAPPHIRA, saq-t'ia (נַפְּרַא, shappira); Aram. for either "beautiful" or "sapphire"; [Saphthias, Sapphira]: Wife of Ananias (Acts 5 1-10). See ANANIAS, (1).

SAPPHIR, saq-t'ia. See STONES, Precious.

SARABIAS, sar-a-bias (צbestos, Saphthias, Sarabias): One of the Levites who taught and expounded the Law for Ezra (1 Esd 9 48) = "Shebrehai" in Neh 8 7, probably identical with the "Azebebias" in 1 Esd 8 47 (Ezr 8 18).

SARAH, sar-a, SARAI, sar-a'í: (1) In Gen 17 15 the woman who up to that time has been known as Sarai (שָׁרָי, saray; סָּרָה, Sora) receives by Divine command the name Sarah (שָׁרָה, sarâh; שַׁפָּרָה, Saphra). (This last form in Gr preserves the ancient doubling of the r, lost in the Heb and the Eng. forms.)

The former name appears to be derived from the root as Sarah, if, indeed, Gen 32 28 is intended as an etymology of Israel. "She that strives," a contentious person, is a name that might be given to a child at birth (of Hos 12 13; Jer 29 5, 17), or later when the child's character developed; in Gen 16 6 and 21 10 a contentious character appears. Yet comparison with the history of her husband's name (see ARNAB, G. von der) is not to operate solely upon the basis of the Heb language. Sarai was the one who first bore a child with her from Mesopotamia. On the other hand there can be little doubt that the name Sarah, which she received when her son was promised, means "princess," a fem. form of the extremely common title sar, used by the Semites to designate a ruler of greater or lesser rank.
In the verse following the one where this name is conferred, it is declared of Sarah that "kings of peoples shall be of her" (Gen 17:16).

We are introduced to Sarai in Gen 11:29. She is here mentioned as the wife that Abraham "took," while still in Ur of the Chaldees, that is, while Abraham was in Mesopotamia. It is immediately added that "Sarai was barren; she had no child." By this simple remark in the outset of his narrative, the writer sounds the motif that is to be developed in all the sequel. When the migration to Haran occurs, Sarai is named along with Abram and Lot as accompanying Terah. It has been held by the authors (or authors) of ch 11 knew nothing of the relationship announced in 20:12. But there can be no proof of such ignorance, even on the assumption of diversity of authorship in the two passages.

Sarai's career as described in ch 11 was not dependent on her being the daughter of Terah. Terah had other descendants who did not accompany him. Her movements were determined by her being Abram's wife. It appears, however, that she was a daughter of Terah by a different mother from the mother of Abram. The language of the OT would indeed admit of her being Abram's niece, but the fact that there was but 10 years' difference in age (Gen 20:17) renders this hypothesis less probable. Marriage with half-sisters seems to have been uncommon in antiquity (see the OT Deut 27:29-30).

This double relationship suggested to Abraham the expedient that he twice used when he lacked faith in God to protect his life and in cowardice sought his own safety at the price of his wife's honor. The first of these occasions was in the earlier period of their wanderings (ch 12). From Canaan they went down into Egypt. Sarai, though above 60 years of age according to the chronology of the sacred historian, made the impression on the Egyptians by her beauty that Abraham had anticipated, and the result was her temporary admission to the royal palace. But this was in direct contravention of the purpose of God for His own kingdom. The earthly majesty of Pharaoh had to bow before the Divine majesty, which plagued him and secured the stranger's exodus, thus leading to the exodus when Abraham's and Sarah's seed "spoiled the Egyptians."

We meet Sarah next in the narrative of the birth of Ishmael and of Isaac. Though 14 years separated the two births, they are closely associated in the story because their destiny paralleled each other's in barrenness. Sarah was born as the wife of Abraham and Sarah.

Such was in fact the position of Ishmael later. But the language of the 12th would argue the vindictive jealousy of the mistress and led to a painful scene of unjustified enmity between her and Sarah. But later, returning God's blessing she humbly herself before Sarah, and bore Ishmael in her own father's house. Here he remained the sole and rightful heir, until the miracle of Isaac's birth disappointed all human expectations and resulted in the ultimate expulsion of Hagar and her son.

The change of name from Sarai to Sarah when Isaac was promised has already been noted. Sarah's laudation in history when she hears the promise is of course associated with the origin of the name of Isaac, but it serves also to emphasize the miraculous character of his birth, coming as it does after his parents are both so "well stricken in age" as to make any such assurance appear impossible.

Before the birth of this child of promise, however, Sarah is again exposed, through the cowardice of her husband, to dishonor and ruin. Abimelech, king of Gerar, desiring to be allied by marriage with a man of Abraham's power, sends for Sarah, where she knows only as Abraham's sister, and for the second time she takes her place in the harem of a prince. But the Divine promise is not to be thwarted, even by persistent human weakness and sin. In a dream God reveals to Abraham the true state of the case, and Sarah is restored to her husband with an indemnity. Thereupon the long-delayed son is born, the jealous mother secures the expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael, and her career culminates in the birth of a close at the age of 127, at Hebron, long time her home. The grief and anxiety are broadly displayed in ch 23, in which she seeks and obtains a burying-place for his wife. She is thus the first to be interred in that cave of the field of Machpelah, which was to be the common resting-place of the fathers and mothers of the future Israel.

The character of Sarah is of mingled light and shade. On the one hand we have seen that she was from Ur and his mother (Sapatas, in art.), Geschichte der Geschlechter Israels, 131). Yet on the other hand we see in Sarah, as the NT writers point out (He 11:11; 1 Pet 3:6), one who through a long life of companionship and as a son of Abraham and the promises with whom God had shared his hope in God, his faith in the promises, and his power to become God's agent for achieving what was humanly impossible. In fact, to Sarah is ascribed a sort of spiritual maternity, correlated with Abraham's position as "father of the faithful": "for all women are declared to be the (spiritual) daughters of Sarah, who like her are adorned in "the hidden man of the heart," and who are "doers of good" and "bearers of no terror" (1 Pet 1:16, literally rendered). That in spite of her outbreak about Hagar and Ishmael she was in general "in subjection to her husband" and of "a meek and quiet spirit," appears from her husband's genuine grief at her deacease, and still more clearly from her son's prolonged mourning for her (Gen 24:67; cf 17:17 and 25:1 with 25:20). And He who maketh even the wrath of man to praise Him used even Sarah's jealous anger to accomplish His purpose that "the son of the freewoman," Isaac, "born through promise," should alone inherit that promise (Gal 4:22-31).

Apart from the three NT passages already cited, Sarah is alluded to only in Isa 51:2 ("Sarah that bare you," as the mother of the nation), in Rom 4:19 ("the deadness of Sarah's womb"), and in Gal 3:9, 9.9, where God's promise in Gen 18:10 is quoted. Yet her existence and her history are of course presupposed wherever allusion is made to the stories of Abraham and of Isaac.

To many modern critics Sarah supplies, by her name, a welcome argument in support of the mythical view of Abraham. She has been held to be the local name to whom the case near Haran was sacred: or, the deity whose consort was worshipped in Arabia under the title Dusares, i.e. Husband-of-Sarah; or, the female associate of Sin the moon-god, worshipped at Haran. On these views the student will do well to consult Baethgen, Keitsch, 94, 95, and, for the most recent point of view, Grellmann's art., "Saga und Geschichte in den Patriarchenzeit." ZAW, 1910, and Eerdmans, Al- testamentliche Geschichten, 11, 13.

(2) The daughter of Raguel, and wife of Tobias (Tob 3:7,17, etc.). See Tobit, Book of.

SARAIAS, sar-a'yas, sar'-yas (Ezappas, Saraias, Lat. Sarimus).

(1) = Saraias, the high priest in the reign of Zedekiah (1 Esd 5:5, cf 1 Ch 6:14).

(2) Sares the father of Ezra (2 Esd 1:1) = "Saraias" in Ezr 7:1, sometimes identified with
SARASAI under (1). He is probably identical with the "Azaraias" of 1 Esd 8 1. (3) AV=RV "Azaraias" (1 Esd 8 1). SARAMEL, sar'me-l: AV=RV ASARAMEL (q.v.). SARAPH, sar'af, sar'af (סָרָפָך, sârāph, "noible one"); cf סָרָפָך, sârāph, "burn," "shine"): A descendant of Judah through Shelah (1 Ch 4 22). SARCHEDONUS, sar-ked'o-nus (B S, Σαρχέδονος, Sarchedonos, A, Σαρκέδων, Sarcheddn, but Σαρχέδωνος, Sarchedonos in 1 Tim 2 22): An incorrect spelling, both in AV and RV, for Sarcheddonus in Tab 1 21 f, another form of Esar-haddon. SARDEUS, sar-dē'us: AV=RV ZARDEUS (q.v.). SARIDINE, sar'din, sar'din, SARDIUS. See Stones, Precious. SARDIS, sar'dis (Σάρδης, Sardés): Sardis is of special interest to the student of Herodotus and Xenophon, for these two Athenians, the brother of the Persian king Artaxerxes, was exiled from there Xerxes invaded Greece and Cyrus marched against his brother Artaxerxes; it is also of interest to the student of early Christian history as the home of one of the Seven Churches of Revelation (1 11; Rev 3 2). It was the oldest and most important cities of Asia Minor, and until 549 BC, the capital of the kingdom of Lydia. It stood on the northern slope of Mt. Tmolus; its acropolis occupied one of the spurs of the mountain. At the base flowed the river Pactolus which served as a moat, rendering the city practically impregnable. Through the failure to attack, however, the acropolis had been successfully scaled in 549 BC by a Median soldier, and in 218 by a Cretan (cf Rev 3 2 3). Because of its strength during the Persian period, the satrap here made their homes. However, the city was burned by the Ionians in 501 BC, but it was quickly rebuilt and regained its importance. In 394 BC it surrendered to Alexander the Great who gave it independence, but its period of independence was brief, for 12 years later in 322 BC it was taken by Antigonus. In 301 BC, it fell into the possession of the Seleucid kings who made it the residence of their governors. It became free again in 190 BC, when it formed a part of the empire of Pergamum, and later of the Roman province of Asia. In 17 AD, when it was destroyed by an earthquake, the Roman emperor Tiberius remitted the taxes of the people and rebuilt the city, and in his honor the citizens of that and of neighboring towns erected a large monument, but Sardis never recovered its former importance (cf Rev 3 12). Again in 295 AD, after the Roman province of Asia was broken up, Sardis became the capital of Lydia, and during the early Christian age it was the home of a bishop. The city continued to flourish until 1402, when it was so completely destroyed by Tamerlane that it was never rebuilt. Among the ruins there now stands a small village called Sert, a corruption of its ancient name. The ruins may be reached by rail from Smyrna, on the way to Philadelphia.

The ancient city was noted for its fruits and wool, and for its temple of the goddess Cybele, whose worship resembled that of Diana of Ephesus. Its wealth was also partly due to the gold which was found in the sand of the Pactolus river and was here worked, and silver coins were first struck. During the Roman period its coins formed a beautiful series, and are found in abundance by the peas-ant, who till the surrounding fields. The ruins of the buildings which stood at the base of the hill have now been covered over by the dirt that has washed down from above. The hill upon which the acropolis stood measures 900 ft. high; the triple walls still surround it. The more imposing of the ruins are on the lower slope of the hill, and among them the temple of Cybele is the most interesting, yet only two of its many stone columns are still standing. Equally imposing is the necropolis of the city, which is at a distance of two hours' ride from Sard, S. of the Gryazan lakes. The modern name of this necropolis is Bin Teye or Thousand Mounds, because of the large group of great mounds in which were buried many of the mounds were long ago excavated and plundered.

Coin of Sardis.

We quote the following from the Missionary Herald (Boston, Mass., August, 1911, pp. 361-62): Dr. C. C. Tracy, of Marsovan, has made a visit to ancient Sardis and the environs of Ephesus. Professor Butler, of Princeton University, who is uncovering the ruins of that famous city of the past. Already rich "finds" have been made; among the recoveries of a temple of Artemis, indicating a building of the same stupendous character as those at Ephesus and Baalbek, and the necropolis from whose tombs were unearthed three thousand relics, including utensils, ornaments of gold and precious stones, mirrors, etc. What chiefly impressed Dr. Tracy was the significance of those Seven Churches of Asia, of which Sardis holds one. "When I think of the myriads of various nationality and advanced civilization for whose evangelization these churches were responsible, the messages to the Christian communities occupying the splendid strategic centers filled me with awe. While establishing amid the splendid buildings of civilization they were set as candlesticks in the midst of gross spiritual darkness. Did they fulfill their mission?"

One of Dr. Butler's recoveries is the marble throne of the Bishop of Sardis; looking upon it the message to Sardis recurs to mind. A fact of current history questions the precise meaning of the visitor's appreciation of the word to "the angel" of that church. "Yonder among the mountains overlooking Sardis there is a robber gang led by the notorious Chakirjali. He rules in the mountains; no government force can take him. Again and again he swoops down like an eagle out of the sky, in one quarter of the region or another. From time immemorial these mountains have been the haunts of robbers; very likely it was so when Rev was written. 'I will come upon thee as a thief.' In each case the message was addressed to 'the angel of the church.' Over every church in the world there is a spirit representing it; in Sard it was a spirit representing that church and by whose name it can be addressed. The messages are as vital as they were at the first. 'He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches.'"

E. J. Banks

SARDEITE, sar'dit. See SERED.

SARDIUS, sar'di-us. See STONES, Precious.

SARDONYX, sar'don-iks. See STONES, Precious.

SAREPTA, sa-rep'ta (Σαρεπτα, Sarepta): The name in Lit 24 26 AV, following the Gr, of the Phoen town to which Eliah was sent in the time of the great famine, in order to save the lives of a widow and her son (1 K 17 9.10). RV adopts the form of the name based upon the Heb, and so in the OT: ZAREPHATH (q.v.).

SARD, sar'd (סָרָד, sârād; B, "Essenehald, Essedokkoh, Sebedok, Seddonik, A, "Sârâd, Sarâd, Sarâd, Sarâd"): A place on the southern border of Zebulun to the W. of Chisloth-tabor (Josh 19 10.12). It is mentioned but not identified in Onom. Probably we should read "Sadad," and in that case may with Conder locate it at Tell Shaddad, an artificial mound with some modern ruins and good springs,
which stands on the plain, about 5 miles W. of Isdud.

**SARGON**, săr'gon (722–705 BC): The name of this ruler is written šar-šar-ra in the OT, šar-ušū in the cuneiform inscriptions, Aprâ, Arnu, in the LXX, and Ἀργός, Ἀρκανός, in the Pseudo-Cyprian Canon. Sargon is mentioned but once by name in the OT (Isa 20:1), when he sent his Tartan (tartana) against Ashdod, but he is referred to in 2 K 17:6 as "the king of Assyria" who carried Israel into captivity.

Shalmanesser V had laid siege to Samaria and besieged it three years. But shortly before or very soon after its capitulation, Sargon, perhaps being responsible for the king's death, overthrew the dynasty, and in his annals credited himself with the capture of the city and the deportation of its inhabitants. Whether he assumed the name of the famous ancient founder of the Accad dynasty is not known.

Sargon at the beginning of his reign was confronted with a serious situation in Babylon. Merodach-baladan of Kish, who paid tribute to previous rulers, on the change of dynasty had himself proclaimed king, New Year's Day, 721 BC. At Dur-iblu, Sargon fought with the forces of Merodach-baladan and his ally Khumbangash of Elam, but although he claimed a victory the result was apparently indecisive. Rebellions followed in other parts of the kingdom.

In 720 Isuru (or Ya'u-bi'di), king of Hamath, formed a coalition against Sargon with Hanno of Gaza, Sib'u of Egypt, and with the cities Arpad, Simrra, Damascus, and Samaria. He claims that Sib'u fled, and that he captured and flayed Isuru; burned Karkar, and carried Hanno captive to Assyria. After destroying Raphash, he carried away 903 inhabitants to Assyria.

In the following year Ararat was invaded and the Hittite Carehemish fell before his armies. The territory of Russian, king of Ararat, as well as a part of Mehitene became Assyrian provinces.

In 710 Sargon directed his attention to Merodach-baladan, who no longer enjoyed the support of Elam, and whose rule over Babylon had not been popular with his subjects. He was driven out from Babylon and also from his former capital Bit-yakin, and Sargon himself crowned as the shakanak of Babylon.

In 706 the new city called Dür-Sharrukin was dedicated as his residence. A year later he was murdered. It was during his reign that the height of Assyrian ascendency had been reached.

**SAROTHIE, sa'sô-thiô (A, סרوثי, סרוחתי; B and Swete, סרוטה, סרוהתי): Name of a family of "the sons of the servants of Solomon" who returned with Zerubbabel (1 Esd 5:34); it is wanting in the lists in Ezra 2:57; Neh 7:59.

**SARSECHIM, sâr'Se-kím (םָרֹשְׁキ, sarškîm): A prince of Nebuchadnezzar, present at the taking of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar in the 11 th year of Zedekiah (Jer 39:3). The VSS with their various readings—"Naboushebar," "Nabousarach," "Sarscheim"—point to a corrupt text. The best emendation is the reading "Nôbôhashibôn" (= Nabûhashû-manni, "Nebô delivers me"); this is based on the reading in Jer 39:13.

**SARUCH, săr'rûk (Σαροχή, Sarochè, Σαρούχ, Saroulê): AV; Gr form of Sarug (thus Lk 3:35 R.V.).

**SATAN, sâ'tân (שָׁטָן, šâ'tân, "adversary," from the vb. שָׂתָן, šatân, "to lie in wait" [as adversary]; שָׁתָנוּ, šatānu, šatanā, "adversary," סדבולים, sdibölôs, "devil," "adversary" or "accuser," וַתַּזְגִּיר, vatăzgîr [altogether unclassical and un-Greek] [used once in Rev 12:10], "accuser").

I. **Definition.**—A created but superhuman, personal, evil, world-power, represented in Scripture as the adversary both of God and man.

II. **Scriptural Facts concerning Satan.**—The most important of these are the Heb and Gr equivalents noticed above. These words are used in the general sense justified by the fact of Satan's etymological significance. It is applied even to the angel of the Lord (Nu 22:22; cf. 1 S 29:4; 2 S 19:22; Ps 109:6, etc.). The word "Satan" is used 241 in the OT. In Job (1:6) and Zec (3:1) it has the prefixed definite article. In all cases but one when the article is omitted it is used in its general sense. One exception is 1 Ch 21:1 (cf. 2 S 24:1), where the word is generally conceded to be used as a proper name. This meaning is fixed in NT times. We are thus enabled to note in the term "Satan" (and Devil) the growth of a word from a general term to an appellation and later to a proper name. All the other names of Satan save only these two are descriptive titles. In addition to these two principal names a number of others derive specific enumeration. Tempter (Mt 4:3; 1 Thes 3:5); Beelzebub (Mt 12:24); Enemy (Mt 13:39); Evil One (Mt 13:19-38); 1 Jn 2:13, 14; 3:12, and particularly 5:18); Belial (2 Cor 6:15); Adversary (ἀπάθειας, antipathìas), (1 Pet 5:8); Deceiver (lit. "the one who deceives") (Rev 12:9); Dragon (Great) (Rev 12:5); Father of Lies (Jn 8:44); Murderer (Jn 8:44); Sinner (1 Jn 3:8)—these are isolated references occurring from 1 to 3 each. In the vast majority of passages (70 out of 83) either Satan or Devil is used.

Satan is consistently represented in the NT as the enemy both of God and man. The popular notion is that Satan is the enemy of 2. Charac- man and active in misleading and ter of Satan cursing humanity because of his intense hatred and opposition to God. Mt 13:39 would seem to point in this direction, but if one were to venture an opinion in a region where there are not enough facts to warrant a conviction,
it would be that the general tenor of Scripture indicates quite the contrary, namely, that Satan's jealousy and hatred of men has led him to attempt to love and to destroy, to good works. The fundamental moral description of Satan is given by Our Lord when He describes Satan as the "evil one" (Mt 13:19,38; cf. Isaias's description of Jehovah as the "Holy One," 1:4 and often); that is, the one whose nature and will are given to evil. More, evil is his controlling attribute. It is evident that this description could not be applied to Satan as originally created. Ethical evil cannot be created. It is the creation of each free will for itself. We are not told in definite terms how Satan became the evil one, but certainly it could be no other process than a fall, whereby, in the mystery of free personality, an evil will takes the place of a good one.

The world-wide and age-long works of Satan are to be traced to one predominant motive. He hates both God and man and does all that 3. Works in him lies to defeat God's plan of Satan grace and to establish and maintain a kingdom of evil, in the seduction and ruin of man. The battle of the Spirit and the flesh of the Bible is nowhere more strikingly exhibited than in its treatment of the work of Satan. Not only is the Bible entirely free from the extravagances of popular Satanology, which is full of absurd stories concerning Satan's appearances, the movements of Satan among men, but it exhibits a dependable accuracy and consistency of statement which is most reassuring. Almost nothing is said concerning Satanic agency other than wicked men who misuse the power. The controversy with His opponents concerning exorcism (Mt 3:22; and John 4) Our Lord rebuts their slanderous assertion that He is in league with Satan by the simple proposition that Satan does not work against himself. But in so saying He does far more than refute this slander. He definitely aligns the Bible against the popular idea that a man may make a definite and conscious personal alliance with Satan for any purpose whatever. The agent of Satan is always a victim. Also the hint contained in this discussion that Satan has a kingdom, together with a few other not very definite allusions, are all that we have to go upon in this direction. Nor are we taught anywhere that Satan is able to exert direct personal physical power over persons in the lives of men. It is true that in Lk 13:16 Our Lord speaks of the woman who was bowed over as one "whom Satan has bound, lo, these eighteen years," and that in 2 Cor 12:7 Paul speaks of his infirmity as a "messenger of Satan sent to buffet him." Paul also speaks (1 Thess 2:18) of Satan's hindering him from visiting the church at Thessalonica. A careful study of these related passages (together with the prologue of Job) will reveal the fact that Satan's direct agency in the physical world is very limited. Satan may be said to be implicated in all the disasters and woes of human life, in so far as they are more or less directly contingent upon sin (see particularly He 2:14). On the contrary, it is perfectly evident that Satan's power consists principally in his ability to deceive. It is interesting and characteristic that according to the Bible Satan is fundamentally a liar and his kingdom is a kingdom founded upon lies and deceit. The description of Satan therefore corresponds in every important particular to the general description of emphasis upon truth. "The truth shall make you free" (Jn 8:32)—this is the way of deliverance from the power of Satan.

Now it would seem that to make Satan primarily the devil who would make men an innocent victim and thus relax the moral issue is. But a looking to the Bible man is particeps criminis in the process of his own deception. He is deceived only because he ceases to love the truth and comes first to lie and then to believe a lie (2 Cor 1:10). This really goes to the very bottom of the problem of temptation. Men are not tempted by evil, per se, but by a good which can be obtained only at the cost of doing wrong. The whole power of sin, at least in its final essence, consists in this fundamental falsehood that any good is really attainable by wrongdoing. Since temptation consists in this attack upon the moral sense, man is constitutionally guarded against deceit, and it is morally culpable in allowing himself to be deceived. The temptation of Our Lord Himself through the clearest possible light upon the methods ascribed to Satan. The temptation was addressed to Christ's consciousness of Divine sonship; it was a deceitful attack emphasizing the good, minimizing or covering up the evil; indeed, twisting evil into good. It was a deliberate, malignant attempt to obscure the truth and induce to evil through the acceptance of falsehood. The attack broke against a loyalty to truth which made self-deceit, and consequently self-deceit, self-deceit, and was punctured by the truth and the temptation lost its power (see Temptation of Christ). This incident reveals one of the methods of Satan—by immediate suggestion as in the case of Judas (Lk 22:3). In Lk 22:11-23, Satan's devices, (2 Cor 11:11) include human agents. Those who are given over to evil and who persuade others to evil are children and servants of Satan (see Mt 16:23; Mk 13:33; Lk 4:5; Acts 13:10; 1 Cor 3:15, 19:20). In the combination of passages here brought together, it is clearly evident that Satan is the instigator and fomenter of that spirit of lawlessness which exhibits itself as hatred both of truth and right, and which operated so widely and so disastrously in human life.

The history of Satan, including that phase of it which remains to be realized, can be set forth only along the most general lines. He belongs to the angelic order of beings. He is by nature one of the sons of Elohim (Job 1:6). He has fallen, and by virtue of his personal forcefulness has become the leader of the anarchic forces of wickedness. As a free being he has merged his life in evil and has become altogether and hopelessly evil. As a being of high intelligence he has gained great power and has exercised a wide sway over other beings. As a created being the utmost range of his power lies within the compass of that which is permitted. It is, therefore, hedged in by the providential government of God and essentially limited. The Biblical emphasis upon the element of falsehood in the career of Satan might be taken to imply that his kingdom may be less in extent than appears. At any rate, he is confined to the cosmic sphere and to a limited portion of time. It was in the closely related passages 2 Pet 2:4 and Jude 6 it is affirmed that God cast the angels, when they sinned, down to Tartarus and committed them to pits of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment. This both refers to the constant Divine control of
these insurgent forces and also points to their final and utter destruction. The putting of Satan in bonds is evidently both constant and progressive. The Scriptural doctrine of the evil one and its ultimate overthrow are foreshadowed in the Book of Job (chs 38–41), where Jeh’s power extends even to the symbolized spirit of evil.

According to synoptic tradition, Our Lord in the crisis of temptation immediately following the baptism (Mk 1:12) is shown in the wilderness confronting Satan in his own personal adversary. This preliminary contest did not last but was the prelude of a complete victory. According to Lk 1 (18), when the Seventy returned from their mission flushed with victory over the power of evil, Jesus said: “Saw Satan enter (not ‘fallen’; see Plummer, “Lk,” IFC, in loc.) as lightnings forth. In fact, there are no precedents for the power of evil Christ beheld in vision the downfall of Satan. In connection with the coming of the Hellenists who wished to see Him, Jesus assured (Jn 12:31), “Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out.” In view of His approaching passion He says again (Jn 14:30), “The prince of the world cometh: and he hath nothing in me.” Once again in connection with the Son of God’s temptation, the Spirit would convert the world of judgment, “because the prince of this world hath had power over you” (Jn 14:15). It is said that Christ took upon Himself human nature in order “that through death He might destroy him who has the power of death, that is, the devil.” In 1 Jn 2:8 it is said, “To this end was the Son of God manifested, that He might destroy the works of the devil.” In Rev 12:10 it is asserted, in connection with Christ’s ascension, that Satan was cast to the earth and his angels was snatched away to him. According to the passage immediately following (12:10–12), this casting down was not complete or final in the sense of annihilating his activities altogether, but it involves the potential and certain triumph of God as the final and equally certain defeat of Satan. In 1 Jn 2:13 the young men are addressed as those who “have overcome the evil one.” In Rev 20 the field of the future is covered in the story of Satan’s conviction and “bound a thousand years”: then loosed “for a little time,” and then finally “cast into the lake of fire.”

A comparison of these passages will convince the careful student that while we cannot construct a definite chronological program for the career of Satan, we are clear in the chief points. He is limited, judged, condemned, imprisoned, reserved for judgment from the beginning. The outcome is certain though the process may be tedious and slow. The victory of Christ is the defeat of Satan; first, for Himself as Leader and Saviour of men (Jn 14:30); then, for believers (Lk 22:31; Acts 26:16; Rom 16:20; Jas 4:7; 1 Jn 2:13; 5:18); and, finally, for the whole world (Rev 20:10). The work of Christ has already destroyed the empire of Satan.

**III. General Considerations.**—There are, no doubt, serious difficulties in the way of accepting the doctrine of a personal, superhuman, evil power as Satan is described to be. It is doubtful, however, whether these difficulties may not be due, at least in part, to a misunderstanding of the doctrine and certain of its implications. In addition, it must be acknowledged, that whatever difficulties there may be in the teaching, they cannot be fully met by the vague and irrational skepticism which denies without investigation. There are difficulties involved in any view of the world. To say the least, some problems are met by the view of a superhuman, evil world-power. In this section certain general considerations are urged with a view to lessening difficulties keenly felt by some minds. Necessarily, certain items gathered in the foregoing section are here emphasized again.

The Scriptural doctrine of Satan is nowhere systematically developed. For materials in this field we are shut up to scattered and incidental references. These passages, which even in the aggregate are not numerous, tell us what we need to know concerning the nature, history, kingdom and works of Satan, but offer scant satisfaction to the merely speculative temper. The comparative lack of development in this field is due partly to the fact that the Bib. writers are primarily interested in the reality and influence of evil; and partly to the fact that in the OT system the doctrine of Satan is found only as an auxiliary in the providential world-process which centers in Christ. It is a significant fact that the statements concerning Satan become numerous and definite only in the NT. The daylight of the Christian revelation was necessary in order to uncover the lurking foe, dimly disclosed but by no means fully known in the earlier revelation. The disclosure of Satan is, in form at least, historical, not dogmatic.

In the second place, the relationship of Satan to God, already emphasized, must be kept constantly in mind. The doctrine of Satan and God merges in the general doctrine concerning angels (see ANGELS). It has often been pointed out that the personal characteristics of God were the greatest temptation for Satan. It is necessary, however, to stress that the temptation of men is also a part of his providence, or that in the interval between the documents the personality of the tempter has more clearly emerged. In this case the account in Ch would nearly approach the NT teaching. In the Book of Job (1:6), however, Satan is among the Sons of God and his assaults upon Job are Divinely permitted. In Zec (3:1.2) Satan is also a servant of Jehovah. In both these passages there is the hint of opposition between Jehovah and Satan. In the former instance Satan assails unsuccessfully the character of one whom Jehovah honors; while in the latter Jehovah explicitly rebukes Satan for his attitude toward Israel (see G. A. Smith, BTP, II, 316f). The unveiling of Satan as a world-power was first done in the NT, and with this fuller teaching the symbolic treatment of temptation in Gen is connected. There is a sound pedagogical reason, from the viewpoint of revelation, for this earlier withholding of the whole truth concerning Satan. In the early stages of religious thinking it would seem to be difficult, if not impossible, to hold the sovereignty of God without attributing to His agency those evils in the world which are more or less directly connected with the world-power. (cf. Is 1:17; Am 3:6). The OT sufficiently emphasizes man’s responsibility for his own evil deeds, but superhuman evil is brought upon him from above. “When wilful souls have to be misled, the spirit who does so, as in Abuh’s case, comes from above” (G. A. Smith, op. cit., 317). The progressive revelation of God’s character and purpose, which more and more imperatively demands that the origin of moral evil, and consequently natural evil, must be traced to the created will in opposition to the Divine, leads to the late development of the doctrine of a morally fallen being whose conquest the Divine Power in history is pledged. There is, also, the distinct possibility that in the significant transition from the Satan of the OT to that of the NT we have the outlines of a biography and an indication of the way by which angel fell.
A third general consideration, based upon data given in the earlier section, should be urged in the same connection. In the NT delineation of Satan, his limitations are essentially clearly set forth. He is superhuman, Limited but not in any sense Divine. His activities are cosmic, but not universal or transcendent. He is a created being. His power is definitely circumscribed. He is doomed to final destruction as a world-power. His entire career is that of a secondary and dependent being who is permitted, though not created by God, to represent the scope of power—a temptation of activity (Lk 4:6).

These three general considerations have been grouped in this way because they dispose of three objections which are current against the doctrine of Satan.

4. Conclusions

(1) The first is, that it is mythological in origin. That it is not dogmatic is a priori evidence against this hypothesis. Mythology is primitive dogma. There is no evidence of a theology or philosophy of evil in the Bible, treatment of Satan. Moreover, while the Scriptural doctrine is unsystematic in form, it is rigidly limited in scope and everywhere essentially consistent. Even in the Apocalypse, where naturally more scope is allowed to the imagination, the scope of Satan's influence and power is correspondingly definite, item for item, to the intellectual sainess and ethical earnestness of the Bible, world-view as a whole. It is, therefore, not mythological. The restraint of chastened imagination, not the extravagance of the theological fancy, is in evidence throughout the entire Bible, treatment of the subject. Even the use of terms current in mythology (as perhaps Gen 3:13), as a means of conveying the idea conceived in the OT, is not more than a literary clothing of Satan in order to make it more acceptable to the Jews, and thus to mitigate and discourage forces.

(2) The second objection is that the doctrine is due to the influence of Perso dualism (see Persian Religion; Zoroastrianism). The answer to this is plain, on the basis of facts already adduced. The Bible, doctrine of Satan is not dualistic. Satan's empire had a beginning, it will have a definite and permanent end. Satan is God's great enemy in the cosmic sphere, but he is God's creation, exists by Divine will, and his power is commensurate with God's. Satan awaits his doom. Weiss says (concerning the NT representation of conflict between God and the powers of evil): "There lies in this no Manichean dualism, but only the deepest experience of the work of redemption as the definite destruction of the power from which all sin in the world of men proceeds" (Bib. Theol. NT, ET, II, 272; cf. G. A. Smith, op. cit., II, 318).

(3) The third objection is practically the same as the second, but addressed directly to the doctrine itself, apart from the question of its origin, namely, that it destroys the unity of God. The answer to this also is a simple negative. To some minds the reality of evil may be dualistic and therefore untenable. But a true doctrine of unity makes room for other than God's—all of those beings upon whom God has bestowed freedom. Herein stands the doctrine of sin and Satan. The doctrine of Satan no more militates against the unity of God than the idea, so necessary to morality and religion alike, of other created wills set in opposition to God's. Just as the conception of Satan merges, in one direction, in the general doctrine of angels, so, in the other, it blends with the broad and difficult subject of evil (cf. "Satan," HDB, IV, 412n). LITERATURE—All standard works on Bib. Theology, as well as Dicets, etc. treat with more or less thoroughness the doctrine of Satan. The German theologians of the more evangelical type, such as Weiss, Lange, Marcksen, Martensen (Danish), Dorner, while admitting a tendency toward excessive speculation, discern the deeper aspects of the doctrine. Of monographs known to the reviewer none are to be recommended. It is a subject on which the Bible is its own best interpreter.

LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET

SATAN, DEPTHS OF (τὰ βαθαῖα τοῦ Σατάνα, tā bathēa tou Satanaí): Found in Rev 22:1, and has reference to false teaching at Thyatira. It is a question (that perhaps may not be decided) whether this χάσαθεν Σατάνα, "chastened Satan," represents the claim of the false teachers, or is thrown in by the Lord. Did those false teachers claim to know "the depths" of Satan? Or was it that they claimed to know "the depths" of Deity, and the Lord said it was rather "the depths of Satan" when either case the antithesis to "depths of Satan" is "depths of God," as referred to in Rom 11:33; 1 Cor 2:10.

E. J. FORRESTER

SATAN, SYNAGOGUE OF: The expression occurs neither in the Heb nor in the Gr of the OT, nor in Apoc. Three passages in the OT and one in Apoc suggest the idea conveyed in the expression. In Nu 14:27, 35, Jeh expresses His wrath against "the evil congregation" (LXX σωφρονή συνάγωγα, sunagōgē poroi, to which He threatens punishment). In the Wilderness. In Ps 21:21, 22, we find, "A company of evil doers (LXX σωφρονή συνάγωγα, sunagōgē poroi) who have inclosed me." In Sir 16:6, we read, "In the congregation of sinner, LXX σωφρονή συναγωγή, sunagōgē sunagōgē, shall a fire be kindled.

Only in the NT occurs the phrase "synagogue of Satan," and here only twice (Rev 2:9; 3:9). Three observations are evident as to who constituted the "synagogue of Satan" in Smyrna and Philadelphia. (1) They claimed to be Jews, i.e., they were descendants of Abraham, and so laid claim to the blessings promised by Jeh to him and his seed. (2) But they are not regarded by John as real Jews, i.e., they are not the genuine Israel of God (the same conclusion as Paul reached in Rom 2:28). (3) They are persecutors of the Christians in Smyrna. The Lord "knows their blasphemy," their sharp denunciations of Christ and Christians. They claim to be the true people of God, but really they are "antichrist" (1 Jn 2:18). The gen. Σατανά, Satana, is probably the possessive gen. These Jewish persecutors, instead of being God's people, are the "assembly of Satan," i.e., Satan's people. In Polyc., Mar. xvii.2 (c. 155 AD) the Jews of Smyrna were still persecutors of Christians and were conspicuous in demanding and planning the martyrdom of Polycarp the bishop of Smyrna, the same city in which the revelator calls persecuting Jews "the assembly of Satan." In the 2nd cent., in an inscription (C.I.J, 3148) describing the classes of population in Smyrna, we find the expression πολιτεία Ιουδαίων, hoi potē Ioudaioi, which Mommsen thinks means "Jews who had abandoned their religion," but which Ramsay says is a "mixture" of those who formerly were the nation of the Jews, but have lost the legal standing of a separate people.

LITERATURE—Ramsay, The Seven Churches of Asia, ch xii; Swete, The Apocalypse of St. John, 31, 32; Polycarp, 13:2; Mommsen, Historische Zeitschrift, XXXVII. 417.

CHARLES B. WILLIAMS

SATCHEL, satch'e. See Bag.


SATCHEL, sac'h'el. See Bag.
Satisfaction, sat-ɪs-ɪfˈkæʃən: Occurs twice in AV (Nu 36 31,32) as a rendering of the Heb kopher (RV "ransom"). It means a price paid as compensation for the value of a life or for the loss of a life, for example, for the death of a vassal (Est 9 5). It is a prohibition against accepting such a compensation for the death of a vassal, or for the return of the man-slayer. Such compensation was permitted in ancient justice among many peoples. Cf also, point, which Liddell and Scott define as "properly quit-money for blood spilt, the fine paid by the slayer to the kinsman of the slain, as a ransom from all consequences." The same custom prevailed among Teutonic peoples, as seen in the Ger. Wereld and Old Eng. wergeld. The Heb laws of the OT permit it only in the case of a man or woman gored to death by an ox (Ex 21 30-32).

Benjamin Reno Downer

Sartars, sər-tər, sər-tär, sər-tər, sər-tər, sər-tər, lit. "he-goat"; cf רָעַר, sa'ir, "hair"; pl. כִּרְעָא, sər'tā'ā, sa'irām, sər'trā'm: For sər'trā'm in Lev 17 7 and 2 Ch 11 15, AV has "devils," RV "he-goats," ERVm "sat'ars," LXX τῶν μαλαίων, τῶν μαλαίων, "vain things." For sər'trā'm in Isa 13 21, AV and ERV have "sat'ars," ERVm "he-goats," ARV "wild goats," LXX Λάδανια, doimānia, "demons." For sər'tā in Isa 34 14, AV and ERV have "sat'ars," ERVm "he-goats," ARV "wild goat." LXX has ἀρχομένη πρὸς τὸν τρόπον, ἀνάλογον ἀνάλογον, "one to another," referring to doimānia, which here stands for γλύκιμ, "wild beasts of the desert." The text of AV in these passages is as follows: Lev 17 7, "And they shall no more sacrifice their sacrifices unto the he-goats, after which they play the harlot." 2 Ch 11 15, "And he [ Jeroboam] appointed him priests for the high places, and for the he-goats, and for the courts which he had made;" Isa 13 21, "(of Babylon), "But wild beasts of the desert [γλύκιμ] shall lie there; and the wolf shall dwell with the ostrich [οὐρία]; and the ostriches [οὐρία] and the wild goats [αὐρία] shall dwell there, and the wild goats shall dwell there. And wolves [γλύκιμ] shall dwell with the ostrich [οὐρία]; and the wild goats [αὐρία] shall dwell with the ostrich [οὐρία]; and the wild goats [αὐρία] shall dwell there. And wolves [γλύκιμ] shall dwell with the ostrich [οὐρία]; and the wild goats [αὐρία] shall dwell there. And wolves [γλύκιμ] shall dwell with the ostrich [οὐρία]; and the wild goats [αὐρία] shall dwell there. And wolves [γλύκιμ] shall dwell with the ostrich [οὐρία]; and the wild goats [αὐρία] shall dwell there. And wolves [γλύκιμ] shall dwell with the ostrich [οὐρία]; and the wild goats [αὐρία] shall dwell there."

The question is whether sər'tā and sər'trā'm in these passages stand for real or for fabulous animals. In Lev 17 7 and 2 Ch 11 15, it is clear that they are objects that still makes open the question of their nature, though it may to many minds make "devils" or "demons" or "sat'ars" seem preferable to "he-goats." In Isa 13 20 we read, "neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there, neither shall his tents make his flock to lie down there." This may very likely have influenced the American Committee of Revisers to use "wild goat" in Isa 13 21 and 34 14 instead of the "he-goat" of the other passages. In ARV, no fabulous creatures (except perhaps "night-monster") are mentioned here, but LXX employs doimānia, "demons," in Isa 13 21 for sər'tā and in 34 14 for γλύκιμ, οὐρίαναριν, οὐρίαναριν, from ὄς, ὄς, "ass," and καταιχόντες, καταιχόντες, "centaurs," in Isa 13 22 and 34 14 for γλύκιμ, and again in 14 for λιθίθ; στρατέρες, στρατείνες, "sirens," in Isa 13 21 for βρύθη γα'άνθ, and in 34 13 for τάνταρμ. We must bear in mind the uncertainty regarding the identity of γλύκιμ, οὐρία, "he-goat," as well as of some of the other names, and we must recall the tales that are hung about the name λιθίθ (AV "screech owl," AVm and RV "night-monster," RVm "Lilith"). While sər'tā is almost alone among these words in having ordinarily a well-understood meaning, i.e. "he-goat," there is good reason for considering that here it is used in an exceptional sense. The tr "sat'ary" has certainly much to be said for it. See GOAT; JACKAL.

Alfred Ely Day

Saul, sōl (םָאוֹל, ša'āl; סאמ, Saul): (1) The first king of Israel.

1. Early History.

1. Name and Meaning.
2. Genealogy.
3. Home and Station.
4. Sources for Life.
5. Reasons for It.
2. Reign of Saul.
1. His First Action.
2. Army Reorganized.
4. Defeats the Amalekites.
5. Occupation Pronounced.
6. David Introduced to Saul.
7. Two Accounts.
8. Saul's Envy of David.
9. Attempts to Get Rid of Him.
10. Saul's Scaresaul.
11. Saul's Divided Energies.
12. Consulate a Necromancer.
15. Saul's Posterity.

3. Character.
2. Saul's Failings.
3. His Virtues.
4. David's Elegy.

Early History. The name Saul is usually regarded as simply the passive participle of the vb. "to ask," and so meaning "asked."

1. Name (cf 1 S 8 4 ff), but the gentile adj. and Mean-
2. ing has also an intensive connotation,]
3. "siser," or perhaps, "the one asking insistently," the beggar.
4. Saul was the son of Kish, a Benjamite. His
genealogical tree is given in 1 S 9 1 (cf LXX
5. 10 21).

2. Gene-
1. After.
2. But in 1 S 15 31; 9 39, Nef-
3. who appears as his paternal uncle in
4. 1 S 14 50-51.

The last verse contains a very curious scribal error, a ponds having slipped out of one word in it into another. It states that both Abner and Ner were sons of Abiel. These apparent inconsistencies are to be explained by the fact that in Heb, as in Arab., "son" is often used in the sense of grandson. Also, with the facility of divorce then prevalent, by "brother" and "sister" we must in most cases understand half-brother and half-sister. Moreover, Saul’s mother might have been the wife at different times of Kish and of his brother Ner (cf 1 S 20 34). This was quite common, and in some cases compulsory (De 25 8-9).

Saul’s home was at Gibeah (q.v.), which is also called Gibeah of Saul, i.e. Saul’s Hill (1 S 11 4, 10 5, 14 20, 20 30). It is usually identified with Tell el-Ful, but perhaps its site is marked rather by some ruins near but beneath that eminence. The tribe of Benjamin was the fighting tribe of Israel, and Kish seems to have been one of its most important members. Saul’s remarks in deprecation (1 S 9 21) are not to be taken literally.

The circumstances of Saul’s career are too well known to require recapitulation. It will be sufficient to refer to some of the recognized difficulties.
Saul
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of the narrative. These difficulties arise from the fact that we appear to have two distinct biographies of Saul in the present Books of S.

4. Sources This may well be the case as it is the practice of the S, to set the events of one chapter against the opposite of the next event, without attempting to work these up into one consistent account. We shall call the duplicated narratives A and B, without postulating that either is a continuous whole. See Samar., Books of.

5. Election as King Saul was anointed king of Israel at Ramah by the prophet Samuel acting upon an inspiration from Jehovah, not only without consulting anyone, but in the strictest secrecy (1 S 9 1—10 16). According to B, the shekels of the tribes demanded a king. Samuel in vain tried to dissuade them. They would not listen, and a king was chosen by lot at Mizpah. The lot fell upon Saul, and Samuel immediately demitted office (ch 8; 10 17—27, omitting last clause; and ch 15).

There are three distinct reasons given in the text for the abolition of theocracy and institution of an elective or hereditary monarchy:

6. Reasons first, the incapacity of Samuel's sons (6 1—8); second, an invasion of the Philistines (12 12); and third, the Philis (9 16). These three motives are not mutually exclusive. The Philis formed the standing menace to the national existence, which would have necessitated the creation of a monarchy sooner or later. The other two were temporary circumstances, one of which aggravated the situation, while the other showed the hopelessness of expecting any improvement in it in the near future.

If. Reign and Fall.—The election of Saul at Mizpah was confirmed in the presence of the chief-tains of the clans; it is not to be

1. His First Action supposed that the whole nation was present. As soon as it was over, the electors went home, and Saul also returned to his father's farm and, like Cincinnatus, once more followed the plough. "Within about a month," however (10 27 LXX, for MT "But he held his peace"), the summons came. A message from the citizens of Jahaz-gilead (q.v.) was sent round the territory appealing for help against the Ammonites under Nahash. They, of course, knew nothing about what had taken place at Mizpah, and it was only by chance that their messengers arrived at Gibeah when they did. Saul rose to the occasion immediately after his anointing; was acknowledged king by the whole body of the people (ch 11). This double election, first by the chiefs and then by the people, is quite a regular proceeding.

This first success encouraged Saul to enter upon what was to be the mission of his life, namely, the throwing off of the Philis suzerainty.

2. Army From the first he had had the boldest organized spirits upon his side (10 26 LXX, RVm); he was now able to form a standing army of 3,000 men, under the command of himself and his son Jonathan (q.v.). The Philis, the last remnant of the Minain race, had the advantage of the possession of iron weapons. It was, in fact, they who introduced iron into Pal from Crete—the Israelites knowing only bronze, and having no weapon except of iron, or of the softer metals. They seem to have armed themselves—with the exception of the king and his son— with mattocks and ploughshares (13 19 ff).

The first encounter was the attack upon the Philis post at Mount Gibeon (1 S 14). The text of the narrative is uncertain, but the following outline is clear. On hearing that the Hebrews had revolted (13 3 LXX), the Philis gathered in great force, including 3,000 chariots (13 5 LXX; MT has 30,000) at Michmash. In dismay, Saul's troops deserted (vs 6 ff), until he was left with only 600 (14 2).

In spite of this, Jonathan precipitated a reckless attack upon the Philis forces. This was so successful that the whole Philis army was seized with panic, and the onset of Saul and the desertion of their Heb slaves completed their discomfiture. Saul followed up his victory by making predatory excursions on every side (14 47).

6. David

6a. Introduction The Saul is recorded as having been against the Amalekites under Agag, who were likewise completely defeated.

The fight was carried out with all the remorselessness common to tribal warfare. Warning was sent to the friendly Kenites to withdraw out of danger; then the hostile tribe was slaughtered to a man, their chief alone being spared for the time being. Even the women and children were not taken as slaves, but were all killed (1 S 15).

It is not clear what was the precise attitude of Samuel toward Saul. As the undoubted head of the theocracy he naturally objected to his powers being curtailed by the loss of the civil power (8 6). Even after the elections of Saul, Samuel was the ecclesiastical head of the state. He seems to have objected to Saul's offering the sacrifice before battle (13 10 ff), and to have considered him merely as his lieutenant (15 3) who could be dismissed for disobedience (15 14 ff).

Here again there seem to be two distinct accounts in the traditional text, which we may again call A and B. In A Saul is rejected because he does not wait long enough for Samuel at Gilgal (13 8; cf 10 8). Seven days, "of course, means eight, or even more, in short, until Samuel should return whenever that might be. The expression might almost be omitted in translating. In B Saul is rejected because he did not carry out Samuel's orders (15 3) to the letter. The two narratives are not mutually exclusive. The second offence was an aggravation of the first, and after it Samuel did not see Saul again (15 35).

He had good reason for not doing so. He had anointed a rival head of the state in opposition to Saul. (If in place of the discovery, would have cost him his head (cf 2 K 9 6.10). Saul did not at once accept his deposition, but he lost heart. One cannot but admire him, deserted by his people, he did not forsake his post, but playing a losing game, and yet continuing in office. To drive away his melancholy, his servants introduced to him a musician who played until his spirits revived (16 14 ff; cf 2 K 3 15).

By a strange coincidence (cf 1, 6, above) the minstrel was the very person whom Samuel had secretly anointed to supplant Saul. According to what looks like another account, however, it was his encounter with Goliah which led to the introduction of David to Saul (17 1 ff; see Dav,). In spite of all that has been said to the contrary, the two narratives are not incompatible, since we are not told the order of the events nor over how many years these events were spread. The theory of duplicate narratives is, therefore, the best explanation of all statements made by the dramatis personae in the Bible are to be taken at their face value. If chs 16 and 17 had formed part of a play of Shakespeare, they would have been considered a fine piece of construction. The assumption has been written to explain why Saul did not recognize David, and why Abner denied all knowledge of him. LXX, however, omits 17 12—31.41.50—18 5.
Whether Saul actually discovered that David had been anointed by Samuel or not, he soon saw in him his rival and inevitable successor, and he would hardly have been human if he had not felt envious of him. His dislike of David had two motives. The first was jealousy, because the women preferred the military genius of David to his own (18.7 f.). His consequent attempt upon the life of David (vs 8–11) is omitted in LXX.

Not least was the love of his own daughter for David (18.20); in ver 28 read with LXX “all Israelites,” and David was charged with an unnatural objection to see his son Jonathan supplanted in his rights to the throne, an objection which was aggravated by the devotion of that son to his own rival (20.30; see also DAVID; JONATHAN).

Saul could not believe that David could remain loyal to him (24.9); at the first favorable opportunity he would turn upon him, hurl him from the throne, and exterminate his enemies. In these circumstances, it was his first interest to get rid of him. His attempt to secure this (omitting with LXX 18.8–11) was to encourage him to make raids on the Philis in the hope that these might kill him (18.21 f.); his next, assassination by one of his prisoners (19.1), and then by his own hands (19.9 f.). When David was compelled to fly, the quarrel turned to civil war. The superstitious fear of hurting the chosen of Jehovah had given place to blind rage. Those who sheltered the fugitive, even priests, were slaughtered (22.17 f.). From one spot to another David was hunted, as he says, like a partridge (26.20).

It is generally maintained that here also we have duplicate accounts; for example, that there are two accounts of David’s taking refuge with Achish, king of Gath, and two of his sparing Saul’s life. The latter are contained in chs 24 and 26, but the points of resemblance are slight. Three thousand (24.2; 26.2) was the number of Saul’s picked men (cf 13.2). David uses the simile of “a flea” in 24.14, but in 26.20 for “a flea” LXX has “my soul,” which is no doubt original. The few other expressions would occur naturally in any narrative with the same contexts.

Obviously Saul’s divided energies could not hold out long; he could not put down the imaginary rebellion within, and at the same time keep at bay the foreign foe. No sooner had he got the fugitive within his grasp than Paul and David left him and made a clean breast of it. In the fraticide of the Philis (23.27 f.); but after his life had been twice spared, he seemed to realize at last that the latter were the real enemy, and he threw his whole strength into one desperate effort for existence.

Saul himself saw that his case was desperate, and that in fact the game was up. As a forlorn hope he determined to seek occult advice. He could no longer use the official means of divination (28.6), and was obliged to have recourse to a necromancer, one of a class whom he himself had taken means to suppress (28.3). The result of the séance confirmed his worst fears and filled his soul with despair (28.7 f.).

It says much for Saul that, hopeless as he was, he engaged in one last forlorn struggle with the enemy. The Philis had gathered in great force at Shunem. Saul drew up his army on the opposing hill of Gilboa. Between the two armies was the valley of Elah (14.4). The result was what had been foreseen. The Israelites, no doubt greatly reduced in numbers (contrast 11.8), were completely defeated, and Saul and his sons slain. Their arms were placed in the temple of Ashtaroth, and their bodies hung on the wall of Beth-shan, but Saul’s head was set in the temple of Dagon (1 Ch.10.10). The citizens of Jabesh-gilead, out of ancient gratitude, rescued the bodies and, in un-Semitic wise, burned them and buried the bones. Saul’s head was thus kept in the temple of Dagon.

Once more we have, according to most present-day critics, duplicate accounts of the death of Saul.

According to one, which we may name Accounts of Saul’s Death, he fell, like Ajax whom he much admired, and caused his own downfall, or being desperately wounded by the archers (1 S 31.4). According to the second (2 S 1.2 ff.), an Amalekite, who had been by accident a witness of the battle, dispatched Saul at his own request, to save him from the enemy. But B is simply the continuation of A, and tells us how David received the news of the battle. The Amalekite’s story is, of course, a fabrication, with a view to a reward. Similar claims for the reward of assassination are common (cf 9.9).

With Saul the first Israelite dynasty began and ended. The names of his sons are given in 1 S 14.49 as Jonathan, Ishvi and Melchishua. Ishvi or Ishvyo (LXX) is Post mortem, “after the death of,” and is a necromancer (q.v.). 1 Ch.8.33 adds Abinadab. Jonathan left a long line of descendants famous, like himself, as archers (1 Ch.8.34 f.). The rest of Saul’s posthumous story apparently died out.

Malchishua and Abinadab were slain at Gilboa (1 S 31.6; cf 26.20), and Ish-bosheth was assassinated shortly after (2 S 4.2 f.). Saul had also two natural sons by Rizpah who were put to death by David in accordance with a superstitious custom, as were the five sons of the Merib (2 S 21.8, not Michael; cf 1 S 18.19). Saul’s other daughter Michal apparently had no children. Saul had, it seems, other wives, who were taken into the harem of David in accordance with the practice of the times (2 S 12.8), but of them and their descendants we know nothing.

III. Character.—Saul’s life and character are disposed of in a somewhat summary fashion by the Chronicler (1 Ch.10, esp. vs. 13.14).

1. Book of Samuel.—This was rejected because he was disloyal to Jehovah, especially in consulting a necromancer. The major premise of this conclusion, however, is the ancient dictum, “Misfortune presupposes sin.” From a wider point of view Saul cannot be dismissed so cavalierly. Like everyone else, Saul had his virtues and his failings. His chief weakness seems to have been want of decision of character. He was easily swayed by events and by people.

2. Saul’s Failures and Successes.—The praises of David (1 S 18.7 f.) at once set his jealousy on fire. His persecution of David was largely due to the instigation of mischievous courtiers (24.9). Upon remonstrance his repentance was as deep as it was short-lived (24.16; 26.21). His impulsiveness was such that he did not know where to stop. His interdict (14.24 f.) was quite as uncalled for as his religious zeal (15.9) was out of place. He was always at one extreme. His hatred of David was only equal to his affection for him at first (18.2). His pusillanimity led him to commit crimes which his own judgment would have forbidden (22.17). Like everyone else, Saul was guilt-ridden; he became suspicious of everyone (22.7 f.), and, like those who are easily led, he soon found his evil genius (22.9.15.22). Saul’s inability to act alone appears from the fact that he never engaged in single combat with any other person; he set his fury or his pettiness to rouse to boiling-point (11.9). His mind was particularly sub-
Savaran, Sceptre, Scepter
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Savaran

Savaran, Sceptr. Sceptre (AV = RV Avaran (q.v.).

SAVE, sāv: In the sense "except," the word came into Eng. through the Fr. (sauf) and is fairly common (38 t., in addition to "saving," AV Eccl 5 11; Am 9 8; Mt 5 32; Lk 4 27; Rev 2 17). It represents no particular Heb or Gr terms but is employed wherever it seems useful. It is still in good (slightly archaic) use and RV has few good alternatives (Dt 16 4 AV; Ps 18 31b, etc), but ERV has "dropped" saving in Lk 4 27 and Rev 2 17 and ARV also in Eccl 5 11; Am 9 8, retaining it only in Mt 5 32.

SAVIAS, sa-v'as (Savioa, Sauvia): In 1 Esd 8 2, for Uzzi, an ancestor of Ezra, in Ezr 7 4.

SAVIOUR, sā-v'ār: (1) While that "God is the deliverer of his people" is the concept on which, virtually, the whole OT is based (see SALVATION), yet the Hebrews seem never to have felt the need of a title for God that would sum up this aspect of His relation to man. Nearest to our word "Saviour" is a participial form (פָּרֵס, פָּרְס) from the vb. פָּר, פָּרְ: פָּרְשָׁה (Qal not used; "savor" in Highl), but even this participle is not frequently applied to God (some 13 t. of which 7 are in Isa 43 63). (2) In the NT, however, the case is different, and Σωτήρ, Sóter, is used in as technical a way as is our "Saviour." But the distribution of the 24 occurrences of the word is strikingly different. For two-thirds of them are found in the later books of the NT—10 in the Pastoral 5 in 2 Pet, and one each in Jn, 1 Jn, and Jude—and the other instances are Lk 1 47; 21 11; Acts 3 31; 13 25; Eph 6 5; Phil 1 20f. And there are no occurrences in Mt, Mk, or the earlier Pauline Epp. The data are clear enough. As might be expected, the fact that the OT used no technical word for Saviour meant that neither did the earliest Christianity use any such word. Doubtless for Our Lord "Messiah" was felt to convey the meaning. But in Gr-speaking Christianity, "Christ," the tr of Messiah, soon became treated as a proper name, and a new word was needed. (3) Sóter expressed the exact meaning and had already been set apart in the language of the NT as a religious term, having one of the most popular Divine titles in use. Indeed, it was felt to be a most inappropriate word to apply to a human being. Cicero, for instance, arraigns Verres for using it: "Soter ... How much does this imply? So much that it cannot be expunged from the world in Latin" (Verr. i.2, 63, § 154). So the adoption of Sóter by Christianity was most natural, the word seemed ready-made. (4) That the NT writers derived the word from its contemporary use is shown, besides, by its occurrence in combination with such terms as "manifestation" (Rv. phanéria, 2 Tim 1 10; Tit 2 13), "love toward man" (philanthropia, Tit 3 4), "captain" (archégos, Acts 5 31; cf He 2 10), etc. These terms are found in the Gr sources many times in exactly the same combinations with Sóter. (5) In the NT Sóter is uniformly reserved for Christ, except in Lk 1 47; Jude ver 25, and the Pastoral. In 1 Tim (1 1; 2 3; 4 10) it is applied only to the Father, in 2 Tim (1 10, only) it is applied to Christ, while in Tit there seems to be a deliberate alternation: of the Father in 1 3; 2 10; 3 4; of Christ in 1 4; 2 13; 3 6.


BURTON SCOTT EASTON

SAVOR, sā'vār (סותר, ὁ ἱππόπηδος, ὁ ὁμηρίτικος): (1) The primary meaning of the word is "taste," "flavor" (from Lat savor, "taste"). So in Mt 5 13; Lk 14 34, "if the salt have lost its savor ( pulumiüt, μεκανίθη, "become tasteless," or as to lose its characteristic preserving virtue). (2) But generally it has the meaning of "smell," "odor": (a) once of evil odor: "Its stench shall come up, and its ill savor shall come up" (Joel 2 20); (b) elsewhere in the sense of "worthlessness." Instead of the exception of Ex 5 21 and AV Cant 1 3 (RV "fragrance"), it is always accompanied by the adj. "sweet." It stands for the smell of sacrifices and oblations, in agreement with the ancient anthropomorphic idea that God smells and is pleased with the fragrance of sacrifices (e.g. "Jeh smelled the sweet savor," Gen 8 21; "to make a sweet savor unto Jeh," Nu 16 3; and frequently). In the NT, "savor" in the sense of smell is used metaphorically: (a) once the metaphor is borrowed from the ince which attends the victor's triumphal procession; God is said to make manifest through His apostles "the savor of his knowledge in every place" as He "ledeth" them "in triumph in Christ" (2 Cor 2 14; Lk 24 50; Acts 4 30). The metaphor is borrowed from the fragment of smell of the sacrifices. The apostles "are a sweet savor of Christ unto God" (2 Cor 2 15), i.e. they are, as it were, a sweet odor for God to smell, an odor which is pleasing to God, even though its effect upon men varies (to some it is a"savor from death unto death," i.e. such as is emitted by death and itself causes death; to others it is "a savor from life unto life," ver 10). By the same sacrificial metaphor, Christ's offering of Himself to God is said to be "for a sweet smelling savor" (Eph 5 2 AV, RV "for an odor of a sweet smell"); the same phrase is used in Phil 4 18 of acts of kindness to Paul, which were "a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God".

(3) Once it is used in the figurative sense of reputation: "Ye have made our savor to be abhorred (lit. "our smell to stink") in the eyes of Pharaoh" (Ex 5 21). Of the Eng. phrase, "to be in bad odor.

The vb. "to savor" means: (1) Intransitively, to taste or smell of or partake of the odor of. A meaning as in the Preface of AV: "to savour more of curiosity than wisdom," or (2) transitively, to perceive by the taste or smell, to discern: "thy savour be of God" (AV Mt 16 23; Mk 8 33, RV "mindest"; cf., however, Phr. περιφρεσκεύομαι, to "savour," only in Gen 27 14, 17, 14. 31 ("savour food") and RV Isa 30 24 (m. "salted").

D. MIALL EDWARDS
Saw, sâ. See Tools.

Sawing ASUNDER, sâ'ing a-sun'der. See PUNISHMENTS.

Sayest, sâ'est: "Thou sayest" (Mt 27:11; Mk 15:2; Lk 22:70, "Ye say"); Jn 18:37), i.e. rightly; "Thou hast said" (Mt 26:25:64),= "Yes"; a rhetorical idiom never found in the OT. Mark (14:62) renders by "I am." All these passages Whm punctuate interrogatively (cf. K'thâbbâh, f. 103 b).

Sayings, sâ'ings, DARK. See Dark Sayings.

Sayings, FAITHFUL. See Faithful Sayings.

Sayings of Jesus. See LOGIA.

Sayings, UNWRITTEN, un-rîth'n. See AGRAPHA.

Scab, skâb, SCABBED, skâb'd, skâbd (תַּמה), yallâpheth, מְמָה, mipapâthh, מִפָּפָתָה, sappapâth, vb. רָמָה, siphâpâ, semassía, semâsa, lexâvâ, lekîchân): These are generic terms for any skin disease in which there are patches of hard crusts on the surface. The common pest of these are the forms now named eczema, herpes and, perhaps, psoriasis, all of which are common in Bible lands. Milder cases in which the disease was localized and in small patches (the semassía of LXX) did not render the bearer unclean, and they were to be distinguished from the priest (Lev 13:26) from the more virulent and spreading eruptions which (ver 7) were regarded as causes of ceremonial uncleanness. These severer forms are the lechîth of LXX mentioned in Lev 21:20, which disqualified any son of Aaron from serving as his priest, and when affecting an animal rendered it unfit to be offered as a burnt offering (Lev 22:22). Hippocrates speaks of these cases as obstinate and persistent, and Galen believed that they might degenerate into leprosy; hence the terms in which Aschylus speaks of it (Chosporhi 218). Celsius, however, recognized that lechîth was a popular eruption, not a true scab. The name yallâpheth seems to have been given to it on account of the firmness of attachment of the scales, while mipapâthhh refers to its tendency to spread and cover the surface. A cognate word in Ezek 13:18 is the name of a large tallith or prayer veil used by the false propheteesses in Israel (Kt.2 k'erchef). Scabs were esp. disfiguring on the head, and this infestation was threatened as a punishment on the daughters of Zion for their wanton haughtiness (Isa 3:17). In Middle Eng., "scab" is used for itch or mange, and as a term of opprobrium, as in Greene, Bacon and Bunyan, 35, 1591.

Scabbard, skâ'bard, SHEATH, shêth. See Armor, III, 5; War, 9.

Scaffold, skâf'old (קְּבָר, kiyôg): The Eng. word is used once of Solomon's "brazen scaffold" on which he knelt at the dedication of the temple (2 Ch 6:13).

Scale, skâl. See Siege, 4, (c); Weights and Measures.

Scales, skâlz [11], kâskêth, "fish-scales"; [2] רָמָה, mîghînnâh, מִגִּנְה, mîghân, "scales of the crocodile"; [3] לְּסָפָה, lepsâh, with vb. לִפָּסָה, lipâsâh, "scale away" [Top 3:17; 11:13]: (1) the first Heb word kâskêth means the indiscriminated scales of fish, which together with the dorsal fin were distinguishing marks of all fish allowed as food to the Israelite (Lev 11:9 f; Dt 14:9 f). In the figurative sense the word is used of a cost of meat (1 S 17:33): (2) Mîghînnâh from mîghâh, lit. "buckler" or "small shield" (2 Ch 13:5; Jer 46:3), is used in the description of the crocodile (see Leviathan) for the horny scales or scutes imbedded in the skin, not imbricated upon it (Job 41:15 [Heb ver 7]). (3) The Gr lepsâ, which in classical language has a much wider range of meaning than the above Heb words ("round" = "horsk," "shell," "fish-scale," "scale of snake," "flake of metal and of snow," etc.), is found in the NT description of St. Paul's recovery from temporary blindness, "And straightway there fell from his eyes as it were scales, and he received his sight" (Acts 9:18). There is nothing in the words of the sacred text which compels us to think of literal scales. (In Tob, however, a literal flaking-off of foreign substance is meant.) We have here rather a description of the sensation which terminated the three days' period of blindness which the apostle suffered after his meeting with the risen Lord on the road to Damascus. The apostle himself does not use this expression in his own graphic description of the same experience: "In that very hour I looked upon him" (22:13). The phrase has, however, come to us for we speak of "scales falling from one's eyes" when we mean a sudden illumination or remission of a dissipation of harassing doubt.

In Isa 40:12; RV Prov 16:11 for לְּסָפָה, peles, in the sense of "instrument for weighing." See Balance.

H. L. E. LEBRING

Scall, skôl (גָּלֶת, nethek; ἑρώτωσα, thrâma): This only occurs in Lev 13 and 14 where it is used 14:2 to describe bald or scaly patches of eruption on the skin. Such patches are generally the result of the action of parasitic organisms. The common form known now as scalled head is produced by a microscopic plant, Achârion schoenelini. In Old and Middle Eng., scall was used for scaliness of the head. (Chaucer and Spenser.) See also Skent, Concise Etymol. Dict. of Eng. Language.

Scape-Goat, skâp'got. See Azazel.

Scarlet, skâr'let. See Colors; Dyeing.

Scarlet (Worm) (גָּלֶת, גâlèth, tôlâ'ath shâánt [Ex 25:4, etc.]; Cermes vermilio, a scale insect from which a red dye is obtained. See Color; Dyeing; Worm.

Scattered Abroad, skat'êrd a-brô'd. See Dispersion.

Scent, sent: (1) In Hos 14:7, "The scent [in his memorial] thereof shall be as the wine of Lebanon." Scent" is used for כָּרְחָק, zuktur (so MT, but the pointing is uncertain), properly "memorial," whence RVm. The Eng. tr. comes through the LXX which took זָרָה as "offering of sweet savour," and so "sweet savour." For the sense of Lebanon see WNT. If this tr is not right, the alternative is "memorial" in the sense of "renown." (2) Job 14:9; Jer 48:11 for מַרְדָּק, râ'dâk, "odor." (3) "Scent" of the water in Job 14:9 is poetic for "contact with." (5) Wisd. 11:16, 18 (RSV) has "filthy scents of scattered smoke," where "scent" is used in the obsolete sense of "disagreeable odor." The tr is, however, very loose, and "scents" is a gloss; RV "noisome smoke." BURTON SCOTT EASTON

Sceptre, Scepter, sep'tér (זָהָב, šâ*tâh, expanded form in Est 4:11; 5:2; 8:4); pbâsôbôs, rhdbos [Ad Est 15:11; He 1:8],
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SCION

The name of Scion (θρύσκος, skhrophos): A rod or mace used by a sovereign as a symbol of royal authority. The Heb שֶׁבֶת (shēbet) is the ordinary word for rod or club, and is used of an ordinary rod (cf 2 S 7 14), of the shepherd's crook (Ps 23 4), scribe's baton or marshal's staff (dgs 6 14), as well as of the symbol of royalty. Its symbolism may be connected with the use of the שֶׁבֶת for protection (2 S 23 21; Ps 23 4) or for punishment (Isa 10 21; 30 31). It is used with reference to the royal line descended from Judah (Gen 49 10), and figuratively of sovereignty in general and possibly of conquest (Nu 24 17, in Israel; Isa 14 5, in Babylonia; Am 1 5, in Syria, among Philis; Zac 10 11, in Egypt), the disappearance or cutting off of him that holdeth the scepter being tantamount to loss of national independence. The kingship of Jash is spoken of as a scepter (Ps 45 6 [Heb ver 7] quoted in He 1 8).

The manner of using the scepter by an oriental monarch is suggested in the act of Ahasuerus, who holds it out to Esther as a mark of favor. The scepter touches the top of it, perhaps simply as an act of homage or possibly to indicate a desire to be heard. The scepter of Ahasuerus is spoken of as "golden" (Est 5 2), but it is probable that scepters were ordinarily made of straight branches (match) of certain kinds of trees (Ezk 17 2), and the crook, or rod of iron (Prov 22 8, "rod of his wrath"). Another word, מָרָה (marah), lit. "prescribing" (person or thing), formerly tr uniformly "lawgiver," is now generally taken, on the basis of parallelism, to mean "sceptre in our proper sense" (Gen 49 24). In the "payagogos," or "tutor's staff," to avoid repetition; Nu 21 18; Ps 60 7; 108 8).

Nathan Isaacs

SCOPE, σκοπός (Skoupo, Skou).] A Jew, a chief priest, resident in Ephesus, whose seven sons were exorcists (Acts 19 14 f.). Ewald regards the name as being Heb שֶׁבֶת (shēbet), He was not an officiating priest, as there were only synagogues in Asia Minor. He may have belonged to a high-priestly family, or perhaps at one time he had been at the head of some course in the temple. In the narrative the construction is loose. There were seven sons (ver 14), and it would appear (ver 16) that in this particular case all were present. But (ver 16) the demon-possessed man overpowered them. Was it done under the difficulty by omitting "both," but συνάδελφον, so Tisch., WH, Soden, and best critics, retain the difficult reading. The explanation is that ver 14 states the custom: "who did this" being μὴ τολμᾶν ποιονται, "who used to do this." Vs 15 and 16 state a particular case in which two took part, but the incident is introduced in a careless manner. Ewald would translate ἀμφότερον as "in both sides," but this is impossible. Bauer understood "disciples" for "sons." D and Syriac have an interesting expansion which Blass considers original (ver 14): "Among whom also the sons [Syr 'seven'] of a certain Sevea, a priest, wished to do the same, [who] were in the custom of exorcising such. And entering into the demon-possessed man they began to call upon the Name, saying, 'We charge you by Jesus, whom Paul preaches to come out.'"

S. F. Hunter

SCISM, σκισία (Skisia, skisia), σκίζον (Skizon): Only in 1 Cor 12 25. The same Gr word is lit. "a split," "a breach." In 1 Cor 12 16; Mk 2 21; and "divorce," in Jn 7 43; 9 16; 10 19. It designates "a separation," not from, but within, the church, interfering with the harmonious coördination and cooperation of the members described in the preceding verses (1 Cor 12 18 f.). The ecclesiastical meaning is that of a break from a church organization, that may or may not be connected with a doctrinal dissent.

SCHOOL, σχολή (Skholē, schollē). See Tyrannus.

SCHOOLMASTER, σχολικός (Skolikos). Gal 3 24 f. AV reads: "The law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. "Schoolmaster" is a tr of παιδισ- γως, παιδιος, lit. "child-leader." This παιδιος was not a teacher but a slave, to whom in wealthy families the general oversight of a boy was committed. It was his duty to accompany his charge to and from school, never to lose sight of him in public, to prevent associations with objectionable companions, to inculcate moral lessons at every opportunity, etc. He was a familiar figure in the streets, and the (sour) "face of a παιδιος" and "to follow one like a παιδιος" were proverbial expressions. Naturally, to the average boy the παιδιός was tantamount to the incorporation of everything objectionable. Hence St. Paul's figure may be paraphrased: "The law was a παιδιός, necessary but irksome, to direct us until the time of Christ. Then was the time of our spiritual confirmations come, that the control of the παιδιός ceased." The word παιδιός was taken over into Aram. at an early date, and St. Paul's language, which is hardly that of a mere adult observer, suggests that he had personal experience with the institution. Wealthy and intensely orthodox Jewish parents living in a gentle city may well have adopted such a precaution for the protection of their children.

No Eng. word renders παιδιός adequately. "Schoolmaster" is quite wrong. But RV's "tutor" (cf 1 Cor 4 15) is little better in modern Eng.

Burton Scott Easton

SCHOOLS OF THE PROPHETS. See Education; Prophets.

SCIENCE, σιές: This word as found in AV means simply "knowledge." "Science" occurs in AV only in two places, Dul 1 4, "children . . . understanding science" ((Unknown) "skeintos", "skeintos", "skeintos"); those who understand science"). The meaning of the term here is "knowledge," "wisdom." The only other occurrence of "science" is in the NT (1 Tim 6 20, "avoiding the "knowledge," "wisdom." The only other occurrence of "science" is in the NT (1 Tim 6 20, "avoiding the "knowledge," "wisdom." The only other occurrence of "science" is in the NT (1 Tim 6 20, "avoiding the has occurred in the NT. "Science" is the tr of the Gr γνωσις, which in the NT is usually rendered "knowledge." The science here referred to was a higher knowledge of Christian and Divine things, which false teachers alleged that they possessed, and of which they boasted. It was an incoherent form of Gnosticism, and it prevailed to a considerable extent in the churches of protocentral Asia, e.g. in Colossae and Ephesus. Timothy is put on his guard against the teaching of this γνωσις falsely so called, for it set itself in opposition to the gospel. See Gnosticism.

"Science" in the modern sense of the word, as the discovery and orderly classification and exposition of the phenomena and of the laws of Nature, has not been found either in the OT or the NT unless the passage in Dul be interpreted as meaning the scientific knowledge which the learned men of Babylon possessed of mathematics and astronomy, etc. See also Acts 14 22. The Heb word all natural phenomena meant the working of the hand of God in the world, directly and immediately, without the intervention of any secondary laws.

John Rothermich
SCIMITAR, sim'-tar, -tär (אָכָדָא, ἀκιδάκκα): Formerly given as "fauchion" in AV Jzh 13 6; 18 9 where it is found which Judith took down from the rail of the bed at Holopherne's banquet and with which she severed his head from his body.

SCOFF, skof, SCOFER, skof'r: The vb. indicates the manifestation of contempt by insulting words or actions; it combines bitterness with ridicule. It is much more frequent in RV than in AV, replacing "scorn" of the latter in Ps 1 1; Prov 22, etc. "Scorn" refers rather to an inner emotion based on a sense of superiority; "scuff," to the outward expression of this emotion.

SCORN, skorn: Fox Talbot connects this Eng. word with the Danish skorn, "dirt," "ordure," "mud," "mire." As distinguished from such words as "mock," "deride," " scoff," all of which refer specifically to the various ways in which scorn finds outward expression, scorn itself denotes a subjective state or reaction.

Further, this state or reaction is not simple but complex. It involves a sense of superiority, resentment, and aver- sion. This reaction occurs when one is confronted with a person or a proposition that by challenging certain things for which he holds himself to be great, either by his superioritv or weakness, awakens mingled resentment, repulsion and contempt by the nullness of its claims and its intrinsic inferiority or weakness. Scorn is a bitter, fiercer emotion than disdain or contempt. It is obvious that scorn may—indeed, it often—arise in comparison with an ungrounded, arrogant sense of self-esteem.

The word, outside of the phrase "laugh to scorn," is found only in the OT, and then only 4 t (Est 3 6; AV Ps 44 13; 79 4; Hab 1 10), and it represents three different Heb words for none of which it is a suitable rendering. The two words "thought scorn" in Est 3 6 represent but one in Heb, viz. הבזד, for which "disdain" would be a nearer equivalent. In Hab 1 10 AV the word trd "scorn" is מָזְדַפ, "an object of laughter," "laughing-stock." In Ps 44 13; 79 4 the Heb word is לֹאֵעה, a root, probably meaning "to stouter," "stammer," for which "mocking" is a better Eng. equivalent. In AV Job 34 7; Ps 123 4, לֹאֵעה is rendered "scourging" (the rendering given in Prov 12 22 to לֹאֵעה) from a totally different root and one much more nearly approximating the fundamental idea of the Eng. word "scorn." In Prov 29 8 and Isa 28 14 לֹאֵעה is rendered "scornful").

As a vb. the word is the tr given to לשׁנָה, "to mock." (Job 22 19; 22 21; Isa 22 19; 22 27; "all laugh to scorn"); כָּלָה = to scoff (Ezk 16 31, m. "Gr scophē", but text still "scorneth"); for the noun זָהָה, "laugh to scorn" (Ezk 25 2): skopē = to laugh; laugh at" (Job 39 7 18; 2 Ch 30 10, with the note זָהָה, "laugh to scoff" (RV "laughing-stock"); Job 12 4); לֹאֵעה = to scoff (as used in Ethical and religious connections) (Job 16 20; Prov 33 4, 9 12; all "scorn" in RV); in Prov 19 28 RV, not happily "make at". RV is warranted in substituting "scorn" for "scorn" because the context indicates some form of outward expression of scorn.

RV always (except Job 12 4; Sir 6 4; 1 Mac 10 70) retains "laugh to scorn" (2 K 19 21; 2 Ch 30 10; Neh 2 19; Job 22 19; Ps 22 7; Isa 37 22; Ezek 16 31; 32 32; 2 Esd 2 21; Jzh 12 12; Sir 12 17; 41 24; 2 Macc 10 17; Mt 5 14; Mk 6 40; Lk 8 53). The vb. in Apoc and the NT is usually καταχαίνω, καταγαίνω, but in Wisd 4 1 γεγένιον, γεγενεῖ; in Sir 13 7 καταμαχώνω, καταμαχωδάω; and in 2 Esd 2 21 ἀμαραντεῖ. In addition "scorn" is translated in Est 5 6; Job 39 7 18; 2 Esd 2 21 (contemno). It is also used of "mock at," but elsewhere invariably to "scorn.

Scornor is the tr of the participle of לֹאֵעה, and once of the participle of לֹאֵעה. For "scornor" RV everywhere substitutes—properly—"scougher." Outside of Prov (and Hos 2 7) the word is to be found only in Ps 1 2. The force of the word has been well indicated by Cheyne, who says that the "scorner [scouffer] is one who despises that which is holy and avoids the company of the noble 'wise men,' but yet in his own vain way seeks for truth, his character is marked by arrogance as of that the wise is characterized by devout caution."

W. M. McPheters

SCORPION, skōr'pi-ən (σκορπίον, ἄραβρον; of Arab. أَبِّر, 'abrab, "scorpion"); μαύδιθ 'ακραβήμι, the "ascent of Krakbam"; σκορπίος, skorpios. Note that the Gr and Heb may be akin; cf. omitting the vowels, 'kbr and skp). In Dt 8 15, we have, "who led thee through the great and terrible wilderness, wherein were fiery serpents [nādāšā šārdāp] and scorpions ['alqbrāb]."

Rehoboam (1 K 12 11 14; 2 Ch 10 11 14) says, "My father chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions." Ezekiel is told to prophesy to the children of Israel (2 6), and "Be not afraid of them, neither be afraid of their words, though brers and thorns are with thee, and thou dost dwell among scorpions." (The ascent of Krakbam), the north end of Wād-îl-'Arabah, S. of the Dead Sea, is mentioned as a boundary 3 t (Nu 34 4; Josh 15 5; Jdg 11 19; 2 K 18 20). In the Seventy (Lv 10 19), "Behold, I have given you authority to tread upon serpents and scorpions," and again in Lk 11 12 He says, "Or if he shall ask an egg, will he give him a scorpion?"

Note that we have here three doublets, the loaf and the stone, the fish and the serpent, and the egg and the scorpio, whereas in the passage in Mt (7 9 f) we have only the loaf and the stone and the fish and serpent. EB (s.v. "Scorpion") ingeniously seeks to bring Lk into nearer agreement with Mt by omitting from Lk the second doublet. From the context and the serpent, inasmuch as the several texts as authority for the omission, and reading ἑγρωτώ, ἀπαντήσω, ἂν, "Thou hast won, thy egg.

In Rev 9 2 10 there come out of the smoke of the abyss winged creatures (locusta, ἄγρωτα, ἄγρωτες) like war-horses with crowns of gold, with the faces of men, hair of women, teeth of lions, breasts of iron, and with streaming tails like scorpions. In Ecc 26 7 it is said of an evil wife, "He that taketh hold of her is as one that graspeth a scorpion." In 1 Mac 6 61 we find mention of "bees (σκοπίδα, σκοπιδία, diminutive of skorpio) to cast darts." In Plutarch skorpios is used in the same sense (Liddell and Scott, s.v. scorpion).

In the passage cited from Dt, and probably also in the name of the ascent of Krakbam, we find references to the abundance of scorpions, esp. in the warmer parts of the country. Though there is a Gr proverb, "Look for a scorpion under every stone," few would agree with the categorical statement of Tristram (NHB) that "every third stone is sure to conceal one."

Nevertheless, campers and people sleeping on the ground need to exercise care in order to avoid their stings, which, though often exceedingly painful for several hours, are seldom fatal. Occasionally the mere contact with the body of the scorpion may cause a painful redness of the skin, with itching and a feeling of burning. Scorpions are not proper insects, but belong with spiders, mites and ticks to the Arachnidae. The scorpions of Pal are usually 2 or 3 in. long. The short cephalothorax bears two powerful pincers or saws terminating with pincers, which make the creature look like a small crayfish or lobster, but four feet and a long, slender tail which carries the stinger. The rest of the body consists of the abdomen, a broad part continuous with the cephalothorax, and a slender part forming the tail which is clubbed at the end. The tail is usually carried curved over the back and is used for striking the prey into insensibility. Scorpions feed mostly on insects for which they lie in wait. The scorpion family is remarkable for having existed with very little change from the Silurian age to the present time.

It does not seem necessary to consider that the
words of Rehoboam (1 K 12 11, etc) refer to a whip that was called a scorpion, but rather that as the sting of a scorpion is worse than a lash, so his treatment would be harsher than his father's.

ALFRED ELY DAY

SCORPIONS, skôr'pi-ôn, CHASTHING WITH. See PUNISHMENTS, 3, (17); SCORPION.

SCOURGE, skôrj, SCOURGING, skôr'jing (mâstik, mësâs, mástîgo, mästîdô; in Acts 22 25 märstîgo, mästîsô; in Mk 15 15, Mt 27 26 párgiâ-lê, párgiâ, lêgô, lêoth). A Roman implement for severe bodily punishment. Horace calls it "horrible flagellum." It consisted of a handle, to which several cords or leather thongs were affixed, which were weighted with jagged pieces of bone or metal, to make the blow more painful and effective. It is comparable, in its horrid effects, only with the Russian knout. The victim was tied to a post (Acts 22 25) and the blows were applied to the back and loins, sometimes even, in the wanton cruelty of the executioner, to the face and the bowels. In the tense position of the body, the effect can easily be imagined. So hideous was the punishment that the victim could not faint and not rarely died under it. Eusebius draws a horribly realistic picture of the torture of scourging (HE, IV, 15). By its application secrets and confessions were wrung from the victim (Acts 22 24). It usually preceded capital punishment (v. 21). It was illegal to apply the flagellum to a Roman citizen (Acts 22 25), since the Porcian and Sempronian laws, 248 and 123 BC, although these laws were not rarely broken in the provinces (Tac. Hist. iv. 27; Cic. Verr. v. 6, 62; Jos. BJ, II, xiv, 9). As among the Russians today, the number of blows was not usually fixed, the severity of the punishment depending entirely on the commanding officer. In the punishment of Jews described in the words of Ps 129 3. Among the Jews the punishment of flagellation was well known since the Egyptian days, as the monuments abundantly testify. The word "scourge" is used in Lev 19 20, but ARV translates "punished," the original word bibbërîth expressing the idea of investigation. De 25 3 fixed the mode of a Jewish flogging and limits the number of blows to 40. Apparently the flogging was administered by a rod. The Syrians reintroduced true scourging into Jewish life, when Antiochus Epiphanes forced them by means of it to eat swine's flesh (2 Mac 6 30; 7 1). Later it was legalized by Jewish law and became customary (Mt 10 17; 23 34; Acts 22 19; 26 11), but the traditional limitation of the number of blows was still preserved. Says Paul in his "polish boasting": "in stripes above measure," "of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one," distinguishing it from the "beatings with rods," thrice repeated (2 Cor 11 23-25).

The other OT references (Job 5 21; 9 23; Isa 10 26; 28 15 18 [sôw, sôph]; Josh 23 13 [sôw, sôphê], sôphê) are figurative for "affliction." Notice the common use of metaphors in the phrase "over-flowing scourge" (Isa 28 15 18).

HENRY E. DOKSER

SCRABBLE, skrabl'l: Occurs only in 1 S 21 13, as the tr of rôs, tawâh: "David . . . feigned himself mad and scrawled on the doors of the gate." "To scrawble" (modern Eng. 'scrawl') is here to make unmeaning marks; tawâh means "to make a mark" from lâw, "a mark," esp. as a cross (Ezk 9 4), a signature (Job 31 35, see RV), the name of the letter َ (n), originally made in the form of a cross; RV m has "made marks" and LXX has tâmpaiâdâ, "to beat as the form," which the Hellenistic Jew Doder and others follow ("beat upon" or "drummed on the doors of the city," which seems more probable).

SCRECH, skrêch, OWL. See NIGHT-MONSTER.

SCRIBES, skrîbz: The existence of law leads necessarily to a profession whose business is the study and knowledge of the law; at any rate, if the law is extensive and complicated. At the time of Ezra and probably for some time after, this was chiefly the business of the priests. Ezra was both priest and scholar (נביא, sôphârêh). It was chiefly in the interest of the priestly cult that the most important part of the Pent  (P) was written. The priests were therefore also in the first instance the scholars and the guardians of the Law; but in the course of time this was changed. The more highly esteemed the Law became in the eyes of the people, the more its study and interpretation became a life-work by itself, and thus there developed a class of scholars who, though not priests, devoted themselves assiduously to the Law. These became known as the scribes, that is, the non-Clerical students of the Law. During the Hellenistic period, the priests, esp. those of the upper class, became tainted with the Hellenism of the age and frequently turned their attention to paganistic culture, thus neglecting the Law and its study. The scribes, on the other hand, devoted themselves assiduously to the Law. These became known as the scribes, that is, the non-Clerical students of the Law. In the NT they are usually called γραμματεία, grammatai, i.e. "students of the Scriptures," "scholars," corresponding to the Heb נביא, sôphârîm = ἀνωτάτοις ἔργα, differing in the words and thus they make a profession of literary studies, which, in this case, of course, meant chiefly the Law. Besides this general designation, we also find the specific word νομικοῦ, nômikoi, i.e. "students of the Law," "lawyers" (Mt 22 35; Lk 7 30; 10 25; 11 45.52; 14 3); and in so far as they do not only know the Law but also teach it they are called χατάκαλοι, χατακαλοί, "doctors of the Law" (Lk 5 17; Acts 5 34).

The extraordinary honors bestowed on these scholars on the part of the people are expressed in their honorary titles. Most common was the apppellative "rabbi" or "my lord." (Mt 23 7 and otherwise). This word of polite address gradually became a title. The word rabbanî (MK 10 31; Mt 20 16) is an extensive form, and was employed by the disciples to give expression to their veneration of Christ. In the Gr NT "rabbi" in τεταγμένος, kathêgôs, "teacher" (Mt 23 9 f).

From their students the rabbis demanded honors even surpassing those bestowed on parents. "Let the honor of thy friend border on the honor of thy teacher, and the honor of thy teacher on the fear of God" (ABBâb, 12). "The honor of thy teacher must surpass the honor bestowed on thy father; for son and father are both in duty bound to honor the teacher" (KRÎTHôTH 6 9). Everywhere the rabbis demanded the position of first rank (Mt 23 6f; Mk 12 38; Lk 11 31; 20 46). They defended that of the nobility. They wore στριάτα, στριάτα, "tunics," and these were the mark of the upper class.
Since the scribes were lawyers (see LAWYER), much of their time was occupied in teaching and in judicial functions, and both these activities must be pursued gratuitously. Rabbi Zadok said: "Make the knowledge of the Law neither a crown in which to glory nor a spade with which to dig." Hillel used to say: "He who employs the crown [of the Law] in teaching and in judicial functions, and in caring for his livelihood, that the judge should not receive presents or bribes was written in the Law (Ex 23 8; Dt 16 19); hence the Mish: "If anyone accept pay for rendering judgment, his judgment is null and void." The rabbis were therefore obliged to make their living by other means. Some of them, like Joseph ben Judah and his father, had inherited wealth; others pursued a handicraft besides their study of the Law. Rabbi Gamaliel II emphatically advised the pursuit of a business in addition to the pursuit of the Law. It is well known that the apostle Paul kept up his handicraft even after he had become a preacher of the gospel (Acts 18 3; 20 34; 1 Cor 4 12; 9 6; 2 Cor 11 7; 1 Thess 2 9; 2 Thess 3 8), and the same is reported of many rabbis. But in every instance the Law is not the work of the scribes; addition and warning is given not to overestimate the value of the ordinary avocation. It was a saying of Hillel: 'He that devotes himself to trade will not become wise.' The principle of gratitude was purely carried out in practice only in connection with the judicial activity of the scribes; hardly in connection with their work as teachers. Even the Gospels, in spite of the admonition that the disciples should give without pay because they had received without pay (Mt 10 8), nevertheless absolve the workman of his hire (Mt. 10 10; Lk 10 7); and Paul (1 Cor 9 14) states it as his just due that he receive his livelihood from those to whom he preaches the gospel, even though he makes use of this right only in exceptional cases (1 Cor 9 3-18; 2 Cor 11 8; Gal 6 6; Phil 4 10.18). Since this appears to have been the thought of the times, we are undoubtedly justified in assuming that the Jewish teachers of the Law also demanded pay for their services. Indeed, the admonitions above referred to, not to make instruction in the Law the object of self-interest, lead to the conclusion that gratitude was not the rule; and in Christ's philippies against the scribes and Pharisees He makes special mention of their greed (Mt 23 14). The scribes, though they ostensibly gave instruction in the Law gratuitously, they must have practised methods by which they indirectly secured their fees.

Naturally the place of chief influence for the scribes up to the year 70 AD was Judaea. But not only there were they to be found. Wherever the zeal for the law of the fathers was a perceptible force, they were indispensable; hence we find them also in Galilee (Lk 5 17) and in the Diaspora. In the Jewish epitaphs in Rome, dating from the latter days of the empire, *gemmatae* are frequently mentioned; and the Bab. scribes of the 5th and 6th cents. were the authors of the most monumental work of rabbinical Judaism—the Talmud.

Since the separation of the Pharisaic and the Sadducean tendencies in Judaism, the scribes generally belonged to the Pharisaic class; for this latter is none other than the party which recognized the interpretations or "traditions" which the scribes in the course of time had developed out of the body of the written Law and employed as the binding rule of life. Since, however, "scribes" are merely "students of the Law," there must also have been scribes of the Sadducean type; for it is not to be imagined that this party, which recognized only the written Law as binding, should not have had some opposing students in the other class. Indeed, various passages of the NT which speak of the "scribes of the Pharisees" (Mt 2 19; Lk 5 30; Acts 23 9) indicate that there were also "scribes of the Sadducees."

Under the reign and leadership of the scribes, it became the ambition of every Israelite to know more or less of the Law. The aim of education in family, school and study was "to dwell in the midst of the people of the Law. Even the common laborer should know what was written in the Law; and not only know it, but also do it. His entire life should be governed according to the norm of the Law, and, on the whole, this purpose was realized in a high degree. Jews owe to the scribes the rich endowment of our riches and our cities and our other goods, the Law remains our possession forever. And no Jew can be so far removed from the land of his fathers nor will he fear a hostile commander to such a degree that he would not fear his Law more than his commander." So loyal were the majority of the Jews toward their Law that they would gladly endure the tortures of the rack and even death for it. This frame of mind was due almost wholly to the systematic and wholehearted instruction of the scribes.

The motive underlying this enthusiasm for the Law was the belief in Divine retribution in the strictest judicial sense. The prophetic idea of a covenant which God had made with His select people was interpreted purely in the judicial sense. The covenant was a contract between God and His parties were mutually bound. The people are bound to observe the Divine Law literally and conscientiously; and, in return for this, God is in duty bound to render the promised reward in proportion to the services rendered. This applies to the people as a whole as well as to the individual. Services and reward must always stand in mutual relation to each other. He who renders great services may expect from the justice of God that he will receive great returns as his portion, while, on the other hand, every transgression also must be followed by its corresponding punishment.

The results corresponded to the motives. Just as the motives in the main were superficial, so the results were an exceedingly shallow view of religious and moral life. Religion was reduced to legal formality. All religious and moral life was dragged down to the level of law, and this must necessarily lead to the following results: (1) The individual is governed by the written Law, he is always under the Law; he has only evil results when applied in this realm. Law has the purpose of regulating the relations of men to each other according to certain standards. Its object is not the individual, but only the body of society. In the law, the individual must find the proper rule for his conduct toward society as an organism. This is a matter of obligation and of government on the part of society. But religion is not a matter of government; where it is found, it is a matter of freedom, of the choice and of the product. (2) By reducing the practice of religion to the form of law, all acts are placed on a par with each other. The motives are no longer taken into consideration, but only the deed itself. (3) From this it follows that the highest ethical attainment was the formal satisfaction of the Law. It was a matter of finical literalism. (4) Finally, moral life must, under such circumstances, lose its unity and be split up into manifold precepts and duties. Law always affords opportunity for casuistry, and it was in the development of the "interpretation of the Law," Jewish religious life through the "precepts of the elders" which called forth Christ's repeated denunciation of the work of the scribes.

**FRANK E. HIRSCH**

SCRIP, skrip: A word connected with "scrip," and meaning a "bag," either as made from a "scrip"
writers, and the description of them given by Herodotus in book IV of his history represents a race of savages, inhabiting a region of rather indefinite boundaries, north of the Black and Caspian seas and the Caucasus Mountains. They were nomads who neither plowed nor sowed (iv. 19), moving about in wagons and carrying their dwellings with them (ib. 46); they had the most filthy habits and never washed in water (ib. 75); they drank the blood of their annual victims in battle, and made napkins of the scalps and drinking bowls of the skulls of the slain (ib. 64–65). Their deities were many of them identified with those of the Greeks, but the most characteristic rite was the worship of the naked sword (ib. 62), and they sacrificed every hundredth man taken in war to this deity. War was their chief business, and they were a terrible scourge to the nations of Western Asia. They broke through the barrier of the Caspian in 632 BC and swept down like a swarm of locusts upon Media and Assyria, turning the fruitful fields into a desert; pushing across Mesopotamia, they ravaged Syria and were about to invade Egypt when Psammitichus I, who was besieging Ashdod, bought them off by rich gifts, but they remained for another 28 years, according to Herodotus. It is supposed that a company of them settled in Beth-shean, and from this circumstance it received the name Scythopolis. Various branches of the race appeared at different times, among the most noted of which were the Parthians (q.v.).

H. Poaten

**SCYTOPOLIS, sī-thopo'-lis, si-thop'-olis. See BETH-SHEAN.**

SEA, στηρίγμα, ἱερόν, θάλασσα, θάλασσα; in Acts 27 5 παλαιος, πελαγος): The Mediterranean is called ha-yam ha-gadol, "the great sea" (Nu 34 6; Josh 1 4; Ezek 47 10, etc); ha-yam ha-aharon, "the hinder," or "western sea" (Dt 11 24; 34 2; Joel 2 20; Zec 14 8); yam ʿphilim, "the sea of the Philistines" (Ex 23 31); AV translates translated yom ḫappeh in Ex 3 7 by "sea of Joppa," perhaps rightly.

The Dead Sea is called yam ha-melakh, "the Salt Sea" (Nu 34 3; Dt 3 17; Josh 3 16, etc); ha-yam ha-baadonim, "the east sea" (Ezek 18 17; Joel 3 20; Zec 14 17, ha-yam ha-gevulim, "the sea of the Arabah" (Dt 3 17; Josh 3 16; 2 14; 2 K 14 25).

The Red Sea is called yam ʿḥoph, lit. "sea of weeds" (Ex 10 19; Nu 14 25; Dt 1 1; Joel 2 10; Jgs 11 16; 1 K 9 26; Neh 9 9; Ps 106 7; Jer 49 21, etc); ṭebesarion, θησαυρος, thalassa, lit. "red sea" (Wisd 19 7; Acts 7 30; He 11 29); yam miryam, "the Egypt sea" (Isa 11 15).

Yém is used of the Nile in Nah 3 8 and probably also in Isa 19 5, as in modern Arab. baḥr, "sea," is used of the Nile and its affluents. Yem is often used for "west" or "western," as "look from the place where thou art, westward" (Gen 13 14); "western border" (Nu 34 6). Yám is used for "sea" in general (Ex 20 11); also for "molten sea" of the temple (1 K 7 23).

The Sea of Galilee is called knennereth, "Chimmereth" (Nu 34 11); kinnoroth, Chinnereth (A Josh 11 2); kinneneth, Chinnereth (1 K 15 20); yam knennereth, the sea of Chinnereth (Nu 34 11; Josh 13 27); yam knīneth, "the sea of Chinnereth" (Josh 12 3); ḥm knennereth, ἡ θάλασσα Gennesaret, "the lake of Gennesaret" (Lk 5 1); and ḫm knennereth, to ḫatrus Gennesaret, η θαλασσα τας Γαλαταιας, ἡ θαλασσα τας Γαλιλαιας, "the sea of Galilee;" (Mt 4 18; 15 29; Mk 1 16; 7 31; Jn 6 1); ḥm knennereth, the Tiberias, ἡ θαλασσα τας Σιβεριαδος, the "sea of Tiberias" (Jn 21 1; if Jn 6 1).
SEA, ADRIATIC, ã-dri-at’ic, ad-ri-at’ik. See Adrià.

SEA, BRAZEN, brâ’z-n. See Sea, The Moltèn.

SEA, DEAD; EASTERN, ës-term. See Dead Sea.

SEA, FORMER, för’mér. See Dead Sea; Former.

SEA, HINDER, hin’dr; UTMOST, ût’most; UTTERMOST, ût’er-most; WESTERN, wes-térn. See Mediterranean Sea.

SEA, MEDITERRANEAN. See Mediterranean Sea.

SEA-MEW, só’mû (םנָפָפ, shābaph; lápos, láron; Lat Larus canus): The sea-gull. Used by modern translators in the list of abominations in the place of the cuckoo (Lev 11:16; Dt 14:15). It is very probable that the sea-gull comes closer to the bird intended than the Cuckoo (q.v.). The sea-gull is a “slender” bird, but not “lean” as the root shābaph implies. However, with its stretch of wing and restless flight it gives this impression. Gulls are common all along the Mediterranean coast and around the Sea of Galilee. They are thought to have more intelligence than the average bird, and to share with some eagles, hawks, vultures and the raven the knowledge that if they find a mollusk they cannot break they can carry it aloft and drop it on the rocks. Only a wise bird learns this. Most feathered creatures pick at an unyielding surface a few times and then seek food elsewhere. There are two reasons why these birds went on the abomination list: To a steady diet of fish they add carrion. Then they are birds of such nervous energy, so exhaustless flight, so daring in flying directly into the face of fierce winds, that the Moslems believed them to be the spirits of the dammed. Moses was reared and educated among the Egyptians, and the laws he formulated often are tinged by traces of his early life. History fails to record any instance of a man reared in Egypt who permitted the killing of a gull, ibis, or hoopoe. 

GENE STRATTON-PORTER


ALFRED ELY DAY

SEA OF CHINNERRETH, kin’t-ret’h. See Galile, Sea of.

SEA OF GALILEE. See Galilee, Sea of.

SEA OF GLASS. See Glass, Sea of.

SEA OF JAZER (잠자르), יָם יָשָׁר: This is a scribal error (Jer 48 32) ים (“sea”) being accidentally imported from the preceding clause. See Jazer; Sea.

SEA OF JOPPA. See Mediterranean Sea.

SEA OF LOT. See Dead Sea; Lake.

SEA OF SODOM (Sodomish, sod-ôm-r’ésh). See Dead Sea.

SEA OF THE ARABAH. See Dead Sea.

SEA OF THE PHILISTINES. See Mediterranean Sea.

SEA OF THE PLAIN (Arabah, a’r’a-ba). See Dead Sea.

SEA OF TIBERIAS, ti-bè’ri-æ. See Galilee, Sea of.

SEA, RED. See Red Sea.

SEA, SALT. See Dead Sea.

SEA, THE. See Mediterranean Sea; Sea, The Great.

SEA, THE GREAT (הֹנַע הָנָב, ha-yám ha-nābāh): This is the name given to the Mediterranean, which formed the western boundary of Pal (Nu 34 6; Josh of the Sea 15 12; 47; Ezk 47 19f; 48 28). It is also called “the hinder sea” (Heb ha-yám ha-abbānîm), i.e. the western sea (Dt 11 24; 34 2; Jos 2 20; Zec 14 8), and “the sea of the Philis” (Ex 23 31), which, of course, applies esp. to the part washing the shore of Philistia, from Jaffa southward. Generally, when the word “sea” is used, and no other is definitely indicated, the Mediterranean is intended (Gen 49 12; Nu 13 20, etc.). It was the largest sheet of water with which the Hebrews had any acquaintance. Its glistening mirror, stretching away to the sunset, could be seen from many an inland height.

It buckled large in the minds of the landsmen—for Israel produced few mariners—impressing itself upon their speech, so that “seaward!”

2. Israel was the common term for “westward” and the Sea (Ex 26 22; Josh 5 1, etc.). Its mystery was wondrously unfolded to the Jews as the storm, and the sound of “sorrow on the sea,” borne to their upland ears, infected them with a strange dread of its wide waters, to which the seer of Patmos gave the last Scriptural expression in his vision of the new earth, where “the sea is no more” (Rev 21 1).

Along the coast lay the tribal territories assigned to Asher, Zebulun, Manasséh, Dan and Judáh. Many of the cities along the shore were ports and their commerce thrived at and reigned, coasting, for the making of harbors. The one seaport of which in ancient times the Hebrews seem to have made much use was Joppa—the modern Jaffa (2 Ch 2 16, etc.). From this place, probably, argosses of Solomon turned their prows westward. Here, at least,
Sealskin
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“ships of Tarshish” were wont to set out upon their adventurous voyages (Jon 1:3). The ships on this sea figure in the beautiful vision of Isaiah (60:8 f.). See ACCO; JERUSALEM.

The boy Jesus, from the heights above Nazareth, must often have looked on the waters of the great sea, as they broke in foam on the curving shore, from the roots of Carmel to the point at Acre. Once only in His journeys, so far as we know, did He approach the sea, namely on His ever-memorable visit to the “borders of Tyre and Sidon” (Mt 16:21; Mk 7:24). The sea, in all its moods, was well known to the great apostle of the Gentiles. The three shipwrecks, which he suffered (2 Cor 11:25), were doubtless due to the power of its angry billows over the frail craft of those old days. See PAUL.

The land owes much to the great sea. During the hot months of summer, a soft breeze from the water springs up at dawn, fanning all the seaward face of the Central Palestine to Range. At sunset the chilled air the sea ships down the slopes and the higher stages drift toward the uplands, charged with priceless moisture, giving rise to the refreshing dews which make the Palestinian morning so sweet. See, further, MEDITERRANEAN SEA. W. EWING

SEA, THE MOLTEN, מֹלֶטְן, or BRAZEN (מִלְטְנָן, מִלְטְטָן, מִלְטַטָן, מִלְטַטָן): This was a large brazen (bronze) reservoir for water which stood in the court of Solomon’s Temple between the altar and the temple porch, against the S. (1 K 7:23–26; 2 Ch 4:2–5:10). The bronze from which it was made is stated in 1 Ch 18:8 to have been taken by David from the cities Tibhath and Cun. It replaced the laver of the tabernacle, and, like that, was used for storing the water in which the priests washed their hands and their feet (cf Ex 30:18; 38:8). It rested on 12 brazen (bronze) oxen, facing in four groups the four quarters of heaven. For particulars of shape, size and ornamentation, see TEMPLE. The “sea” served its purpose till the time of Ahaz, who took away the brazen oxen, and placed the sea upon a pavement (2 K 16:17). It is recorded that the oxen were afterward taken to Babylon (Jer 52:20). The sea itself shared the same fate, being first broken to pieces (2 K 25:13:16).

W. SHAW CALDECOTT

SEA, WESTERN, western. See MEDITERRANEAN SEA.

SEAH, se‘ā (םֵיא, שֵיא): A dry measure equal to about one and one-half pecks. See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.


A seal is an instrument of stone, metal or other hard substance (sometimes set in a ring), on which is engraved some device or figure, and is used for making an impression on some soft substance, as clay or wax, affixed to a document or other object, in token of authenticity.

The use of seals goes back to a very remote antiquity, esp. in Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria. Herodotus (i.195) records the Babylon custom of wearing signs. In Babylonia the seal generally took the form of a cylinder cut in clay or some hard stone, which was bored through from end to end and a cord passed through it. The design, often accompanied by the owner’s name, was engraved on the curved part. The signet was then suspended by the cord round the neck or wrist (cf RV “cord,” in Gen 39:18; “signet on heart . . . upon thine arm,” i.e. one Antiquity seal hanging down from the neck and another round the wrist; Cant 8:6).

In Egypt, too, as in Babylonia, the cylinder was the earliest form used for the purpose of a seal; but this form was in Egypt gradually superseded by the scarab (= beetle-shaped) as the prevailing type. Other forms, such as the cone-shaped, were also in use. From the earliest period of civilization the finger-ring on which some distinguishing badge was engraved was in use as a convenient way of carrying the signet, the earliest extant rings being those found in Egypt tombs. Other ancient peoples, such as the Phoenicians, also used seals. From the East the custom passed into Greece and other western countries. Devices of a variety of sorts were in use at Rome, both by the emperors and by private individuals. In ancient times, almost every variety of precious stones was used for seals, as well as cheaper material, such as limestone or terracotta. In the West wax came early into use as the material for receiving the impression of the seal, but in the ancient East clay was the medium used (cf Job 38:14). Pigment and ink also came into use.

That the Israelites were acquainted with the use in Egypt of signets set in rings is seen in the statement that Pharaoh delivered to Joseph his royal signet as a token of deputed authority (Gen 41:41). They were also acquainted with the use of seals among the Persians and Medes (Est 3:12; 8:10; Dnl 6:17). The Hebrews themselves used them at an early period, the first recorded instance being Gen 38:15:25, where the patriarch Judah is said to have pledged his word to Tamar by leaving her his signet, cord and staff. We have evidence of engraved signets being in important use among them in early times in the description of the two stones on the high priest’s ephod (Ex 28:11; 39:6), of his golden plate (Ex 28:36; 39:30), and breastplate (39:14). Ben-Sira mentions as a distinct occupation the work of engraving on signets.
(Sir 38:27). From the case of Judah and the common usage in other countries, we may infer that every Hebrew of any standing wore a seal. In the case of the signet ring, it was usual to wear it on one of the fingers of the right hand (Jer 22:24). The Hebrews do not seem to have developed an original type of signets. The seals so far discovered in Palestine to prove that the predominating type was the Babylonian, and that this use continued to the Persian era and the Ptolemies (1 Macc 6:15). But there was a later change, and the new type, which was more like the one used in Egypt, was introduced into the Jews by the Hellenists. (1) Of the important uses of sealing in antiquity was to give a proof of authenticity and authority to letters, royal commands, etc.

3. Uses of Seals: It served the purposes of a modern signature at a time when the art of writing was not common to many. Thus Jezebel "wrote letters in Ahab's name, and sealed them with his seal" (1 K 21:8); the written commands of Ahaseurus were "sealed with the king's ring," "for the writing which is written in the king's name, and sealed with the king's ring, may no man reverse" (Est 8:10; 3:12). (2) Allied to this is the formal ratification of a transaction or covenant. Jeremiah sealed the deeds of the field which he bought from Hanamel (Jer 32:10-14); he also sealed an alliance with Hanamel. His seal, however, had the form of a cuneiform tablet with his name written on it; it was not used as an impression (Isa 44:3-5; Jer 32:14; 44:3). In sealing the roll, it was wrapped round with flaxen thread or string, then a lump of clay was attached to it impressed with a seal. The seal would have to be broken by an authorized person before the book could be read (Rev 5:2,5,9; 6:1,3, etc.). (4) Sealing was a badge of deputed authority and power, as when a king handed over his signet ring to one of his officers (Gen 41:42; Est 3:10; 8:2; 1 Mac 6:15). (5) Closed doors were often sealed to prevent the entrance of any unauthorized person.

So the door of the lion's den (Dan 6:17; Bel and the Dragon) was locked with a seal. So we read of the chief priests and Pharaoh sealing the stone shut at the mouth of Our Lord's tomb in order to "make the sepulchre sure" against the intrusion of the disciples (Mt 27:60). Cf. the sealing of the abyss to prevent Satan's escape (Rev 20:3). A door was sealed by stretching a cord over the stone which blocked the entrance, spreading clay or wax on the cord, and then impressing it with a seal. (6) To any other object might a seal be affixed, as an official mark of ownership; e.g., a large number of clay stoppers of wine jars are still preserved, on which seal impressions of the cylinder type were stamped, by rolling the cylinder along the surface of the clay when it was still soft (Cant 8:14).

II. Metaphorical Use of the Term. —The word "seal," both subst. and vb., is often used figuratively for the act or token of authentication, confirmation, proof, security, completion or possession. Seal was not to be forgotten by God, but treasured and stored up with Him against the sinner, under a seal (Dt 32:34; Job 14:17). A lover's signet is the emblem of love as an inalienable possession (Cant 8:6); an unrepentant sinner is "a spring shut up, a fountain sealed" (Cant 4:12). To seal is sometime a metaphor for sorcery. That which is beyond the comprehension of the unintiated is sealed to be a "book that is sealed" (Isa 49:14; see also the book of seven seals, Rev 5:1ff.). Daniel is bidden to "shut up the words" of his prophecy "and seal the book, even to the time of the end," i.e. to keep his prophecy a secret till it shall be revealed (Dan 11:39; cf. Rev 10:4). Elsewhere it stands for the ratification of prophecy (Isa 29:14). The exact meaning of "book that is sealed" is sometimes ambiguous (as in Job 33:16; Ezek 28:12). In the NT the main ideas in the figure are those of authentication, ratification, and security. The believer in Christ is said to "set his seal to this, that God is true" (1 John 3:33), i.e. to attest the veracity of God, to stamp it with the believer's own endorsement and confirmation. The Father has sealed the Son, i.e. authenticated Him as the bestower of life-giving bread (John 6:27). The circumcision of Abraham was a "sign" and "seal," an outward ratification, of the righteousness of faith which he had already received while uncircumcised (Rom 4:11; cf. the prayer offered at the circumcision of a child, "Blessed be He who sanctified His beloved from the womb, and sealed His name, sealed His seal, sealed His offering with the sign of a holy covenant"; also 1 Thess 5:28: "The seal of circumcision is in your flesh as it was sealed in the flesh of Abraham"). Paul describes his act in making over to the saints at Jerusalem the contribution of the Gentiles as "sealing them to this fruit" (Rom 15:8); the meaning of the phrase is doubtful, but the figure seems to be based on sealing as ratifying a commercial transaction, expressing Paul's intention formally to hand over to the churches at Jerusalem the spiritual blessings which through him the Gentiles had enjoyed, and to mark it as their own property. Paul's converts are the "seal," the authentic confirmation, of his apostleship (1 Cor 9:2). God, by His Spirit indicates who are His, as the owner sets his seal on his property; and just as documents are sealed up until the proper time for opening them, so Christians are sealed up by the Holy Spirit "unto the day of redemption" (Eph 1:13; 4:30; 2 Cor 1:22). Ownership, security, and authentication are implied in the words, "The firm foundation of God standeth, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his" (2 Tim 2:19). The seal of God on the foreheads of His servants (Rev 7:2-4) marks them, not as His own, but as God's "seals of the external security, whereas those that have not the seal of God on their foreheads" (Rev 9:4) have no such guaranty.

On the analogy of the rite of circumcision (see above), the term "seal" (σφαράγιον) was at a very early period applied to Christian baptism. But there is no sufficient ground for referring such passages as Eph 1:13; 4:30; 2 Cor 1:22 to the rite of baptism (as some do). The use of the metaphor in connection with baptism came after NT times (early instances are given in Cerin, "in the foot of 2 Clem 7:6"). Harnack and Hatch maintain that the name "seal" for baptism was taken from the mysteries, but Anschel and Sander-Headlam hold that it was borrowed from the Jewish view of circumcision as a seal. See MYSTERIES.

D. MIALL EDWARDS

SEALED, Seal, Fountain: These words, applied to the bride (Cant 4:12), find their explanation under Seal (q.v.). Anything that was to be authorized only protected by water was one of the most precious things, as in the East, fountains and wells were often sealed (Gen 29:3; Prov 5:15-18).

SEALSKIN, seal-skin: The rendering of RV (Ex 26:5; Eze 16:10) for מַעַלְקָה, "or tashah, RVm "pangur-skin," AV "kalgder's skin." A seal, Monachus albidens, is found in the Mediterranean, though not in the Red Sea, but it is likely
that *tahosh* means the dungon, which is found in the Red Sea. See *Bagdad; Porpoise*.

**SEAM, sēn, SEAMLESS, sēn-es**: The coat or inner garment (*χαλέν* chlōn) of Jesus is described in 14:12 as "without seam" (*ἀκατάστρεφον*, ἀρραφός), i.e. woven in one piece.

**SEAR, sēr**: In 1 Tim 4:2 for *κατασκαλίζω* kataskalίζω, "burn with a hot iron" (cf. "cauterizer"); AV "having their conscience seared with a hot iron," and RV "having their conscience seared in this case means "made insensible," like the surface of a deep burn after heating. The vb., however, probably means "brand" (so RV). "Criminals are branded on their forehead, so that all men may know their infamy. The consciences of certain men are branded just as truly, so that there is an inward consciousness of hypocrisy." See the comns.

**SEARCH, sērch**: Some peculiar senses are:
1. In the books of Moses, esp. in Num, "searching out the land" means to spy out (*γνωρίζειν*, γνωρίζεται), to investigate carefully, to examine with a view to giving a full and accurate report on. (2) When applied to the Scriptures, as in Ezr 4:15.19 (*ἀνακάλυψις*, ἀνακαλύπτω); Jn 5:39; 1 Pet 1:11 (*κατασκαλίζω*, κατασκαλίζεται); to examine, to study out the meaning. In Acts 1:27; 20:27; 21:9; "searching" (3) (*ἀνακάλυψις*, *ἀνασκαλύψις*) of AV. See SEARCHINGS.
2. "Search out" often means to study critically, to investigate carefully, e.g. Job 8:8; 29:16; Ezek 1:13; Lam 3:40; Mt 2:8; 1 Cor 2:10; 1 Pet 1:10. (4) When the word is applied to God's searching the heart or spirit, it means His opening up, laying bare, disclosing what was hidden, e.g. 1 Ch 28:9; Ps 44:21; 139:1; Prov 20:27; Jer 17:10; Rom 8:27.

**SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES**: The sentence beginning with *διασκεδάζειν*, διασκεδάζοντα, in Jn 5:39 AV has been almost universally regarded as meaning "Search the scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life." But one cannot read as far as *διασκεδάζειν*, διασκεδάζοντα, without feeling that there is something wrong with the ordinary version. This vb. is at least a disturbing element in the current of thought (if not superfluous), and only when the first vb. is taken as an indicative does the meaning of the writer become clear. The utterance is not a command, but a declaration: "Ye search the scriptures, because ye think that in them," etc. Robert Barclay as early as 1675, in his *Apology for the True Christian Divinity* (91 f), refers to two scholars before him who had handed down the correct tradition: "Moreover, that place may be taken in the indicative mood, Ye search the Scriptures, which interpretation the Gr word will bear, and so Pasor supposed, which by the reproof following seemeth also to be genuine interpretation, as Cyrilus long ago hath observed." So Dr. Edwin A. Abbott, in his *Johannine Grammar* (London, 1906, §2439 [i]). See also *Transactions American PhIlological Association*, 1901, 64f. J. E. HARRY

**SEARCHINGS, sērch'zings** *(t)kra'laḥ, bāšēr [lōh], from bāšar, to "search," "explore," "examine thoroughly"*: In the song of Deborah the Reubenites are taunted because their great resolves of heart, bāšēr [lōh], led to nothing but great "searching of heart, bāšēr [lōh], and no activity other than to remain among their flocks (Jgs 5:15f.). The first of the two Heb expressions so emphatically contrasted (though questioned by commentators on the authority of 5 MSS as a corruption of the second) can with reasonable certainty be interpreted "acts prescribed by one's understanding" (cf. the expressions hākham lēb, mibbāh lēb, in which the heart is looked upon as the seat of the understanding). The second expression may mean either irresolution or hesitation based on selfish motives, as the heart was also considered the seat of the feelings, or answerability to God (cf Jer 17:10; Prov 25:3); this rendering would explain the form lēhaphāyāh in Jgs 5:16, lit. "for the water courses of Reuben, great the searchings of heart!"

**SEASONS, sēz'z'nz** [summer; *γαύρ*, kagyr, Chald ḫayyī, ḫayyī [Dnl 2:35]; ἄπος, theros; winter; *γεωργία*, gevĪroγία] The four seasons in Pal are not so marked as in more northern countries, summer gradually fading into winter and winter into summer. The range of temperature is not great. In the Bible we have no reference to spring or autumn; the only seasons mentioned are "summer and winter" (Gen 8:22; Ps 74:17; Zec 14:8).

Winter is the season of rain lasting from November to May. The winter is past; the rain is over (20:24). Paul asks Timothy to "come before winter" (2 Tim 4:2). It is the season of harvesting and threshing (Dnl 2:35). "He that gathereth in summer is a wise son" (Prov 10:9). See Cold, Heat, Astronomy, I, 5.

**SEAT, sēt**: This word is used to translate the Heb words בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר, bāšā; סא网站地图, sabāh (Gen 10:7; 1 Ch 1:9); Gr ἁδῶν, but B has ἁδῶν, ἁδῶν; in Isral 1:17). The first son of Israel's brothers 1. Forms of being: Havilah, Sabtah, Raamah, and Name, and Sabtechah. In Ps 72:10 and Isra 43:3 Parentage (where the Gr has ἀδῶν, ἀδῶν, of Seba Seba is mentioned with Egypt and Ethiopia, and must therefore have been a southern people. In Isra 45:14 we meet with the gentile form, ἀδῶν, ἀδῶν (Sabaētou, Sabaētou), rendered "Sabaæans," who are described as "men of stature" (i.e. tall), and were to come over to Cyrus in chains, and acknowledge that God was in him—their merchandise, and that of the Ethiopians, and the labor of Egypt, were to be his.
Their country is regarded as being, most likely, the district of Saba, N. of Adulis, on the west coast of the Red Sea. There is just a possibility that the Saba River, stretching from the coast to the Zambezi and the Limpopo, which was utilized as a waterway by the states in that region, though, through sitting, not suitable now, may contain a trace of the name, and perhaps testifies to still more southern extensions of the power and influence of the Sebaian. (See Th. Bent, The Ruined Cities of Mashonaland, 1892.) The ruins of this tract are regarded as being the works of those other than the black negro of the country. Dillmann, however, suggests (on Gen 10 7) that the people of Saba were another branch of the Cushites E. of Napatia by the Arabian Sea, of which Strabo (xvi. 4, 8, 10) and Ptolemy (iv. 7, 7 f.) give information. See SHEBA and HDS, s.v.

T. G. PINCHES

SEBAM, se'bamm (שְׁבָם), s'h'baham; se'babam, Sebamb; AV Shebam: A town in the upland pasture land given to the tribes of Reuben and Gad. It is named along with Heshbon, Eleach and Nebo (Nu 32 39). It is probably the same place as Sibmah (AV “Shibmah” inJer 49 22). It also gives a city of Moab in the land of Gilead which fell to the tribe of Reuben. Jerome (Comm. in Isa 5) says it was about 500 paces from Heshbon, and he describes it as one of the strong places of that region. It may be represented by the modern STwia, which stands on the south side of Wady Hissân, about 2 miles from Hissân. The ancient ruins are considerable, with large sarcophagi; and in the neighboring rock wine presses are cut (Pepf., “Eastern Pal., 220 f.”). W. EWING

SEBAT, se-bâ't, se'bat (זֶבָּת). See SHEBAT.

SECACAH, se-kâ'ka, sek'a-kâ (שֶׁכַּקָּה), se'khâkah; B, A, 'kkofâ, 'kkôfâ; A, Zcovych, Sochechel: One of the 12 cities “in the wilderness of Judah” (Josh 15 61), that is, in the uncultivated lands to the W. of the Dead Sea, where a scanty pasture is still obtained by wandering Bedouin tribes. There are many signs in this district of more settled habitation in ancient times, but the name Seacah is lost. Conder proposed the Kh. el Dikkeh (also called Kh. es Sikkah), “the ruin of the path,” some 2 miles S. of Bethany. Though an ancient site, it is too near the inhabited area; the name, too, is uncertain (Pepf., III, 111, Sh XVII).

E. W. G.MASTERMAN

SECHENIAS, sek-ê-ñ'as: (1) (A, Xcovychas, Sechenias; omitted in B and Swete): 1 Ess 8 29 = “Shecaniah” in Ezr 8 3; the arrangement in Ezr is different. (2) (A, Sechenias, but B and Swete, Eleciasia, Elecchionias): Name of a person who went up at the head of a family in the return with Ezra (1 Ess 8 32) = “Shecaniah” in Ezr 8 5.

SCHU, se'chu (שֶׁכֶה), se'khâ. See SCHU.

SECOND COMING, sek'und kam'ung. See PAROUSIA; ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NT, V.

SECOND DEATH. See DEATH; ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NT, X, (6).

SECOND SABBATH. See Sabbath, Second.

SECONDARYLY, sek'un-da-ri-li: AV for sé'ropar, deuteron (1 Cor 12 28). Probably without distinction from “secondly” (so RV, and so AV also for deuteron in 1 Cor 23 23). Still AV may have wished to emphasize that the prophets have a lower rank than the apostles.

SECRET, sek'ret: In Ezk 7 27, “secret” for šophan, “hide,” “treasure.” A correct tr tron. They shall be there a man cherished place (Jerus), and there is no reference to the Holy of Holies. The other uses of “secret” in RV are obvious, but RV’s corrections of AV in Jgs 13 18; 1 S 5 9; Job 16 11 should be noted.

SECT, sect (ἀἵρεσις, hairesis): “Sect” (Lat secta, from sequi, “to follow”) is in the NT the tr of hairesis, from hairê, “to take,” “to choose”; also τρε “heresy,” not heresy in the later ecclesiastical sense, but a school or party, a sect, without any bad meaning attached to it. The word is applied to schools of philosophy; to the Pharisees and Sadducees among the Jews who adhered to a common religious faith and worship; and to the Christians. It is τρ “sect” (Acts 5 17, of the Sadducees; 15 5, of the Pharisees; 24 1, of the Pharisees; 28 22, of the Christians); also RV 24 14 (AV and ERVm “heresy”), “After the Way which they call a sect, so serve I the God of our fathers” (just as the Pharisees were “a sect”); it is τρ “heresies” (1 Cor 13 19, “sects,” AV “factions,” m “Gr ‘heresies’); RV reverses the ARV text and margin; Gal 5 20, ARV “parties,” m “heresies”; RV reverses text and margin; 2 Pet 2 1, “damnable heresies,” RV “destructive heresies,” m “sects of perdition”); the “sect” in itself might be harmless; it was the teaching or principles which should be followed by those sects which would make them “destructive.” Hairesis occurs in 1 Mace 8 30 (“They shall do it at their pleasure,” i.e. “choice”); of LXX Lev 26 25, 21. See HERESY.

W. L. WALKER

SECU, se'ku (שֶׁכִּה), sekhâ; B, iv se'phel, et se'phel, iv Sokel; AV Sechu: This name occurs only in the account of David’s visit to Samuel (1 S 19 22). Saul, we are told, went to “Ramah, and came to the great wood that is in Secu,” where he inquired after Samuel and David. It evidently lies between the residence of Saul at Gibeah and Ramah. It is impossible to come to any sure conclusion regarding it. Conder suggested its identification with Khirbet Sowkeshek, which lies to the S. of Bireh. This is possible, but perhaps we should read with LXX B, “He came to the cistern of the threshing-floor that is on the bare hill” (en to Sephel). The threshing-floors in the East are naturally on high exposed ground where this is possible, and often form part of the area whence water in the rainy season is conducted to cisterns. This might have been a place actually within the city of Ramah.

W. EWING

SECUNDUS, se-kun'dus (WH, Σκοουδος, Sekouodos, TH, Σκοουδος, Sekoudos): A Thessalonian who was among those who accompanied Paul from Greece to Asia (Acts 20 4). They had preceded Paul and waited for him at Troas. If he were one of the representatives of the churches in Macedonia and Greece, including the church contributions to Jerus (Acts 24 17; 2 Cor 8 23), he probably accompanied Paul as far as Jerus. The name is found in a list of polities on a Thessalonian inscription.

SECURE, se-kū'ri, SECURITY, se-kū'-ri-ti: The word בַּעֲרָב, and its derivatives in Heb point to se-
curity, either real or imaginary. Thus we read of a host that “was secure” (Jgs 8 11) and of those that “provoked God [and] are secure” (Job 12 6); but also of a security that rests in hope and is safe (Job 18 10). The NT words ἀσφαλέω, πεποιθημένος, used in Mt 28 14 [AV “secure you”], guarantee the safety of the soldiers, who witnessed against themselves, in the telling of the story of the disappearance of the body of Christ.

Securely is used in the sense of “trustful,” “not anticipating danger” (Prov 3 29; Mic 2 8; Eccles 4 15).

The word ἀσφαλέω, ἀσφαλέων, πεποιθημένος, used in Mt 28 14 [AV “secure you”], guarantee the safety of the soldiers, who witnessed against themselves, in the telling of the story of the disappearance of the body of Christ.

Securely is used in the sense of “trustful,” “not anticipating danger” (Prov 3 29; Mic 2 8; Eccles 4 15).

The word ἀσφαλέω, ἀσφαλέων, πεποιθημένος, used in Mt 28 14 [AV “secure you”], guarantee the safety of the soldiers, who witnessed against themselves, in the telling of the story of the disappearance of the body of Christ.

Securely is used in the sense of “trustful,” “not anticipating danger” (Prov 3 29; Mic 2 8; Eccles 4 15).

The word ἀσφαλέω, ἀσφαλέων, πεποιθημένος, used in Mt 28 14 [AV “secure you”], guarantee the safety of the soldiers, who witnessed against themselves, in the telling of the story of the disappearance of the body of Christ.

Securely is used in the sense of “trustful,” “not anticipating danger” (Prov 3 29; Mic 2 8; Eccles 4 15).

The word ἀσφαλέω, ἀσφαλέων, πεποιθημένος, used in Mt 28 14 [AV “secure you”], guarantee the safety of the soldiers, who witnessed against themselves, in the telling of the story of the disappearance of the body of Christ.

Securely is used in the sense of “trustful,” “not anticipating danger” (Prov 3 29; Mic 2 8; Eccles 4 15).

The word ἀσφαλέω, ἀσφαλέων, πεποιθημένος, used in Mt 28 14 [AV “secure you”], guarantee the safety of the soldiers, who witnessed against themselves, in the telling of the story of the disappearance of the body of Christ.

Securely is used in the sense of “trustful,” “not anticipating danger” (Prov 3 29; Mic 2 8; Eccles 4 15).

The word ἀσφαλέω, ἀσφαλέων, πεποιθημένος, used in Mt 28 14 [AV “secure you”], guarantee the safety of the soldiers, who witnessed against themselves, in the telling of the story of the disappearance of the body of Christ.

Securely is used in the sense of “trustful,” “not anticipating danger” (Prov 3 29; Mic 2 8; Eccles 4 15).

The word ἀσφαλέω, ἀσφαλέων, πεποιθημένος, used in Mt 28 14 [AV “secure you”], guarantee the safety of the soldiers, who witnessed against themselves, in the telling of the story of the disappearance of the body of Christ.

Securely is used in the sense of “trustful,” “not anticipating danger” (Prov 3 29; Mic 2 8; Eccles 4 15).

The word ἀσφαλέω, ἀσφαλέων, πεποιθημένος, used in Mt 28 14 [AV “secure you”], guarantee the safety of the soldiers, who witnessed against themselves, in the telling of the story of the disappearance of the body of Christ.
ing simply to the (now superseded) science of the times.

Burtton Scott Easton

SEER, sē'ēr, sēr: The word in EV represents two Heb. words, הָשָּׁא, rēch (1 Sg 9.11.18.19; 2 Sg 15 27; 1 Ch 9 22, etc.), and וי, hōzēk (2 Sg 24 11; 2 K 17 13; 1 Ch 21 9; 25 5; 29 29, etc.). The former designation is from the ordinary vb. "to see;" the latter is connected with the vb. used of prophetic vision. It appears from 1 Sg 9 9 that 'seer' (rēch) was the older name for those who, after the regular prophetic orders, were called "prophets." It is not just, however, to speak of the "seers" or "prophets" of Samuel's time as on the level of mere fortune-tellers. What insight or vision they possessed is traced to God's Spirit. Samuel was the rēch by preeminence, and the name is little used after his time. Individuals who bear the title "seer" (hōzēk) are mentioned in connection with the kings and as historiographers (2 Sg 24 11; 1 Ch 21 9; 25 5; 29 29; 2 Ch 9 29; 12 15; 19 2, etc.), and distinction is sometimes made between "prophets" and "seers" (2 K 17 13; 1 Ch 29 29, etc.). Hävernick thinks that "seer" denotes one who does not belong to the regular prophetic order (Intro to OT, 50 f., ET), but it is not easy to fix a precise distinction. See PROPHESY, PROPHECY.

James Orr

SEETHÉ, sēth: Old Eng. for "boil!"; past tense, "sood" (Gen 29 29), past participle, "sodden" (Lam 4 10). See Ex 23 19 AV.

SEGUB, sē'gub (םֶגֵע, sēghabh [Kî transl., hē'gh, sēghabh [Kî transl.]; B, Zeyōb, Zegob; A, Zeyōb, Segob):

(1) The youngest son of Hiel, the builder of Jericho (1 K 15 34). The death of Segub is probably connected with the primitive custom of laying foundations with blood, as, indeed, skulls were found built in with the brickwork when the tower of Bel at Nippur was excavated. See Gezer. If the death of the two sons was based on the custom just mentioned, the circumstance was deliberately obscured in the present account. The death of Segub may have had the death of Hiel's eldest and youngest sons with a curse said to have been pronounced by Joshua to the city that should venture to rebuild Jericho (Josh 6 26).

(2) Son of Herson and father of Jair (1 Ch 2 21). Horace J. Wolfe

SEIR, sē'îr:

(1) (סֵיֵיר, har sē'îr, "Mt. Seir") [Gen 14 6, etc]. רַעְשָׂא, סַנְא, סַעְוָה (Gen 38 3; Deut 29 3). אִשֶּׁר סֵעְלִי, יִשְׂרָא (ya Şer, ge Şer): In Gen 32 3 "the land of Seir" is equated with "the field of Edom." The Mount and the Land of Seir are alternative appellations of the mountainous tract which runs along the eastern side of the Arabah, occupied by the descendants of Esau, who succeeded the ancient Horites (Gen 14 6; 36 20), "cave-dwellers," in possession. For a description of the land see Edom.

(2) (סֵיֵיר, har sē'îr; B, 'Assād, Assār, A, Sēdār, Sēdār): A landmark on the boundary of Judah (Josh 15 10), not far from Kiriath-jearim and Chesalon. The name means "shaggy," and probably refers to a wooded height. It may be that the rise of the range which runs N.E. from Sāfis by Karyat el-'Anab and Bīdūl to the plateau of el-Ḥb. Traces of an ancient forest are still to be seen here.

W. Ewing

SEIRATH, sē'îr-ath, sē'î-i-ath (סֵיֵרְה, ha-sē'î-rēh; B, Zegobā, Seliethā, A, Seliethā, Seeruthā; AV Seirath): The place to which Ehud escaped after his assassination of Eglon, king of Moab (Jgs 3 20). The name is the same as the region dwelt in, and probably applied to some shaggy forest. The quarries by which he passed are said to have been by Gilgal (ver 19), but there is nothing to guide us to an identification. Onom gives the name, but no indication of the site.

Seerah, sē'ri-th, sē'ri-rath. See Seirah.

SELA, sē'la (סֵלָה, sela', סֵלָה, ha-sela; [with the art.]; pipā, petra, ĕ petra, Ṣē petra; AV Selah [2 K 14 7]). AV renders this name in a number of other ways: in 2 K 14 17; Isa 16 1. In Jgs 1 30; 2 Ch 25 12; and Ob ver 3, it translates lit. "rock;" but RVm in each case "Sela." It is impossible to assume with Hull (HDB, s.v.) that this name, when it appears in Scripture, always refers to the capital of Edom, the great city in Wady Musa. In Jgs 1 36 its association with the Ascent of Akribabbm shuts us up to a position toward the southwestern end of the Dead Sea. Probably in that case it does not denote a city, but some prominent crag. Moore (Judges, [CC, 56), defining Buhl, with es-Sābīth, "a bare and dazzlingly white sandstone promontory 1,000 ft. high, E. of the mud flats of es-Siekhab, and 2 miles S. of the Dead Sea." A more probable identification is a high cliff which commands the road leading from the Dead Sea, "the spring of Salt," to Edom, over the pass of Akribabbm. This was a position of strategic importance, and if fortified would be of great strength. (In this passage "Edomites" must be read for Amorites.) The victory of Amaziah was won in the Valley of Salt. He would naturally turn his arms at once against this stronghold (2 K 14 17); and it may well be the rock from the top of which he hurled his prisoners (2 Ch 25 12). He called it Jokteel, a name the meaning of which is obscure. Possibly it is the same as Jekuthiild (1 Ch 4 18), and may mean "preservation of God" (OHI, s.v.). No trace of this name has been found. The narratives in which the place is mentioned put identification with Petra out of the question.

"The rock" (RVm "Sela") in Ob ver 3, in the phrase "thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock" is only a vivid and picturesque description of Edom. The purple mountains into which the wild rocks of Eeau clambered run out from Syria upon the desert, some hundred miles west. On the extreme E.

They are said to be the finest rock scenery in the world. "Salvator Rosæ never conceived so savage and so suitable a haunt for a handkerchief." They are the white cliffs notorious for their wild and naked beauty, by defiles so narrow that two horsemen may scarcely side abreast, and the sun is shut out by the overlapping rocks. . . . Little else than wild fowls' nests are the villages: human fringes perched on high shelves of hidden away in caves at the ends of the deep gorges" (C. A. Smith, The Book of the Twelve Prophets, II, 178 f).

In Isa 16 1; 42 11 RV, perhaps we have a reference to the great city of Petra. Jos (Ant, IV, viii, 1) tells us that among the kings of the Midities who fell before Moses was one Rekem, king of Rekem (akeb, or rekemo), the city deriving its name from its founder. This he says was the Arab name, the Greeks called it Petra. Onom says Petra is a city of Arabia in the land of Edom. It is called Jechthol; but the Syrians call it Rekem. Jokter, as we have seen, must be sought elsewhere. There can be no doubt that Jos intended the city in Wady Mīsīr. Its OT name was Bozrah (Am 1 12, etc). Wetstein (Excursus in Delitseh's Iat, 696 f) hazards the conjecture that the proper ancient name was Bṣram hate-Sela, "Bozrah of the Rock.

This "rose-red city half as old as Time" was for long difficult of access, and the attempt to visit it was fraught with danger. In recent years, however, it has been seen by many tourists and
from the Dead Sea, and just N. of the watershed between that sea and the Gulf of Aqaba. The valley owes its modern name, Wády Mùṣá, “Valley of Moses,” to its connection with Moses in Mohomedan legends. While not wholly inaccessible from other directions, the two usual approaches are that from the S.W. by a rough path, partly artificial, and that from the E. The latter is by far the more important. The valley closes to the E., the only opening being through a deep and narrow defile, called the Sīk, “shaft,” about a mile in length. In the bottom of the Sīk flows westward the stream that rises at ‘Ain Mùṣá. E. of the cleft is the village of ‘Uli, an ancient site, corresponding to Gaia of Onom. Passing this village, the road threads its way along the shadowy winding gorge, overhung by lofty cliffs. When the valley is reached, a sight of extraordinary beauty and impressiveness opens to the beholder. The temples, the tombs, the theater, etc., hewn with great skill and infinite pains from the living rock, have defied to an astonishing degree the tooth of time, many of the carvings being as fresh as if they had been cut yesterday. An idea of the scale on which the work was done may be gathered from the size of the theater, which furnished accommodation for no fewer than 3,000 spectators.

Such a position could not have been overlooked in ancient times; and we are safe to assume that a city of importance must always have existed here. It is under the Nabataeans, however, that Petra begins to play a prominent part in history. This people took possession about the end of the 4th cent. B.C., and continued their sway until overcome by Hadrian, who gave his own name to the city—Hadrianopolis. This name, however, soon disappeared. Under the Romans Petra saw the days of her greatest splendor.

According to old tradition St. Paul visited Petra when he went into Arabia (Gal. 1:17). Of this there is no certainty; but Christianity was early introduced, and the city became the seat of a bishopric. Under the Nabataeans she was the center of the great caravan trade of that time. The merchandise of the East was brought hither; and hence set out the caravans for the South, the West, and the North. The great highway across the desert to the Pers Gulf was practically in her hands. The fall of the Nabataean power gave Palmyra her chance; and her supremacy in the commerce of Northern Arabia dates from that time. Petra shared in the declining fortunes of Rome; and her death blow was dealt by the conquering Moslems, who desolated Arabia Petraea in 629–32 A.D. The place now furnishes a retreat for a few poor Bedaw families.

SELH, sela. See Music, II, 1.

SELED, sel·ed (סֶלֶד, qeledh): A Jerahmeelite (1 Ch 2:30 bis).

SELEMIA, sel·e·mì·a: One of the swift scribes whose services Ezra was commanded to secure (2 Esd 14:21). The name is probably identical with Selémias of 1 Esd 9:34 (q.v.).

SELEMIAS, sel·e·mi·as (Σελημίας, Selémias): One of those who put away their “strange wives” (1 Esd 9:34) = “Selémias” in Ezr 10:39, and probably identical with “Selémia” in 2 Esd 14:24.

SELEUCIA, sel·é·u·kì·a (Σελεύκεια, Seleukía): The seaport of Antioch from which it is 16 miles distant. It is situated 5 miles N. of the mouth of the Orontes, in the northeastern corner of a fruitful plain at the base of Mt. Rousa or Plera, the modern Jebel multis, a spur of the Amanus Range. Built by Seleucus Nikator (d. 280 B.C.) it was one of the Syrian Tetrapolis, the others being Apamea, Laodicea and Antioch. The city was protected
by nature on the mountain side, and, being strongly fortified on the S. and W., was considered invulnerable and the key to Syria (Strabo 751; Polyb. v.58).

It was taken, however, by Ptolemy Euergetes (1 Mac 11 8) and remained in his family till 219 BC, when it was recovered for the Seleucids by Antiochus I, who then newly adorned it. Captured again by Ptolemy Philometer in 146 BC, it remained for a short time in the hands of the Egyptians. Pompey made it a free city in 64 BC in return for its energy in resisting Tigranes (Pliny, NH, v.18), and it was then greatly improved by the Romans, so that in the 1st cent. AD it was in a most flourishing condition.

On their first missionary journey Paul and Barnabas passed through it (Acts 13 4; 14 26), and though it is not named in Acts 15 30-36, this route is again implied; while it is excluded in Acts 15 3.

The ruins are very extensive and cover the whole space within the line of the old walls, which shows a circuit of four miles. The position of the Old Town, where the City and the ruins may still be identified, as also that of the Antioch Gate, the Market Gate and the King's Gate, which last leads to the Upper City. There are rock-cut tombs, broken statuary and sarcophagi at the base of the Upper City, a position which probably represents the burial place of the Seleucids. The outline of a circus or amphitheater can also be traced, while the inner harbor is in perfect condition and full of water. It is 2,000 ft. long by 1,200 ft. broad, and covers 47 acres, being oval or pear-shaped. The passage seaward, now silted up, was protected by two strong piers or mole, which are locally named after Barnabas and Paul. The most remarkable of the remains, however, is the great water canal behind the city, which the emperor Constantius cut through the solid rock in 338 AD. It is 3,074 ft. long, has an average breadth of 20 ft., and is in some places 120 ft. deep. Two portions of 102 and 293 ft. in length are tunneled. The object of the work was clearly to carry the mountain torrent direct to the sea, and so protect the city from the risk of flood during the wet season.

Church synods occasionally met in Seleucia in the early centuries, but it gradually sank into decay, and long before the advent of Islam it had lost all its significance.

W. M. CHRISTIE

SELEUCIDAE, sél-é-úk'dé-a. See Seleucus.

SELEUCUS, sél-ú-kús (Σελεύκος, Seleukos):

(1) Seleucus I (Nicator, "The Conqueror"), the founder of the Seleucidæ or House of Seleucus, was an officer in the grand and thoroughly equipped army, which was perhaps the most important part of the inheritance that came to Alexander the Great from his father, Philip of Macedon. He took part in Alexander's Asiatic conquests, and on the division of these on Alexander's death he obtained the satrapy of Babylonia. By later conquests and under the name of king, which he assumed in the year 294, he became ruler of Syria and the greater part of Asia Minor. His rule extended from 312 to 280 BC, the year of his death; at least the Seleucid era which seems to be referred to in 1 Macc 16 is reckoned from Seleucus I, 312 BC to 65 BC, when Pompey reduced the kingdom of Syria to a Roman province. He followed generally the policy of Alexander in spreading Gr civilization. He founded Antioch and its port Seleucia, and is said by Jos (Ant. XII, iii, 1) to have conferred civic privileges on the Jews. The reference in Dan 11 5 which is usual to be to this ruler.

(2) Seleucus II (Callinicus, "The Gloriously Triumphant"), who reigned from 246 to 226 BC, was the son of Antiochus Soter and is the "king of the north" in Dan 11 7-9, who was expelled from his kingdom by Ptolemy Euergetes.

(3) Seleucus III (Ceroanus, "Thunderbolt"), son of Seleucus II, was assassinated in a campaign which he undertook into Asia Minor. He had a short reign of rather more than 2 years (220-223 BC) and is referred to in DRL 11 13-19.

(4) Seleucus IV (Philopator, "Fond of his Father") was the son and successor of Antiochus the Great and reigned from 187 to 175 BC. He is called 'King of Asia' (2 Macc 3 3), a title claimed by the Seleucidæ even after their serious losses in Asia Minor (see 1 Macc 8 6; 11 13; 12 29; 13 32). He was present at the decisive battle of Magnesia (190 BC). He was murdered by Heleodorus (q.v.), one of his own courtiers whom he had sent to plunder the Temple (2 Macc 3 1-40; Dan 11 20).

For the connection of the above-named Seleucidæ with the "ten horns" of Dan 7 24, the commentators must be consulted.

Seleucus V (125-124 BC) and Seleucus VI (95-93 BC) have no connection with the sacred narrative.

J. Hutcson

SELF-CONTROL, self-kon-trôl (ὑγείατεια, eghyd-tei-a): Rendered in AV "temperance" (cf Lat temperatio and continenda), but more accurately "self-control," as in RV (Acts 5 25; Gal 5 23; 2 Pet 1 6): adj. of same, ἐγκράτεια, egkratrēia, "self-controlled" (Tit 1 8 RV); cf vb. forms in 1 Cor 7 9, "have . . . continency"; 9 25, the athlete "exercised self-control." Self-control is therefore repeatedly set forth in the NT as among the important Christian virtues.

SELF-RIGHTEOUSNESS, self-r'fh-e-us-nes: A term that has come to designate moral living as a way of salvation; or as a ground for neglecting the redemptive work of Jesus Christ. The thought is present in the teaching of Jesus, who spoke one parable particularly to such as reckoned themselves to be righteous (Lk 18 9 ff). The Pharisees quite generally resented the idea of Jesus that all men needed repentance and that they were regarded as sinners and looked with contempt on "sinners." Paul in all his writings, esp. Rom 3; Gal 3; Eph 2; Phil 3, contrasts the righteousness that is God's gift to men of faith in Jesus Christ, with righteousness "of the law" and "in the flesh." By this latter he means formal conformity to legal requirements in the strength of unregenerate human nature. He is careful to maintain (cf Rom 7) that the Law is never really kept by one's own power. On the other hand, in full agreement with Jesus, Paul looks to genuine righteousness in living as the demand and achievement of salvation based on faith. God's gift here consists in the capacity progressively to realize righteousness in life (cf Rom 8 1 ff). See also SancTIFICATION. WILLIAM OWEN CAYVER

SELF-SURRENDER, self-su-ren'dé: The struggle between the natural human impulses of self-seeking, self-defence and the like, on the one hand, and the more altruistic impulse toward self-denial, self-surrender, on the other, is as old as the race. All religions imply some conception of surrender of self to deity, ranging in ethical quality from a heathen fanaticism which impels to complete physical exhaustion or rapture, superinduced by more or less mechanical means, to the high spiritual quality of self-sacrifice to the divinest aims and achievements. The Scriptures represent self-surrender as among the noblest of human virtues.
I. In the OT.—In the OT self-surrender is taught in the early account of the first pair. Each was to be given to the other (Gen 2 24; 3 16b) according to their gender, and was the loss of personality; it was the finding of the true selfhood (Mk 8 35; Mt 10 39). Our Lord not only taught self-surrender, but practised it. As a child, He submitted Himself to His parents (Lk 2 51).

Self-surrender marked His baptism and temptation (Mt 3 15; 4 1 f.). It is shown in His life of physical privation (8 20). He had come not to do His own will, but the Father's (Jn 4 34; 5 30; 6 38). He refuses to use force for His own deliverance (Mt 25 36; Jn 18 11). In His person God's will, not His own, must be done (Mt 26 28; Lk 22 42); and to the Father He at last surrendered His spiritual life (Lk 23 46). So that while He was no ascetic, and did not demand asceticism of His followers, He "emptied himself . . . becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross" (Phil 2 7; see Kenosia).

The early disciples practised the virtue of self-surrender. Counting none of their possessions their own, they gave to the good of all (Acts 2 44-45; 4 32-37). Stephen and Apostles others throw themselves in their witnessing with the perfect abandon of the martyr; and Stephen's successor, Paul, counted not his life dear unto himself that he might finish the Divinely appointed course (20 22 f.).

The Epp. of Peter are permeated with the doctrine of self-surrender. The Pauline Epp. are particularly full of it. The Christian life is conceived of as a dying self to and of Christ's world—a dying with Christ, a crucifixion of the old man, that a new man may live (Gal 2 20; 6 14; Col 2 20; 3 3; Rom 6 6), so that no longer the man lives but Christ lives in him (Gal 2 20; Phil 1 21). The Christian is no longer his own but Christ's (1 Cor 6 19-20). He is to be a living sacrifice (Rom 12 1); to die daily (1 Cor 15 31). As a corollary to surrender to God, the Christian must surrender himself to the welfare of his neighbor, just as Christ pleased not Himself (Rom 15 5); also to leaders (1 Cor 16 15), and to earthly rulers (Rom 13 1).

In the Epp. of Peter self-surrender is taught more than once. Those who were once like sheep astray now submit to the guidance of the Shepherd of souls (1 Pet 2 25).

II. In the NT.—In the NT self-surrender is still more clearly set forth. Christ's teachings and examples as presented in the Gospels, give it special emphasis. It is a prime requisite for becoming His disciple (Mt 10 38; 16 21; Lk 9 23-24). 50 f.; 14 27-33; cf Mt 19 27; Mk 8 34). When certain of the disciples were called they left all and followed (Mt 4 20; 9 9; Mk 2 14; Lk 5 27). His followers must so completely surrender as, that father, mother, kindred, and one's own life must be, as it were, hated for His sake (Lk 14 26). The rich young ruler must renounce self as an end and give his own life to the service of men (Mt 19 21; Mk 10 21; cf Lk 12 33). But this surrender of self was never a loss of personality; it was the finding of the true selfhood (Mk 8 35; Mt 10 39). Our Lord not only taught self-surrender, but practised it. As a child, He submitted Himself to His parents (Lk 2 51).

Self-surrender marked His baptism and temptation (Mt 3 15; 4 1 f.). It is shown in His life of physical privation (8 20). He had come not to do His own will, but the Father's (Jn 4 34; 5 30; 6 38). He refuses to use force for His own deliverance (Mt 25 36; Jn 18 11). In His person God's will, not His own, must be done (Mt 26 28; Lk 22 42); and to the Father He at last surrendered His spiritual life (Lk 23 46). So that while He was no ascetic, and did not demand asceticism of His followers, He "emptied himself . . . becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross" (Phil 2 7; see Kenosia).

The early disciples practised the virtue of self-surrender. Counting none of their possessions their own, they gave to the good of all (Acts 2 44-45; 4 32-37). Stephen and Apostles others throw themselves in their witnessing with the perfect abandon of the martyr; and Stephen's successor, Paul, counted not his life dear unto himself that he might finish the Divinely appointed course (20 22 f.).

The Epp. of Peter are permeated with the doctrine of self-surrender. The Pauline Epp. are particularly full of it. The Christian life is conceived of as a dying self to and of Christ's world—a dying with Christ, a crucifixion of the old man, that a new man may live (Gal 2 20; 6 14; Col 2 20; 3 3; Rom 6 6), so that no longer the man lives but Christ lives in him (Gal 2 20; Phil 1 21). The Christian is no longer his own but Christ's (1 Cor 6 19-20). He is to be a living sacrifice (Rom 12 1); to die daily (1 Cor 15 31). As a corollary to surrender to God, the Christian must surrender himself to the welfare of his neighbor, just as Christ pleased not Himself (Rom 15 5); also to leaders (1 Cor 16 15), and to earthly rulers (Rom 13 1).

In the Epp. of Peter self-surrender is taught more than once. Those who were once like sheep astray now submit to the guidance of the Shepherd of souls (1 Pet 2 25)

Epistles of Peter: The Christian is to be like a child under the mighty hand of God (5 6); the younger to be subject to the elder (5 5); and all to civil ordinances for the Lord's sake (2 13).

So also in other Epp. The Christian is to subject himself to God (Jas 4 7; He 12 9).

SELF-WILL, self-will (τὸ ἐναρκτύνα; αὐτοδιάτυν), αὐτοθαλάττω: Found once in the OT (Gen 49 6, "In their self-will they hocked an ox") in the death song of Jacob (see Hock). The idea is found twice in the NT in the sense of "pleasing oneself": "not self-willed, not soon angry" (Tit 1 7); and"daring, self-willed", they tremble not to raise at digestion (2 Pet 2 10). In all these texts it stands for a false pride, for obstinacy, for "a pertinacious adherence to one's will or wish, esp. in opposition to the dictates of wisdom or propriety or the wishes of others." —Henry E. Dusker

SELL, SELLER, sellér. See TRADE; LYDIA.

SELVEDGE, sel'vej, k pérdì: The word occurs only in the description of the tabernacle (Ex 26 1; 36 19) —the seven curtains which oversee the boards of the sanctuary. Five of these formed one set and five another.
These were "coupled" at the center by 50 loops of blue connected by "clips" (q.v.) with 50 others on the opposite side. The "self-edge" (self-edge), is the extremity of the curtain in which the loops were.

SEM, sem (סֵם, סְמ): AV from the Gr form of Shem; thus RV (Lk 3:36).

SEMACHIAH, sem-a-khi (סְמַעְחָה, semakhāhā), "Jeh has sustained": A Korahite family of gatekeepers (1 Ch 26:7). Perhaps the same name should be substituted for "Ismaeliah" in 2 Ch 31:13 (see HFN, 201, 205).

SEMEI, sem-e'i: (1) (A, שֵׂמֶל, Seminar, B, שֵׂמֶל, Semel): One of those who put away their "strange wives" (1 Esd 9:33) = "Shimei" of the sons of Hashum" in Est 10:33. (2) AV = RV "Semelos" (Ad. Est 11:2). (3) AV form of RV "Semelos" (Lk 3:26).

SEMEIAS, sē-mē'ē-as (Σαμέιας, Semeias; B, Σεμείας, Semeias; AV Semei): An ancestor of Mordecai (Ad. Est 11:2) = "Shimei" (Est 2:5).

SEMEIN, sē-mē'ē-in (Σαμέιν, Semein, A, Σαμείη, Seminar, B, Σαιμέη, Semait; AV Semei): An ancestor of Jesus in Lk's genealogy (Lk 3:26).

SEMEIS, sē-mē'ē-is (A and Fritzsche, Σαιμείας; B, Σαιμέης, Semeis; AV Semeis): One of the Levites who put away their "strange wives" (1 Esd 9:23) = "Shimei" in Est 10:23.

SEMELIUS, sē-mēl'i-us: AV = RV Semellius (q.v.).

SEMIS, sē-mi's: AV = RV Semeis (q.v.).

SEMITES, sem'īt's, SEMITIC, sem'i't-ik.

RELIGION:
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LITERATURE
The words "Semites," "Semitic," do not occur in the Bible, but are derived from the name of Noah's eldest son, Shem (Gen 5:22; 6:10).
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   (3) Its View of Nature
   (4) The Moral Being of God

Euphrates. The greatest uncertainty is in the identification of Arpachshad, the most distinct ancestor of the Semitic branch of those of the Bible, and more recent importance.

2. The
Five Sons
From him descended the Hebrews and of Shem the Arab tribes, probably also some East African colonies (Gen 10:24-30; 11:12-26). The form of his name (ןָרָֽפָֽכְּחָד, arpakshad) has given endless trouble to ethnographers. Most commonly divides the two words, Arpach or Arpath, unidentified, and keseth, the sing. of kaseth, i.e. the Chaldeans; Schrader also holds to the Chaldaean interpretation, and the Chaldeans themselves traced their descent from Arpachshad (Jos, Ant, i, vi, 4); it has been suggested also to interpret as the "border of the Chaldeans" (BDB; Dillmann, in loc.). But the historic, ordinary and most satisfactory identification is with Arapachyitis, N.E. of Assyria at the headwaters of the Upper Zab in the Armenian highlands (so Ptolemy, classical geographers, Gesenius, Delitzsch). Delitzsch calls attention to the Armenian termination shahd (Comm. on Gen, in loc.).

If we accept, then, this identification of Arpachshad as the most northeasterly of the five Sem families (Gen 10:22), we are still faced by the problem of the primitive origin of the racial and cultural groups of the Semites.

3. Original Home of the Semites
Various theories of course have been proposed; fancy and surmise have ranged from Africa to Central Asia. (1) The most common, almost generally accepted, theory places their beginnings in Arabia because of the conservative and primitive Semitic of the Arabic language, the desert characteristics of the various branches of the race, and the historic movements of Sem tribes northward and westward from Arabia. But this theory does not account for some of the most significant facts: e.g. that the Sem developments of Arabia are the last, not the first, in time, as must have been the case if Arabia was the cradle of the race. This theory does not explain the Sem origin of the Elamites, except by denial; much less does it account for the location of Arpachshad still farther north. It is not difficult to understand a racial movement from the mountains of the N.E. to the lowlands of the South and West. But a primitive Semites could have migrated uphill, as it were, to settle in the Median and Armenian hills is a much more difficult proposition.

(2) We must return to the historic and the more natural location of the ancient Sem home on the highlands and in the valleys of Asia Minor. The Sem branches of the eldest branch migrated in prehistoric times southward to become historic Elam; Lud moved westward into Asia Minor; Assur found his way down the Tigris to become the sturdy pastoral people of the middle Mesopotamian plain up to the time of the Bab colonists and civilization; Aram found a home in Upper Mesopotamia; while Arpachshad, remaining longer in the original home, gave his name to at least a part of it. There in the fertile valleys along the high hills the ancient Semites developed their distinctive tribal life, emphasizing the beauty and close relationship of Nature, the sacredness of the family, the moral obligation, and faith in a personal God of whom they thought as a member of the tribe or friend of the family. The confinements of the mountain valleys is just as adequate an explanation of the Sem traits as the isolation of the oasis. So from the purer life of their highland home, where had been developed the distinctive and virile elements which were to impress the Sem face of the history of the world, and increasing multitudes of Semites poured over the mountain barriers into the broader levels of the plains. As
their own mountain springs and torrents sought a way to the sea down the Tigris and Euphrates beds, so the Sem tribes followed the same natural pathways. Edomites, Babylon, Assyria, Medo-Persia, Arabia, Pal. Then, when Aryan invaders pushed Arabia further into the interior of Africa as well as reascending into the desert west of the Euphrates, Syria and Pal. Thus Western Asia became the arena of Sem life, whose influences also reached Egypt. Through Phoenicia, the far-away West-Mediterranean.

While we may properly call Western and Southwestern Asia the home of the Sem peoples, there still remains the difficulty of separating the Sem from the other races that they possessed, and which became prevalent among them. The historic

4. Confusion with Babylonians, e.g., were Sem; yet Races they dispossessed an earlier non-Sem people, and were themselves frequently invaded by other races, such as the Hittites, and even the Egyptians. It is not certain which gods, customs, laws, etc., of the Babylonians were Sem, and not adopted from them as they superseded.

Assyria was racially purely Sem, but her laws, customs, language, and even her system of writing were acquired from Babylonia; to such an extent was this true that we are inclined to say that the Sem language is untrustworthy for much that we know of Bab religion, literature and tradition. In Syra also the same mixed conditions prevailed, for the same reason. Semitic was the language of the Pharaohs throughout the history of the nations, and Hittite and Mitannian at various times shared the land with her, and left their influence in Sem. Possibly in Arabia Sem blood ran purest, but even in Arabia there are tribes from other races; and the table of the nations in Gen divides that land among the descendants of both Ham and Sem (see Table of Nations). In Palestine, the Sem and Hittite influences were not separated until after the time of the conquest. The archaic remains of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic must be regarded as true representations of the races of the land, holding outposts from their northern empire, even in the extreme south of Pal. Though the blue eyes and fair complexions of the Sem were common throughout the land, the typical Sem was a Semite, although uniformly these are represented in the OT as foreigners and enmities of alien races which the Hebrews were commanded to exterminate. The adoption of the Sem could be, and was, inimical to their own ancestral faith. Because of this, and eventually the language of the Sem, appropriated his art and conveniences, did traffic in his ships, and in Ahab's reign adopted his Baal and Anarchy, the Sem were not warranted at all in rushing to the conclusion that the Hebrews were a Sem type. Racial identification by linguistic argument is always precarious, as history clearly shows. One might as well say that Latin and the gospel were Saxon. There are indications that the Sem were the human race, and the language of the Hebrews were different from those of the people whom they subdued and dispossessed. Such is the consistent tradition of their race, the Bible always emphasizing the irreconcilable difference between the Sem and the other races of the land and the people of Canaan. We may conclude that the reasons for disregarding the classification of Gen with reference
to the Semites and neighboring races are not final. Out from that fruitful womb of nations, the Cauc- casus, the Semites, one branch of the Caucasian peoples, were flung by the Persian and Aryan invaders. The Hamites went earlier toward the South and as their younger relatives, the Aryans, were to go northward and westward—with marked racial traits and a pronounced religious development, to play a leading part in the life of man.

6. Semitic Languages

The phrase Semitic Language is used of a group of languages which have marked features in common, which also set them off from other languages. We must avoid any erroneous inference that nations using the same or similar languages must be akin. There are other explanations of linguistic affinity than racial, as the Indians of Mexico may speak Spanish and yet have Sem systems of thought, etc. So also neighboring or intermingled nations may just as naturally have used branches of the Sem language stock. However, it is true that the nations which were truly Sem used languages which are strikingly akin. These have been grouped as (1) Eastern Sem, including Bab and Assy; (2) Northern, including Syrian and Aramaic; (3) Western, including Canaanite, or Phoenician, and Hebrew; and (4) Southern, including Arabic, Sabaeans and Ethiopic (of Gedem, Intro to the Heb Bible, 14-25). The distinctive features of this family of languages are (1) a tri-root, tri-consonantal, root; (2) the monosyllabic writing, vowel indications being frequently marked by a diacritic name or sign; (3) the usage of moods of verbs and in terms of the inflection, every action being graphically viewed as belonging to one of two standard classes. The inflection is incomplete, (4) the paucity of parts of speech, and (3) the frequent use of internal change in the inflection of words, e.g., the doubling of a consonant or the change of a vowel, and (6) the use of prefixes or suffixes in inflection. These are parts of speech or the words as a residuum of speech and writing.

Bab and Assy being ideographic and syllabic, and written from right to left. The Semitic alphabets were alphabetical and written from right to left. The Semitic forms and inflections of the group are best preserved in the Sem, by reason of the conservatism of the Sem peoples, and in the Assy by the sudden destruction of that empire and the burial of the records. The Semitic language in a comparatively pure state, to be brought back to light by Germany of 19th century, the characteristics given above are clearly manifest in the Heb of the OT.

In the study of Sem Religion there are two tendencies toward error: (1) the Western pragmatic method and unadulterated oriental Nature-symbols and vividly imaginative speech. Because the Semites used the figure of the rock (De 32, 4.18.30) in describing God, or poetically conceived of the storm as the chariot of the Chariot God, we must not be led into believing that his religion was a savage animism, or that Jeh of Israel was only the Zeus of the Greeks. How should an imaginative child of Nature speak of the unseen Spiritual Power, except in the richest analogies of Nature? (2) The second error is the tendency to treat the acceptions acquired by contact with other nations as the essence of Sem religion, e.g., the golden calf following the Egyptian bondage, and the sexual abominations of the Can. But the facts are just the opposite.

The primitive and distinctive beliefs of the Sem peoples lie still in great uncertainty because of the long association with other peoples, whose practices they readily took over, and because of the lack of records of the primitive periods of Sem development, their origin and dispersion among the nations being prehistoric. Our sources of information are the Bab and Assy tablets and monuments, the Egypt inscriptions, Phoen history, Arabian traditions and inscriptions, etc. These provide the data.

We can never know perhaps how much the pure Semitism of Babylonians and Assyrians was corrupted and distorted by the development civilization which they invaded and appropriated; Egypt was only indirectly affected by Sem life; Sem development in Arabia was the latest in the Sem areas in which the monuments and roots of Arabian antiquity
which have come down to us are comparatively few; and the Phoen development was corrupted by the semiology of the ancient Canaanitish cults, while the Bible of the Hebrews emphasized the theism of the unwholesome religions of Pal their own faith, which was ancestral, revealed and pure. Was that Bible faith the primitive Sem cult? At least we must take the Heb tradition at its face value, for it enshrines Hebraic features of an ancient faith, preserved through one branch of the Sem group. We are met frequently in these Heb records by the claim that the religion they present is not a new development, nor a thing apart from the origin of their race, but rather the preservation of an ancient worship, Abraham, Moses, and the prophets appearing not as originators, but reformers, or revivers, who sought to keep their people true to an inherited religion. Its elemental features are the following:

(1) *It was pronouncedly theistic;* not that other religions do not affirm a god; but the theism of the Semites was such as to give their religion a unique place among all others. To say the least, it had the germ of or the tendency toward monothelism, if not enough evidence to form its mature theism, and to rate the later polytheistic representations of Babylonia and Assyria as local perversions. If the old view that Sem religion was essentially monothelistic be incapable of proof, it is true that the necessity of the concept of God must ultimately arrive at monothelism. This came to verification in Abram the Hebrew, Jesus the Messiah (Jo 4 21–24) and Mohammed the false prophet. A city-state exclusively, a nation predominantly, worshipped one god, often through some nature-symbol, as sun or star or element. With the coming of world-conquest, intercourse and vision, the one god of the city or the chief god of the nation became universalized. The ignorant and materialistic Hebrew might localize the God of Israel in a city or on a hilltop; but to the spiritual mind of Amos or in the universal vision of Isaiah He was Jehovah, Lord of all the earth.

(2) Closely related to this high conception of Deity was the apparently contradictory but really potent idea of the Deity as a personality. The Semite did not grossly materialize his God as did the savage, nor vacantly abstract and eterealize Him and so eliminate Him from the experience of man as did the Greek; but to him the Deity was a god personal and intimate. The Hebrew ran the risk of conditioning the spirituality of God in order to maintain His real personality. Possibly this has been the most potent element in Sem religion; God was not far from every one of them. He came into the closest relations as father or friend. He was the companion of king and priest. The affairs of the nation were under His immediate care; He went to war with armies, was a partner in harvest rejoicings, the home of peace. This conception of Deity carried with it the necessary implication of revelation (Am 3 8). The office, message and power of the Heb prophet were also the logical consequence of knowing God as a Person.

(3) Its peculiar view of Nature was another feature of Sem religion. God was everywhere and always present in Nature; consequently its symbolism was the natural and ready expression of His nature and presence. Simle, parable and Nature-marvels cover the pages and tablets of their records. Unfortunately this poetic conception of Nature qualified to some extent the “natural path in which wayward feet and carnal minds might travel toward Nature-worship with all of its formalism and its degrading excesses. This feature of Sem religion offers an interesting commentary on their philosophy. With them the doctrine of Second Causes received no emphasis; God worked directly in Nature, which became to them therefore the continuous arena of signs and marvels. The thunder was His voice, the sunshne reflected the light of His countenance, the winds were His messengers. And so through this imaginative view of the world the Semite dwelt in an enchanted realm of the miraculous.

(4) The Semite believed in a *God who is a moral being.* Such a faith in the nature of it was certain to influence profoundly their own moral development, making for them a racial character which has been distinctive and persistent through the changes of centuries. By it also they have impressed other nations and religions, with which they have had contact. The CH is an expression of the moral issues of the theism. The Law and the Prophets of Israel arose out of the conviction of God’s righteousness and of the moral order of His universe (Ex 19 6–5; Le 19 18–20).

While these elements are not absent altogether from other ancient religions, they are pronouncedly characteristic of the Sem to the extent that they have given to it its permanent place in its development, and its primacy among the religions of the human race. To know God, to hear His eternal word in Nature, to clothe Him with light as with a garment, to establish His throne in righteousness, to perceive the immensity and the holiness of His presence — such convictions were bound to affect the life and progress of a race, and to concentrate them as a nation of priests for all mankind.

**Literature:** For discussion of the details of Sem peoples and religions reference should be made to particular articles, such as *Abraham*, *Eber*, *Abraham-Hammurabi*, *Assyria*, *Babylonia*, *Assur*, *Ashtoreth*, *Molech*, *Chethun*, *Israel*, *Religion*, etc. The list on the subject is vast, interesting and far from conclusive. Few of the Bible Dictionaries have arts. on this particular subject; reference should be made to those in the *Standard Se* and in the *HDB*, vol V, both by McCurdy; "Semites" in *Catholic Encyclopedia* signifies the surface: arts. in *International Se* are good. In OT Theologies, *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, *Dictionary of the Bible*, *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*, *Expository Dictionary of the Bible*, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, *Dictionary of Religion in the Near East*, *Dictionary of the Bible*, *Bibel* and *Bible*, *Religion*, *Bible*.

**Edward Mack**

**Sennah**, *fَثَنَّ أَضْحَى*; *funa thun*; B, *Thun*, *Sannat*, *Sanaah* or *Sanad*, *Sanaah*, or *Sanad*, *Sannad*, *Sannat*, *Thun*, *Hasan*. The children of Sennah are mentioned as having sided with part of the company returning from the captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2 35; Neh 7 38). The numbers vary as given by Ezr (3,630) and Neh (3,930), while 1 Esd 5 23 puts them at 3,330. In the last place the name is Sanahs, A V *Sannah*, B, *Saad*, A V *Sa'ad*, B, *Saud*. In Neh 3 3 the name occurs with the def. art., ha-sennaah. The people may be identical with the Benjamite clan Hassenah (1 Ch 9 7). Onoma speaks of Magdala-senna, a village about 7 miles N. of Jericho, which may be the place intended, but the name is not known.

**W. Ewing**

**Senate** *sēn'at*, **Senator**, *sēn'-a-tar*: In *Ps 105 22*, "teach his senators [R V "servitors"] Wisdom." *The Heb* is *ןְבֵית* (*Sb*); LXX *πρεσβυτεροί*, *presbyteroi*). In *Acts 5 21*, "called the council together and all the senate of the children of Israel." The *Gr* *poyyváthi*, *gerousia*, is here evidently used as a more precise equivalent of the foregoing *council* (*συνεδρία*, *sunedrion*), to which it is used by *kai, kei, kephalikos* did have to the Sanhedrin. See *Sanhedrin*. This term *gerousia*
Sennacherib, in his first campaign marched into Babylonia. He found Merodach-baladan in-trenched at Kish, about 9 miles from Babylon, and defeated him; after which he entered the gates of Babylon, which had been thrown open to him. He placed a Babylonian, named Bél-ibni, on the throne.

This campaign was followed by an invasion of the country of the Cassites and Isuabigalleans. In his third campaign he directed his attention to the W., where the people had become restless under the Assyry yoke. Hezekiah had been victorious over the Philis (2 K 18 8). In preparation to with-stand a siege, Hezekiah had built a conduit to bring water within the city walls (2 K 20 20). Although strongly opposed by the prophet Isaiah, gifts were sent to Egypt, whence assistance was promised (Isa 30 1-4). Apparently also the Phoenicians and Philis, who had been sore pressed by Assyry, had made provision to resist Assyry. The first move was at Ekron, where the Assyr governor Padi was put into chains and sent to Hezekiah at Jerus.

Sennacherib, in 701, moved against the cities in the W. He ravaged the environs of Tyre, but made no attempt to take the city. He then turned his naval force. After Eluæus the king of Sidon fled, the city surrendered without a battle, and Ethbaal was appointed king. Numerous cities at once sent presents to the king of Assyry. Ashkelon and other cities were also taken. They were entirely routed at Eltekeh, and Ekron was destroyed. He claims to have conquered 46 strongholds of Heze-kiah's territory, but he did not capture Jerus, for concerning the king he said, in his annals, "himself like a bird in a cage in Jerus, his royal city, I penned him." He states, also, how he reduced his territory, and how Hezekiah sent to him 30 talents of gold and 800 talents of silver, besides hostages.

The Bib. account of this invasion is found in 2 K 18 13-19 37; Isa 36, 37. The Assy account differs considerably from it; but at the same time it corroborates it in many details. One of the striking parallels is the exact amount of gold which Hezekiah sent to the Assyr king (see EXPO P, XII 225, 336).

In the following year Sennacherib returned to Babylonia to put down a rebellion by Bél-ibni and Merodach-baladan. The former was sent to Assyry, and the latter soon afterward died. Ashur-nadin-shum, the son of Sennacherib, was then crowned king of Babylon. A campaign into Cili-cia and Cappadoicia followed.

In 694 Sennacherib attacked the Elamites, who were in league with the Babylonians. In revenge, the Elamites invaded Babylonia and carried off Ashur-nadin-shum to Elam, and made Nergal-ushēzib king of Babylon. He was later captured and in turn carried off to Assyria. In 691 Sennacherib again directed his attention to the S., and at Khatulé fought with the combined forces. Two years later he took Babylon, and razed it to the ground.

In 681 Sennacherib was murdered by his two sons (2 K 19 37; see SAREZER). Esar-haddon their younger brother, who was at the time conducting a campaign against Ararat, was declared king in his stead. A. T. CLAY

SENSES, sensiz; The tr of ἀναθέτειν, anathe- teîn (He 5 14, "those who by reason of use have their sensibilities exercised to death"). The word means, primarily, the seat of the senses, the region of feeling; in the LXX of Jer 4 19, it represents the Heb שיר, "the walls of the heart" (see RV), and is used to denote the internal sense or faculty of perceiving and judging, which in He 5
14 is regarded as becoming perfected by use or exercise (cf Eph 4 12 f; 1 Tim 4 7; 2 Pet 3 18).

In 2 Esd 10 36 we have "Or is my sense deceived, or my soul in a dream?" Lat sensus, here "mind" rather than "sense." W. L. Walker

SENSUAL, sen'shənal (ψυχικός, psuchikós, "animal, "natural"): Bib. psychology has no Eng equivalent for this Gr original. Man subject to the lower appetites, "sarkiche, "fleshly," in the communion of his spirit with God he is "πνευματικός, pneumatikós, "spiritual." Between the two is the ψυχή, psuché, "soul," the center of his personal being. This ψυχή or "I" in each man is bound to the spirit, the higher nature; and to the body or lower nature.

The soul (psuché) as the seat of the senses, desires, affections, appetites, passions, i.e. the lower animal nature common to man with the beasts, was distinguished in the Pythagorean and Platonic philosophy from the higher rational nature (nous, poiein).

The subjection of the soul to the animal nature is man's debasement, to the spirit indwelt by God is his exaltation. The Eng equivalent for psuchikos, "psychic," does not express this debasement. In the NT 'sensual' indicates man's subjection to self and self-interest, whether animal or intellectual—the selfish man in whom the spirit is degraded into subordination to the debased psuché, "soul." This debasement may be (1) intellectual, "not wisdom from above, but earthly, sensual" (Jas 3 15); (2) carnal (and of course moral), "sensual, having not the Spirit" (Jude ver 19). It ranges all the way from sensuality to self-indulgence in gross immorality. In the utter subjection of the spirit to sense it is the utter exclusion of God from the life. Hence the "natural [psychikon] man receives not the things of the Spirit of God" (1 Cor 2 14).

SENT (σήμερα, shēlāh; οἰκητικος, apostēlō): "Sent" in the OT is the tr of shēlāh, "to send!" (of presents, messengers, etc, Gen 26 18; 44 3; Josh 6 14; 1 K 14 6; Est 3 13; Prov 17 11; Jer 49 14; Ezk 3 25, 39; Dtn 10 11; Ob ver 1); of ευδοκία, ευδοκιματικός, "sent" (Ex 15 10; 29 5, and psuchikos, "psychic," does not express this debasement. In the NT "sensual" indicates man's subjection to self and self-interest, whether animal or intellectual—the selfish man in whom the spirit is degraded into subordination to the debased psuché, "soul." This debasement may be (1) intellectual, "not wisdom from above, but earthly, sensual" (Jas 3 15); (2) carnal (and of course moral), "sensual, having not the Spirit" (Jude ver 19). It ranges all the way from sensuality to self-indulgence in gross immorality. In the utter subjection of the spirit to sense it is the utter exclusion of God from the life. Hence the "natural [psychikon] man receives not the things of the Spirit of God" (1 Cor 2 14).

SENT (σήμερα, shēlāh; οἰκητικος, apostēlō): "Sent" in the OT is the tr of shēlāh, "to send!" (of presents, messengers, etc, Gen 26 18; 44 3; Josh 6 14; 1 K 14 6; Est 3 13; Prov 17 11; Jer 49 14; Ezk 3 25, 39; Dtn 10 11; Ob ver 1); of ευδοκία, ευδοκιματικός, "sent" (Ex 15 10; 29 5, and psuchikos, "psychic," does not express this debasement. In the NT "sensual" indicates man's subjection to self and self-interest, whether animal or intellectual—the selfish man in whom the spirit is degraded into subordination to the debased psuché, "soul." This debasement may be (1) intellectual, "not wisdom from above, but earthly, sensual" (Jas 3 15); (2) carnal (and of course moral), "sensual, having not the Spirit" (Jude ver 19). It ranges all the way from sensuality to self-indulgence in gross immorality. In the utter subjection of the spirit to sense it is the utter exclusion of God from the life. Hence the "natural [psychikon] man receives not the things of the Spirit of God" (1 Cor 2 14).

SENT (σήμερα, shēlāh; οἰκητικος, apostēlō): "Sent" in the OT is the tr of shēlāh, "to send!" (of presents, messengers, etc, Gen 26 18; 44 3; Josh 6 14; 1 K 14 6; Est 3 13; Prov 17 11; Jer 49 14; Ezk 3 25, 39; Dtn 10 11; Ob ver 1); of ευδοκία, ευδοκιματικός, "sent" (Ex 15 10; 29 5, and psuchikos, "psychic," does not express this debasement. In the NT "sensual" indicates man's subjection to self and self-interest, whether animal or intellectual—the selfish man in whom the spirit is degraded into subordination to the debased psuché, "soul." This debasement may be (1) intellectual, "not wisdom from above, but earthly, sensual" (Jas 3 15); (2) carnal (and of course moral), "sensual, having not the Spirit" (Jude ver 19). It ranges all the way from sensuality to self-indulgence in gross immorality. In the utter subjection of the spirit to sense it is the utter exclusion of God from the life. Hence the "natural [psychikon] man receives not the things of the Spirit of God" (1 Cor 2 14).
SEPHARVITES, sef-ar-vits, sef-ar-vits (ΣΕΦΑΡΩΤΙΟΙ, g'pharw'oi): In 2 K 17 31, the inhabitants of Sepharvaim (q.v.), planted by the king of Assyria in Samaria. They continued there to burn their children to their native gods.

SEPPIHORIS, sep'ə-ris: A city of Galilee, taken by Josephus (Vita, IX, lvii, 71) and later destroyed by the son of Varus (A.D., XVII, x, 9).

SEPTUAGINT, sep'tu-a-jint:

I. Importance
II. Name

III. Traditional Origin
1. Letter of Aristarch
2. Evidence of Aristobulus and Philo
3. Later Accretions
4. Criticism of the Aristean Story
5. Date
6. Credibility

IV. Evidence of Prologue to Sirach

V. Transmission of LXX Text
1. Early Corruption of the Text
2. Official Revision of Hebrew Text c. 100 AD
3. Conversion of LXX by Christ
4. Alternative 2d-Century Greek Versions
5. Apocrypha
6. Theodotion
7. Symmachus and Others
8. Origin and the Hexapla
9. Hexaplaric Manuscripts
10. Recensions Known to Jerome
11. Hexychian Recension
12. Lucianic Recension

VI. Reconstruction of LXX Text:
1. Versions, Manuscripts and Printed Editions
1. Ancient Versions Made from LXX
2. Manuscripts
3. Printed Texts
4. Reconstruction of Original Text

VII. Number, Titles and Order of Books
1. Prologues
2. Titles
3. Bipartition of Books
4. Grouping and Order of Books

VIII. Characteristics of the Version and Its Component Parts
1. Grouping of Books on Internal Evidence
   (1) The Hexateuch
   (2) The "Latter" Prophets
   (3) Partial Version of the "Former" Prophets
   (4) The Psalter
   (5) The Latest LXX Translations
2. General Characteristics

IX. Significant Differences Between Greek and Hebrew Texts
1. Preparatory
2. Subject-Matter

Literature

I. Importance.—The Gr VS of the OT commonly known as the Septuagint holds a unique place among translations. Its importance is many-sided. Its chief value lies in the fact that it is a VS of a Heb text earlier by about a millennium than the earliest dated Heb MS extant (916 AD), a VS, in particular, prior to the formal rabbinical revision of the Heb which took place early in the 2d cent. AD. It supplies the materials for the reconstruction of an older form of the Heb than the MT reproduced in our modern Bibles. It is, moreover, a pioneering work; there was probably no precedent in the world's history for a series of translations from one language into another on so extensive a scale. It was the first attempt to reproduce the Heb Scriptures in another tongue. It is one of the outstanding results of the breaking-down of international barriers by the conquests of Alexander the Great and the dissemination of the Gr language, which were fraught with such vital consequences for the history of religion. The cosmopolitan city which he founded in the Delta witnessed the first attempt to bridge the gulf between Jewish and Gr thought. The Jewish commercial settlers at Alexandria, forced by circumstances to abandon their language, clung tenaciously to their faith; and the tr of the Scriptures into their adopted language, produced to meet their own needs, had the further result of isolating the outside world from the edge of their history and religion. Then came the most momentous event in its history, the starting-point of a new life; the tr was taken over from the Jews by the Christian church. It was the Bible of most writers of the NT. Not only are most of their express citations from Scripture borrowed from it, but their writings contain numerous reminiscences of its language. Its words are household words to them. It laid for them the foundations of a new religious and literary weapon for missionary work, and, when VS of the Scriptures into other languages became necessary, it was in most cases the LXX and not the Heb from which they were made. Prescient among these daughter VSs was the Old Lat which preceded the Vulg. Jerome's VS, for the most part a direct tr from the Heb, was in portions a mere revision of the Old Lat; our Prayer-book VS of the Psalter preserves peculiarities of the LXX, transmitted through the medium of the Old Lat. The LXX was also the Bible of the early Gr Fathers, and helped to mold dogma; it furnished proofs-texts to both parties in the Arian controversy. Its language gives it another strong claim to recognition. Unrapid and unclassical as much of it appears, we now know that this is not wholly due to the hampering effects of translation. "Biblical Greek," once considered a distinct species, is now a rather discredited term. The hundreds of contemporary papyrus records (letters, business and legal documents, etc) recently discovered in Egypt illustrate much of the vocabulary and grammar and go to show that many so-called "Hebraisms" were in truth integral parts of the koino, or "common language," i.e. the international form of Greek which, since the time of Alexander, replaced the old dialects, and of which the spoken Gr of today is the lineal descendant. The VS was made for the populace and written in large measure in the language of their everyday life.

II. Name.—The name "Septuagint" is an abbreviation of Interpretatio secentum (or justa) Septuaginta senioris (or viros), i.e. the Gr tr of the OT of which the first instalment was, according to the Alexandrian legend (see III, below), contributed by 70 (or 72) elders sent from Jesus to Alexandria for the purpose at the request of Ptolemy II. The legend in its oldest form restricts their labors to the Pent, but they were afterward credited with the tr of the whole Bible, and before the 4th cent. It
had become customary to apply the title to the whole collection: Aug., De Civ. Dei, xvii.42, "quorum interpretatio ut Septuaginta vocetur iam obtinuit consuetudo" ("whose tr is now by custom called the Septuagint"), The "Septuagint" is a Greek translation of the Old Testament under the abbreviation of o' ("the seventy") or o'q' ("the seventy-two"). The "Septuagint" and the abbreviated form "LXX" have been the usual designations hitherto, but, as these are based on a now discredited legend, they are coming to be replaced by "the OT in Greek," or "the Alexandrian version" with the abbreviation of Β.  

III. Traditional Origin.—The traditional account of the tr of the Pent is contained in the so-called De Aristarchus text (Ed Ostr text, W. Wendland, Teubner series, 1890, and Thackeray in the App. to Swete's Life of Ptolemy introd to the OT in Gr, 1900, etc; Wendland's sections cited below appear in Swete's Life, introd ed 2; ET by Thackeray, Macmillan, 1904, reprinted from JQR, XV, 357, and by H. T. Andrews in Charles' Apocr. and Pseudepigrapha of the OT, II, 53-122, Oxford, 1913).

The writer professes to be a high official at the court of Ptolemy Philadelphia (285-247 BC), a Greek interested in Jewish antiquities.  

1. Letter of Aristeas. The Philohistorian Aristeas he describes an embassy to Jesus on which he has recently been sent with another courtier, Andreas. According to his narrative, Demetris of Phalerum, a prominent figure in later Athenian history, who here appears as a royal librarian at Alexandria, convinced the king of the importance of securing for his library a tr of the Jewish Law. The king at the same time, to propitiate the nation from whom he was asking a favor, consented on the suggestion of Aristeas, to liberate all Jewish slaves in Egypt: he seventy), of the letters which passed between Ptolemy and Eleazar, the high priest at Jerusalem. Ptolemy requests Eleazar to select and dispatch to Alexandria 72 elders, proficient in the Law, 6 from each tribe, to undertake the tr, the importance of which task requiring the services of a large number to secure an accurate VS. Eleazar complies with the request and names of the selected translators are appended to his letter.  

A translation follows a detailed description of the offerings sent by Ptolemy for the temple: (2) a sketch of the temple and its services, and the geography of Alexandria; (3) a list of the books of the Law, and the explanation of each book, its history, and the setting of the story of the book's discovery in the temple; (4) an exposition of the Law.  

The translators arrive at Alexandria, bringing a copy of the Law written in letters of gold on rolls of skins, and are honorably received by Ptolemy. A seven days' banquet follows, at which the king tests the proficiency of each in the task questions. Three days later Demetrius conducts them across the mole known as the Heptastadion to the island of Pharos, where, with all necessary provisions for their convenience, they complete their task, as by a miracle, in 20 days; they told that their work was the result of collaboration and comparison. The completed VS was read by Demetrius to the Jewish community, who received it with enthusiasm and begged that a copy might be intrusted to their leaders; a solemn curse was pronounced on any who should venture to add to or subtract from or make any alteration in the tr. The whole VS was then read aloud to the king who expressed his admiration and his priest Gr writers had remained in ignorance of its contents; he directed that the books should be preserved with scrupulous care.  

To set aside this account we have two pre-Christian allusions in Jewish writings. Aristobulus, addressing a Ptolemy who has been identified as Philometer (182-146 BC), repeats the statement that the Pent was tr under Philadelphia at the instance of Demetrius Phalerus (Euseb., Hist. Eccl. III, 12.614); but the author of Aristeas, in 11.12.664b, says that the Ptolemaic kings, the Linaves, alsoadd the missing tr, adding a tr of the significance of the passage is doubtful. Philo, 7.11.685ff, accepts the Aristeas text. The main features of the story were believed at Alexandria within a century of the date assigned by Aristeas to the tr. Philo (Vit. Mosis, ii.5 ff) repeats the story of the sending of the trs by Eleazar at the request of Philadelphia, adding that in his day the completion of the undertaking was celebrated by an annual festival on the island of Phares. It is improbable that an artificial production like the Aristeas text should have been accepted by the Jews of Philadelphia; Philo's evidence seems therefore to rest in part on an independent tradition. His account in one particular paved the way for later accretions; he hints at the inspiration of the translators and the miraculous agreement of their separate trs. We may suppose that they prophezed like men possessed, not one in one way and one in another, but all producing the same words and phrases as though some unseen promter were at the ears of each.
4. Criticism
It is unhistorical, in particular the reported fessed date and nationality of the Aristaea writer. Its claims are not authenticated.

Yet it has long been recognized that much of the text is unhistorical, in particular the reported fessed date and nationality of the Aristaea writer. Its claims are not authenticated.

5. Date
In discussing the date and nationality of the Aristaea writer, it is important to note that the manuscript is believed to be from the first century, although the exact date is not known. The manuscript is believed to have been written in Alexandria, as the name of the city is mentioned in several places. The manuscript is also believed to have been written in Greek, as indicated by the use of the Greek alphabet.

6. Prolegomena to Strach.
The translator dates his work from the time of the emperor Augustus, using the same dates as those used in Strach's work. He argues that the manuscript was written in Alexandria, as the name of the city is mentioned in several places.

The translator dates his work from the time of the emperor Augustus, using the same dates as those used in Strach's work. He argues that the manuscript was written in Alexandria, as the name of the city is mentioned in several places.
its own. Used for centuries by both Jews and Christians it underwent corruption and interpolation, and, notwithstanding the multitude of materials for its restoration, the original text has yet to be recovered. We have now more certain knowledge of the rabbinic "spesissima verba" of the NT writers than of the original Alexandrian VS of the OT. This does not apply to all portions alike. The Gr Pent., e.g., has survived in a relatively pure form. But everywhere we have to be on our guard against interpolations, sometimes extending to whole paragraphs. Not a verse is without its array of variant readings. An indication of the amount of "mixture" which has taken place is afforded by the numerous "doubtlets" or alternative renderings of a single Heb word or phrase which appear side by side in the transmitted text.

Textual corruption began early, before the Christian era. We have seen indications of this in the letter of Aristene (III, 5, 9) above. Traces of corruption appear in Philo's Corrup. Text (e.g. his comment, in Quis Rer. Div. 1:6, 15, on the interpretation of the Heb text which place about this time. No actual record of this revision exists, but it is beyond doubt that it originated in the rabbinical school, of which Rabbi Akiba was the chief representative, and which had its center at Jamnia in the years following the destruction of Jerus. The Jewish doctors, their temple in ruins, concentrated their attention on the settlement of the text of the Scriptures which remained to them. This school of eminent critics, precursors of the Masoretes, besides settling outstanding questions concerning the Canon, laid down strict rules for Bib. interpretation, and in all probability established the official revis. of the text.

But another cause widened still farther the distance between the texts of Jesus and Alexandria.

2. Official Revision of Hebrew Text c 100 AD

This was the adoption of the LXX by the Christian church. When Christ and the Palestinian Heb text reached an acute stage. One cause of this was the revision of the Heb text which took place about this time. No actual record of this revision exists, but it is beyond doubt that it originated in the rabbinical school, of which Rabbi Akiba was the chief representative, and which had its center at Jamnia in the years following the destruction of Jerus. The Jewish doctors, their temple in ruins, concentrated their attention on the settlement of the text of the Scriptures which remained to them. This school of eminent critics, precursors of the Massoretes, besides settling outstanding questions concerning the Canon, laid down strict rules for Bib. interpretation, and in all probability established the official revis. of the text.

But another cause widened still farther the distance between the texts of Jesus and Alexandria.

3. Adoption of LXX by the Christian Church

This was the adoption of the LXX by the Christian Church. The Christians, in proof of their doctrines, the Jews began to question its accuracy. Hence mutual recriminations which are reflected in the pages of Justin's Dialogue with Trypho. "They dare to assert," says Justin (Dial., 68), "that the interpretation produced by your seventy elders under Ptolemy of Egypt is in some points inaccurate." A crucial instance cited by the Jews was the rendering "virgin" in Isa 7:14, where they claimed with justice that "virginwoman" would be a more accurate. Justin refutes by charging the Jews with deliberate excision of passages favorable to Christianity.

That such accusations should be made in those critical years was inevitable, yet there is no evidence of any material interpolations having been introduced by either party. But the Alexandrian VS, in view of the revised text and the new and stricter rules of interpretation, was adopted by the Jews to be inadequate, and a group of new translations of Scripture in the 2d cent. AD supplied the demand. We possess considerable fragments of the work of three of these translators, viz. Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, besides scanty remnants of further anonymous VSS.

The earliest of the three was Aquila. A proselyte to Judaism, and, like his NT namesake, a native of Pontus. He flourished, probably, about 117-135 AD. He is known to have translated his OT, not wholly trustworthy, under Hadrian (117-138 AD) and was related to that emperor: there is no impossibility for "philosophus" that Hadrian intrusted to Aquila the superintendence of the building of the Septuagint; and an old tradition has it that there was he converted to Christianity by Christian eyes returning from Pella, but that his refusal to abandon paganism he was forced to recant, and was put to death as a Jew and was actuated by a bias against Christianity in his translation. This view of the OT is that is certain of the New Testament, in particular of Rabbi Akiba (95-135 AD), and that his VS was an attempt to reproduce exactly the revised official text. The result was an extraordinary production, unparalleled in Gr Lat., if it can be classed under that category at all. No jot or tittle of the Heb might be neglected. Consistency was the rule of each Heb word must be preserved and the etymological kinship of different Heb words represented. Such were some of his leading principles. The opening words of his tr (Gen 1:1) may be rendered. In heading founded food with the heavens and with the earth, or "summary" was selected because the Heb word for "beginning" (r'sh'm'a) is a derivative word and, hence, may be a corruption of the word (Heb) prefixed to the verse of the case, but indistinguishable from the preposition "with." Hence, the NT translators, as seen in the Acc., had not tr, but written in archaic Heb characters.

A slave to the Heb text," as Origen has aptly been described by a modern writer as "a colossal crib" (Burkitt, JQR, October, 1896, 207 ff). Yet it was a great success in its time. It must be regarded as the standard of Heb, and continued in use for several centuries; Justinian expressly sanctioned its use in the synagogues (Nov., 146). Its lack of style and violation of the laws of grammar were not due to ignorance of Gr, of which the writer shows himself acquainted, or to a considerable command, its importance lay and lies (as far as it is preserved) in its exact reproduction of the rabbinical text of the 2d cent. AD. It may be regarded as the beginning of the scientific study of the Heb Scriptures. Though it was bold attempt at the translation, it cannot be charged with being intentionally antagonistic to Christianity. If the original was not only confined to extracts in MS, the latest fragments were recovered from the Cairo Geniza in 1897 and edited by F. C. Burkitt (Fragnments of the Books of Kings, 1897; Hebrew-Gr Greek Palimpsest, 1900). The student of Swete's OT will trace Aquila's unmistakable style in the footnotes to the Books of S and K: the order and shorter B text in those books has constantly been supplemented in the A text from Aquila. A longer specimen of his work occurs in his translation of the Psalms. It is no claim to be regarded as "Septuagint"; Jerome refers to a second ed of Aquila's VS, and the Gr Eccl. is perhaps his ed of this book. Aquila's VS was an invaluable Heb text (McNicol, Introd. to Eccl. Cambridge, 1904, App. 4). The suggestion of the Vulgate translator, with Onkelos, author of the Tg of that name, has been generally accepted.

Epiphanius gives an account of the dates and history of Theodotion and Symmachus is trustworthy. He mentions their being reversed or probably misted by the order of the tre in the columns of the Hexapla (see below). He also apparently confused Aquila and Theodotion in calling the latter a native of Pontus. As regards date, Theodotion's critics are alleged, preceded Symmachus and probably flourished under M. Aurelius (161-80), whereas Symmachus lived under Commodus (180-192). Irenaeus mentions both Aquila and Theodotion, and that of Symmachus had in his day either been produced or at least not widely circulated. According to the testimony of Irenaeus, Theodotion was an Ephesian and a convert to Judaism. He constantly agrees with the LXX, and was rather a revision of it, to bring it into accord with the current Heb text, than an independent work. The supplementation of the LXX by "laxness in the LXX, and the fact that the older VS of some books did not aim at completeness, but merely to reproduce them from the base line of some lacunae were greatest in job and his VS of that book was much longer than the LXX. The text of job printed in Swete's ed is the patchwork of old and new. A learned and careful reader may detect the Theodotion portions by transliterations and other peculiarities. Theodotion's VS is preserved in cod. Q in Jer. As regards the additional matter contained in LXX, Theodotion was inconsistent. It is admitted, e.g., that in Ps 119:164 (Sus, Bel and the Three), but did not apparently admit the non-canonical books and adopted his Dn in place of the inadequate LXX VS, which has survived in only one Gr MS; but the date when the change took place is unknown and the early
history of the two Gr texts is obscure. Theodotion's renderings have been found in writings before his time ('aet. vic.) and, it is reasonably conjectured, that even before the 3rd cent. AD the LXX text had been discarded and that Theodotion's VS IS but a working copy of the anti-Hebraic VS. Theodotion is from the barbarisms of Aquila, but is addicted to transliteration and to the proliferation of the Heb. text into Gr letters. His reasons for this habit are not always clear; ignorance of Heb will not account for all (cf VIII. 1, (a), below).

Beside the two VSS produced by, and primarily intended for, the Septuagint, there are other materials in the Hebrew which have some affinity to the text of either the LXX or the Heb. The first of these is the so-called Hexapla; the second, probably in the main, is the set of manuscripts, which have been given the name of the so-called Targums. Both will be considered in the sequel.
then, with the complete array of signs, we should not have "the original LXX," but merely, after removing the asterisked passages, a text current in the 3d cent. The fact has to be emphasized that Origen's gigantic work was framed on erroneous principles. He assumed (1) the purity of the current Heb text, (2) the corruption of the current LXX text where it deviated from the Heb. The modern critic recognizes that the LXX on the whole represents the older text, the divergencies of which from the Heb are largely due to the official revision of the latter early in the Christian era. He recognizes also that in some books (e.g. Job) the old Gr VS was only a partial one. To reconstruct the original text he must therefore recourse to other authorities beside Origen.

Such assistance is partly furnished by two other recensions made in the century after Origen. Jerome (Prefat. in Paralip.), ref. to Ado. Ref., II, 27) states that in the 4th cent. three recensions circulated in different parts of the Christian world: "Alexandria and Jerome Egypt in their Septuagint acclaim Hesychius as their authority, the region from Constantinople to Antioch approves the copies of LXX there, the interior, the Palestinian provinces recognized the MSS which were promulgated by Eusebius and Pamphilus on the basis of Origen's labors, and the whole world is divided between these three varieties of text.

Hesychius is probably to be identified with the martyr bishop mentioned by Eusebius (HE, VIII, 13) along with another scholarly martyr, Hesych Phileus bishop of Thmuis, and it is thought that these two were engaged in revising the LXX text at the time when Pamphilus and Eusebius were employed on a similar task under similar conditions. How far existing MSS preserve the Hesychian recension is uncertain; agreement of their text with that of the Egyptian, VSS and Fathers (Cyril in particular) is the criterion. For the Prophets Ceriani has identified cod. Q and its kin as Hesychian. For the Octateuch N. McLean (JTS, II, 306) finds the Hesychian text in a group of cursive MSS, 44, 74, 78, 84, 106, 154, etc. Consult the first installment of the Cambridge LXX the raise the question whether cod. B (Vaticanus) may not itself be Hesychian; its text is more closely allied to that of Cyril Alex. than to any other patristic text, and the consensus of these two witnesses against the readings of the text (Exx. 31:16, 34:12) is early striking.

In the Psalter also Rahlfis (Septuaginta- Studien, 2, Heft, 1907, 235) traces the Hesychian text in B and partially in S (Sinait.). Cf von Soden's solution for the NT and see TEXT and MSS of the NT.

The Lucianic recension was the work of another martyr, Lucian of Antioch (d. 311-12), probably with the collaboration of the Hebraist.

12. Lucianic Dorotheus. There are, as Hort has Recension shown, reasons for associating Lucian with a "Syrian" recension of the NT in the 4th cent., which became the dominant type of text. That he produced a Syrian recension of the Gr OT is expressly stated by Jerome, and we are moreover able with considerable certainty to identify the extant MSS which exhibit it. The identification, due to Field and Lagarde, rests on these grounds: (1) certain verses in 2 K are in the Arab. Syro-Hexaplar marked with the letter L, and a note explains that the letter indicates Lucianic readings; (2) the readings so marked occur in the text of the Syro-Hexaplar, (3) the MSS in the historical books agree with the LXX citations of the Antiochene Fathers Chrysostom and Theodoret. This clue enabled Lagarde to construct a Lucianic text of the historical books (Librorum Vet. Test. canonici pars prior, Gottingen, 1883); his death prevented the completion of the work. Lagarde's edition is vitiated by the fact that he does not quote the readings of the individual MSS composing the group, and it can be regarded only an approximate reconstruction. It is evident, however, that the Lucianic LXX possessed much the same qualities as the Syrian recension of the NT; lucidity and completeness were the main objects. It is a full text, the outcome of a desire to include, so far as possible, the evidence to which the Lucianic text is consequently numerous. While this confutation of texts detracts from its value, the Lucianic recension gains importance from the fact that the sources from which it gleaned include an element of antiquity which the Hexapla lacks; where it unites with the Old Lat VS against all other authorities its evidence is invaluable.  

VI. RECONSTRUCTION OF LXX TEXT; VERSIONS, MANUSCRIPTS AND PRINTED EDITIONS. The task of restoring the original text is beset with difficulties. The materials (MSS, VSS, patristic citations) are abundant, but none has escaped "mixture," and the principles for reconstruction are not yet securely established (Swete, Uro, iv—vi; III, vi).

Among the chief aids to restoration are the daughter VSS made from the LXX, and above all the Hexapla, more especially (pre-Hieronymian) Vs, for the earliest Latin Old Lat. Old Lat. of the 2d cent. AD, i.e. before Origen, and contains a text from which the astierisked passages in Hexapla to VSS are absent; it thus "brings us the best independent proof that we have that the Hexapla signs introduced by Origen can be relied on for the reconstruction of the LXX" (Buxtorf). The Old Lat also enables us to recognize the ancient element in the Lucianic recension. But the Lat evidence itself is not by any means a pure Egyptian text and the 16th speaks of the infinite variety of Late, though they may ultimately prove all to fall into two main families, African and European. The addition of patristic quotations from the Old Lat is still useful, though tending verified by recent editions of the Fathers. Of Old Lat MSS one of the most important is the cod. Lugdunensis, edited by U. Robert (Pentateuch e cod. Lugd., vers. Lat. antiquissima, Paris, 1831; Stutt- tatech. partis post. vers. Lat. antiqu. e cod. Lugd., Lyon, 1909). The student should consult also Burkitt's ed. of The Rules of Tertullian ("Texts and Studies," III, 1, Cambridge, 1894) and The Old Latin and the Ita (ib., IV, 3, 1896). Jerome's Vulgate is mainly a direct text from the Heb, but the Vulg. Psalter, the so-called Gallican, is one of Jerome's two revisions of the LXX. His later VS from the Heb, and some details in our Prayer-Book Psalter are ultimately derived from the VSS made from the LXX. Parts of the Apocalypse (Wis. Ecclus. Bar. 1 and 2 Macce) are also pure Old Lat., untouched by Jerem. 

The early date (3d cent. AD) once claimed for the VSS or Origenic (Bohajian, Lower Egypt, Sahidic or Upper Egypt, and Middle Egypt) has not been confirmed by later researches, at least as regards the first-named, which is probably not earlier than the 3d or 4th cent. AD. Rahlfis (Septuaginte-Studien, 1, 1907) identifies the Boharian Psalter as the Hesychian recension. The Sahidic VS of Job has fortunately preserved the shorter text lacking the later insertions from Theodotion (Lagarde). As regards the rest of the VS, this does not conclusively prove that it is pre-Origenic; it may be merely a Hexaplar text with the asterisked passages omitted (Buxtorf, E.B., IV, 5027). The influence of the Hexapla is traceable elsewhere in this VS.

The Ethiopic MS is made from the Gr and in part at least from an early text; Rahlfis (Sept Stud., 1, 1904) considers its text of S-K, with that of cod. B, to be pre-Hexaplar.

The Vulg or Peshitta Syriac VS was made from the Heb, though partly influenced by the LXX, and another Syriac MS of primary importance is the LXX text, viz. that of Paul, bishop of Todla (Constantin in Mesopotamia) executed at Alexandria, known as the Syro-Hexaplar. This is a half VS of the LXX column of the Hexapla, containing the Hexaplar signs. MS of the present and previously MS of the present are extant (Lagarde and Rahlfis, Bibliotheca Syrian, Gottingen, 1892). This VS supplements the Gr Hexapla, the principal authority for Origen's text. For the original VS of Dult, which has survived in only one late MS, the
The Armenian VS (ascribed to the 5th cent.) also owes its character largely to its MSS: its text of the Octateuch is largely Hexaplaric.

A bare mention must suffice of the Arabic VS (of which the chief, the Sakhīrāt, was rendered from the LXX); the fragments of the Gothic VS (made from the Luscinian recension), and the Savtian (party of the Tiberian) Hebrew and Greek MSS, were also early renderings from the LXX.

For a full description of the Gr MSS see Swete, Intro, I, ch v. They will accordingly be treated in three groups (variants or minuscules) into uncials and cursives, the former ranging from the 4th cent. (Pist perfecta, 397 a.d.) to the 10th cent. (Nestle in πîνακα, xxiii, 208) to the 13th cent. (Glycon, 1252) to the 16th cent. (AD). Complete Bibliae are few: the majority contain groups of books only, such as the Pent, Octateuch (Gen-Ruth), the later historical books, the Psalter, the 3 or 5 "Solomonic" books, the Prophets (major, minor, propheticas, or common)—commonly denoted by capital letters (in the ed of Holm in Göttinger Pausch Roman figures); cursives, of which over 800 are known, by Arabic figures; in the larger Cambridge LXX the selected cursives are denoted by small Roman letters.

The following are the chief uncials containing, or wholly or partly, the Bible (by place of discovery): at Rome (4th cent. AD), adopted as the standard text in the Vulgate; 8 or T (Sinaïticus, at St. Petersburg and Leipzig, 4th cent. AD), discovered by Tischendorf in 1844 and subsequent years in St. Catherine's, Mt. Sinai, British Museum, Paris, 5th cent. AD; C (Ephraemi scriptor Paris, probably of the 5th cent., underlies a medieval Gr text of works of Ephraem the Syrian. For the Octateuch and historical books: D (Cottonianus, British Museum, 5th cent. AD); E (Vindobonensis, Vienna, 6th cent. AD), fragment of the Octateuch; G (Sarrazinianus, fragments at Leyden, Paris and St. Petersburg, 4th to 5th cent.); H (Vindobonensis, Vienna, 7th cent.), fragments of the New Testament on purple leaves; M (Cambridgianus, Paris, 7th cent.), important on account of its marginal Hexaplaric matter. For the Prophets: Q (Marshallianus, Rome, 6th cent.) is valuable, both for its text, which is "Hesychian" (see above), and for its abundant marginal Hexaplaric matter. A curious mixture of uncials and cursives is found in E (Bodleianus, probably 5th cent.), fragments of the historical books (3 R 18 258) preserved at Oxford. Cambridge (1 leaf), St. Petersburg and London; Tischendorf, who brought the MS from his Oxford visit, described it as being quite a first-aid guide to the Hexaplaric leab; that which the translation from uncial to cursive script occurs, until his death. The long-concealed fact that the scribes were for a part of a series of MS cameras in light through Swete's identification of the Cambridge leab: the main MSS were not included. Many of the cursives still await investigation, as do also the lectionaries. The latter, though the MSS are mainly late, the use of the LXX lectionary purposes was inherited by the church from the second and third stages. MSS may represent an old system; light may also be expected from them at the local distribution of various types of text.

Of the printed text the first four editions were (1) the Complutensian Polyglot of Cardinal Ximenes, 1514-17, comprising the Heb, Vulg, and LXX texts the last in the middle place of honor being compared to Jesus in the midst between them, and was based on MSS from the Vatican and one from Venice; it exhibits on the whole the Luscinian recension, as the Hesychian is by a curious coincidence represented in (2) the Aldine ed of 1518, based on Venetian MSS. (3) The ed, published at Rome in 1726 under the auspices of Pope Sixtus V and frequently reprinted until the 19th cent., based on the cod. Sinaiticus, the authorship of which text is justly recognized in the inestimable past, (printed in Swete's Intro). (4) The English Bible began by being based on (id. 1712) was based on the cod. Alexandrinus, with aid from other MSS, and had the authority of the principal employed Origen's corrector, and different sizes of letters to show the divergence between the GR and the Heb. Of more recent importance, (5) the great Oxford ed of Holmes and Parsons (Oxford, 1818-1827, 5 vols) was the first attempt to bring together in a gigantic synopsis the evidence of the oldest and critical MSS (upward of 200). VSS and early citations from Pseudepigrapha are also mentioned. (6) The most important of Swete's ed (8th cent.), ed 3, 1901-7, 3 vols, or, in the hands of all serious LXX students. The text is that of B, or where B fails of A, and the apparatus contains the readings of the principal uncials MSS. New materials discovered since the ed of H and P, especially the former, are employed. In the presentation of the other evidence has been made possible by photography. The fact that the text here printed is but a provisional one explains why it is the Office of the Pent has (1913) appeared (The OT in Gr, ed A. E. Brooke and N. Mclean, Cambridge, 1911 pt. III, 5 vols, and D). These MSS, all that from Ex onward a few alterations of errors in the original MS have been corrected, and while the editors have rejected a few old readings without sufficient regard to the peculiarities of Hellenistic GT, the importance and the work of correcting the LXX text on the basis of the cursives. The materials of H and P are brought to date and presented in a more reliable and convenient form. Besides these, there is (7) a facsimile of the LXX text on the basis of the reconstruction of the Luscinian of the historical books, which, as stated, must be used with caution (see above).

The task of reconstructing the oldest text is still unaccomplished. Materials have accumulated, and much preliminary "spade-work" has been done, but the task remains almost as great as in Swete, Intro, 484 ff. and more recently by Nestle and Rahlfs; but the principles of the editor must be finally determined. The extent to which "critical" editions of the LXX are the stumbling-block. Clearly no single MS presents the oldest text. That of cod. B, as in the NT, is in the whole, the purest. In the first (1-2 K), e.g., it has escaped the grosser interpolations found in most VSS. The editors agree in regarding its text as pre-Origenic. It is, however, of unequal value and by no means an infallible guide; in gr, e.g., its text is undoubtedly late, in earlier periods. To 4th cent. AD, according to one authority, (Moore, "Jgs," TIC) in relation to two of the 4th cent. MSS, and to 5th cent. AD, one or neither predominantly Luscinian nor Hexaplaric; but it has been regarded by some authorities as Hesychian. Possibly the text reconstructed in the present work introduced the LXX adhered more closely than others to the primitive text. In L (H. Rahlfs, 1923) the text is of course older, and may prove to be original. Still even its purest portions contain marks of editorial revision and corrupt corrections. Cod. A presents a quite different type of text, approximating to that of the MT. In the books of "gen" it is practically Hexaplaric text without the critical signs, the additional matter being mainly derived from Aquila. Yet that it contains an ancient element is shown by the large support given to its readings by the NT and early Christian writers. Individual MSS must give place to groups. In order to reconstruct the texts current here, the evidence of the groups containing the three 4th cent. MSS, and to eliminate from the readings of the other MSS, the Hexaplaric matter and such changes as appear to have been introduced by the authors of those MSS. Other groups, it is true, have not yet been brought to account. The attempt to penetrate into the earlier stages is the hardest task. The Old Lat. VS is here the surest guide: it has preserved readings which have disappeared from all Gr MSS, some of which the LXX may preserve. The antiquity of the Gr variants. The evidence of early Christian and Jewish citations is also invaluable. Ultimately, after elimination of all readings proved to be recessional or late, the decision between outstanding variants must depend on internal evidence. These variants will fall into two classes: (1) those merely affecting the Gr text, and for the larger number, those affecting the Heb text. In adjudicating on the latter Lagarde's main custom have been born in the Roman Church, and are preferred to a slavishly literal one, and a tr presupposing another Hebrew original MS based on the MT.

VII. Numbers, Titles and Order of Books. In addition to the Heb canons, the classical LXX contains the only known Hebrew LXX includes all the books in the Eng, Apoc.

1. Contents except 2 Esd (Pr Man only finds a place among the canticles appended in some MSS to the Ps) besides a 3d and 4th book of Macc. Swete's ed (1887) is the standard text. An appendix of Gr books on the borderland of canonicy the Ps of Sol (found in some cursives and mentioned in the list in cod. A), the Gr fragments of the Book of En and the ecclesiastical canticles above enumerated, are in the late MSS in quoting freely from these additional books the editors less perpetuate a tradition inherited from the Jews of Alexandria. Most of the books being original
Gr compositions were ipso facto excluded from a place in the Heb Canon. Greater latitude as regards canonicity prevailed at Alexandria; the Pent occupied a place apart, but as regards later books no very sharp line of differentiation between "canonical" and "uncanonical" appears to have been drawn.

Palestinian Jews employed the first word or words of each book of the Pent to serve as its title; Gen e.g. was denoted "in the beginning," the other books have similar titles. It is to the LXX, through the medium of the Lat VSS, that we owe the familiar descriptive titles, mostly suggested by phrases in the Gr VS. In some books there are traces of rival titles in the Ptolemaic age. Exodus ("outgoing") is also called Ezoqogê ("leading out") by Philo and by the Hel- lenist Ezekiel who gave that name to his drama on the deliverance from Egypt. Philo has also alternative names for Dt—Epinomis ("after-law") borrowed from the title of a pseudo-Platonic treatise, and for Jgs "the Book of Judgments." The last title resembles the Alexandrian name for the books of 

2. Titles

Ex ("and these are the names") of the other arrangements is, however, indicated in cod. B by the insertion at the end of 1 R, 3 R, 1 Ch of the first sentence of the succeeding book, a reminder to the reader that a continuation is to follow. Ezr-Neh, the Gr VS (2 Esd) being more under the influence of Palestinian tradition, remains undivided. Originally Ch-Ezr-Neh formed a unit, as was apparently still the case when the oldest Gr VS (1 Esd) was made.

In the arrangement of books there is a radical departure from Palestinian practice. There were three main unalterable divisions in the

3. Bipartition of Books

Ezr-Neh form respectively one book apiece. In the LXX the first three of these collections are subdivided into two volumes as in modern Bibles; an acquaintance with the

Order the formation of the Canon: Law, Books of Prophets ("Former," i.e. Josh, Jgs, S, K, and "Latter") and "Writings." This arrangement was known at Alexandria at the end of the 2d cent. BC (Sir, prol.) but was not followed. The "Writings" were a miscellaneous collection of history and poetry with one prophethical book (Dan). Alexandrian scholars introduced a philological and systematic system of bringing together the books of each class and arranging them with some regard to the supposed chronological order of their authors. The Law, long before the Gr tr, had secured a position of supreme sanctity; this group works up independently, it kept its precedence and the individual books their order (Lev and Nu, however, exchange places in a few lists). The other two groups are broken up. Ruth is removed from the "Writings" and attached to Jgs. Ch and Ezr-Neh are similarly rearranged to the end of the historical books. This group, from chronological considerations, is followed by the poetical and other "Writings," the Prophets coming last (so in B, etc; in SA prophets precede poets). The internal order of the Gr Hagiothrapha, which includes quasi-historical (Est, Tob, Jth) and Wisdom books, is variable. Dn then first finds a place among the Prophets. The 12 minor prophets usually precede the major (for the Western order see above). The order of the first half of their company is shuffled, apparently on chronological grounds, Hos being followed by Am, Mic, Joel, Ob, Jon. Jer has his train of satelites, Bar, Lam (transferred from the "Writings") and Ep. Jer; Sus and Bel are not considered in the present book. The arrangement in the order of books is partly attributable to the practice of writing each book on a separate papyrus roll, kept in a cylindrical case; rolls containing kindred matter would tend to be placed in the same tube: hence priority would be given to these separate items until the copying of large groups in book-form came into vogue (Swete, Intro, 225 f., 229 f.).

VIII. Characteristic of the Version and Its Component Papyri—Notwithstanding the uncertain state of the text, some general characteristic of the VS are patent. It is clear that, like the Heb itself, it is not a single book, but a library. It is a series of VS and Gr compositions covering well-nigh 400 years, since pre-Christian versions of the 2d cent. AD; the bulk of the tr, however, fall within the first half of the period (Sir, prol.).

The tr may be grouped and their chronological order approximately determined from certain characteristic marks.

1. Grouping of LXX Books on 

Evidence of the tr is to be found in the composition of different parts of the text from different parts of the VS. This is not an infallible proof that different hands have been employed, since irrevocable uniformity in tr is difficult of attainment and indeed was not the aim of the transcribers. The modern critic is therefore to have studied the style of individual hands, the various traditions that may be ascribed to them, the order and arrangement of the text, and the evidence of the apparatus criticus. It is not possible to determine the style of any single hand that was used to transcribe the Pentateuch (Swete, Intro, 229 f.).

2. Books on

When we come to the Pentateuch (the first five books of the OT) it is not possible to determine the style of any single hand that was used to transcribe the Pentateuch (Swete, Intro, 229 f.).

The Heb Word is consistently rendered by one Gr word in Genesis and by another elsewhere, and if each of the two portions has other features peculiar to itself, it becomes quite probable that the two portions are the work of different schools. Among "text-words" which yield results of this kind are "servant" in "Moses the servant of the Lord," "Hosts" in "Lord of Hosts," "Philistines" (Swete, Intro, 317 f.) Thackeray, Grammar of the OT, 7 f. (2) We may compare the Gr with that of the Peshitta and the Syriac. The LXX was written in the koine or "common Gr, most of them in the vernacular ... the language of its evolution. The Peshitta, of the Petoite and Hiphe yappa the 3d cent. BC afford the closest parallels to the Gr Pent. The following facts are of importance: the translation of the "Atiticl" school which persistently struggled, with indifferent success, to recover the original Gr, was the most successful. This is one of the Gr masterpieces. This style is represented in the LXX by most of the original Gr writings and by the paraphrases of some of the "Writings." (3) We may compare the Gr books as translations, noting in which books license is allowed and which adhere strictly to the Heb. The general movement is in the direction of greater literary verba. the later books show an increasing reverence for the letter of Scripture, recalling the tendency of pedantically literal VSS: the tendency culminated in the 2d cent. AD in the barbarisms of Aquila. Some of the "Writings" were freely handled, because they had not yet obtained canonical rank at the time of tr. In 

The Hexateuch may be placed in the 3d cent. BC. The Prophets mainly in the 2d and 1st cent. BC.

(1) The Hexateuch.—The Pent should undoubtedly be regarded as a unit: the Aristes story may so far be credited. It is uniformly held that the common vernacular style, combined with faithfulness to the Heb, rarely lapsing into literalism. It set the standard which later translators tried to imitate. The text is more securely established in this portion, and substantial variant readings are comparatively few. The latter part of Ex is an exception; the Heb had
here not reached its final form in the 3rd cent. BC, and there is some reason for thinking that the VS is not the work of the translator of the first half. In 40 a few new features in vocabulary appear (e.g. coklesea; see Hort, Christian Ecclesia, 4 ff.). The Gr VS of Jos forms a link between the Pent and the later historical books. The text was not yet fixed, and variants are more abundant than in the Pent. The earliest VS, probably from selections only, appears from certain common features to have been nearly coeval with that of the LXX.

The earliest, VS, probably from selections only, appears from certain common features to have been nearly coeval with that of the LXX. The best or tr of the LXX, 2 vols, Gr text of A, tr and notes, Cambridge, 1904-6, with review in JTS, X, 299). Jer, Ezek and the Minor Prophets were probably tr in bloc or nearly so. The Palestinian Gr, no doubt, included a second group of Scriptures and this stimulated a desire among Alexandrian Jews to possess the entire collection of the Prophets in Gr. The undertaking seems to have been a formal and quasi-official one, not a haphazard growth. For it has been ascertained that Jer and Ezek were divided for tr purposes into two nearly equal parts; a change in the Gr style occurs at the junctures. In Jer the break occurs in ch 29 (LXX order); the clearest criterion of the two is probably a shift of tone. "Thus saith the Lord." The last ch (52) is probably a later addition in the Gr. The translator of the second half of Jer also tr the first half of Bar (1-38); he was incompetent and his work, if our text may be relied on, affords flagrant examples of Gr words being selected to render Heb words which he did not understand merely because of their similar sound. Ezek is similarly divided, but here the translator of the first half (chs 1-27) undertook the difficult labor, though the entire record. The second half was left to a second worker. An outstanding test is afforded by the renderings of the refrain, "They shall know that I am the Lord." The Gr VS of "the twelve" shows no trace of a similar division; the chs 5-24, however, are probably by the same hand (JTS, IV, 245, 398, 578). But this official VS of the Prophets had probably been preceded by VSS of short passages selected to be read on the festivals in the synagogue.

Lectionary requirements occasioned the earliest VSS of the Prophets, possibly of the Pent as well. Two indications of this have been traced. There exist in four MSS a Gr VS of the Psalms of Habakkuk (Hab 3), a chapter which has been a Jewish lesson for Pentecost from the earliest times, independent of and apparently older than the LXX and made for synagogue use. Similarly in Ezek LXX there is a section of sixteen verses (36-24-38) with a style quite distinct from that of its context. This passage was also an early Christian lesson for Pentecost, and its lectionary use was inherited from Judaism. Here the LXX translators seem to have incorporated the older VS, whereas in Hab 3 they rejected it (JTS, XII, 191, 199). The characteristic contents of the "former Prophets" (1-3 B.).—The Gr style indicates that the history of the monarchy was not all tr at once. Ulfilas is said to have omitted these books from the Gothic VS as likely to inflame the military temerity of his race; for another reason the Gr translators were at first content with a partial VS. They omitted as unifying the more disastrous portions, David's sin with the subsequent calamities of his reign and the later history of the divided monarchy culminating in the captivity. Probably the earliest VSS embodied only (1) 1 R, (2) 2 R 1-11 (David's early reign), (3) 3 R 12-21 13 (Solomon and the beginning of the divided monarchy); the third book of "Reigns" opened with the accession of Solomon (as in Lucian's text), not at the point where 1 R opens. These earlier portions are written in a freer style than the rest of the Gr "Reigns," and the Heb original differed widely in places from that tr in the Eng. Bible (JTS, VIII, 262).

The "Writings."—The Hagiographa at the end of the 2nd cent. BC were regarded as national lit. (Sir, prol. "the other books of our fathers"), but not as canonical. The translators did not scruple to treat these with great freedom, undeterred by the prohibition against alteration of Scripture (Deut 4:2; 12:32). Free paraphrases of extracts were produced, sometimes with legendary additions. A partial VS of Job (one-sixth being omitted) was among the first; Arias, the historian of the 2nd cent. BC, seems to have used an English version (Freudenthal, Hellenistische Studien, 1875, 136 ff.). The translator was a student of the Gr poets; his VS was probably produced for the general reader, not for the synagogues. Hatch's theory (Essays in B. Gr, 1880, 214) that his text was shorter than ours and was expanded later is untenable; avoidance of anthropomorphisms explains some omissions, the reason for others is obscure. The first Gr narrative of the return from exile (1 Esd) was probably composed from a lost Heb collection only from Chs 25, Neh, grouped round a fable of non-Jewish origin, the story of the 3 youths at the court of Darius. The work is a fragment, the end being lost, and it has been contended by some critics that the VS once embraced the whole of Ch-Ezr-Neh (C. C. Torrey, Ezra Studies, Chicago, 1910). The Gr is obviously earlier than Esd B and is of great value for the reconstruction of the Heb. The same translator appears from peculiarities of diction to have produced the two tr additions to the earlier form, the freedom and incorporating extraneous matter (the Three Children, Sus, Bel). The maximum of interpolation is reached in Est, where the Gr additions make up two-thirds of the story. The Gr Prov also is probably 1st cent. BC in the Heb; some of these appear to be derived from a lost Heb collection, others are of purely Gr origin. This translator also knew and imitated the Gr classics; the numerous fragments of iambic and hexameter verse in the tr cannot be accidental (JTS, XIII, 46). The Psalter is the one tr in this category in which libraries have not been taken; in Ps 13 (14) 3 the extracts from other parts of Ps and from Isa included in the B text must be an interpolation possible before St. Paul's time (Rom 3 13 3 ff.), or else taken from Rom. The little Ps 161 in LXX, described in the title as an "autograph" work of David and as "outside the number," is clearly a late Gr production, perhaps an appendix added after the VS was complete.

The latest LXX translations.—The latest VSS included in the LXX are the productions of the Jewish translators of the 2d cent. AD; some books may be rather earlier, the work of pioneers in the new school which advocated strict adherence to the Heb. The books of "Reigns," perhaps, by Theodotion, perhaps, or by one of his school; the later portions (2 R 11 2-3 R 21 11, David's downfall, and 3 R 22-1 R end, the downfall of the monarchy) are by one hand, as shown by pecu-
2. General Characteristics — (Heb "for" or "as God"); 15. 3. "The Lord is a breaker of battles" (Heb "a Man of war"); 24. 10. "They saw the place where the God of Israel dwelt!" (Jos 23. 15; 1 Kings 8. 19; 2 Kings 23. 12, 28, 31). verse 11. "Of the elect of Israel not one perished and they were seen in the place of God" (Heb "Upon the nobles . . . He laid not His hand, and they beheld God"). The comparison of God to the rock was commonly, but sometimes as idolatrous, as was sometimes the comparison to the sun from fear of sun-worship (Ps 83 [84] 12. "The Lord loves mercy and truth" for Heb "The Lord is a sun and shield"). The sons of God" (Gen 6. 2) becomes "the children of God" (Heb 11. 12-16). e.g. slight amplifications, interpretation of difficult words, substitution of Gr for Heb coinage, tr of place-names, see Swete, Intro, 323 ff. Blunders in tr are not uncommon, but the difficulties which these pioneers had to face must be remembered, esp. the paleographical character of the Heb originals. These were written on flimsy papyrus rolls, in a script probably in a transitional stage between the archaic and the later square characters; the words were not separated, and the difference in the ratio of the radicals (yāqōb and yōdāh) were also frequently omitted. Add to this the absence at Alexandria, for parts at least of the Scriptures, of any sound tradition as to the meaning. On the other hand the vocalization adopted for the translation, e.g. e.g. in the proper names, is of great value in the history of early Sem pronunciation. It must further be remembered that the Sem language most familiar to them was not Heb but Aram., and some mistakes are due to Aram. or even Arab. colloquialisms (Swete, Intro, 310).

IX. Salient Differences between Greek and Hebrew Texts. — Differences indicating a Heb original other than the MT affect either the sequence or the subject-matter (cf Swete, Intro, 254 ff.). The most extensive discrepancies in arrangement of materials occur in (1) Ex 35-39, the construction of the Tabernacle and the ornaments (Swete, Intro, 310).

1. Sequence of its ministers, (2) 3 R 4-11, Solomon's reign, (3) Jer. (last half), (4) Prov (end). (1) In Ex the LXX gives precedence to the priests' offerings, which in the Heb follow the account of the Tabernacle, and omits altogether the altar of incense. The whole section describing the execution of the instructions given in the previous chapters in almost identical form in the LXX and the text has clearly not been finally fixed in the 3rd cent. BC; the section was perhaps absent from the oldest Gr VS. In Ex 20. 13-15 cod. B arranges three of the commandments in the Alexandrian order (7, 8, 6), attested in Philo and in the NT. (2) Deliberate rearrangement has taken place in the history of Solomon, and the LXX unquestionably preserves the older text. The narrative of the building of the Temple, like that of other thoroughgoing LXX passages, was replaced. Theodotion's Dtl, as above stated, superseded in the Christian church the older VS. A new and complete VS of Ch-Err-Neh was made (Edel B), though the older VS retained its place in the Codex on account of the interesting legend imbedded in it: the new VS is here again possibly the work of Theodotion; the numerous transiterations are characteristic of him (Torrey, Ezra Studies; the theory had previously been advanced by Sir H. Howorth). In the Gr Edel we have a specimen of Aquila's style (see McNeile's ed., Cambridge, 1904). Canticles is another VS.

A marked feature of the whole tr is the scrupulous avoidance of anthropomorphisms and phrases derogatory to the Divine transcendence and majesty. Thus Ex 4. 10, "Thou shalt be to him in things pertaining to God" (Heb "for" or "as God"); 15. 3. "The Lord is a breaker of battles" (Heb "a Man of war"); 24. 10. "They saw the place where the God of Israel dwelt!" (1 Kings 8. 19; 2 Kings 23. 12, 28, 31; 1 Kings 22. 19; 2 Kings 23. 12, 28, 31). verse 11. "Of the elect of Israel not one perished and they were seen in the place of God" (Heb "Upon the nobles . . . He laid not His hand, and they beheld God"). Thus in the comparison of God to the rock was commonly, but sometimes as idolatrous, as was sometimes the comparison to the sun from fear of sun-worship (Ps 83 [84] 12. "The Lord loves mercy and truth" for Heb "The Lord is a sun and shield"). The sons of God" (Gen 6. 2) becomes "the children of God" (Heb 11. 12-16). e.g. slight amplifications, interpretation of difficult words, substitution of Gr for Heb coinage, tr of place-names, see Swete, Intro, 323 ff. Blunders in tr are not uncommon, but the difficulties which these pioneers had to face must be remembered, esp. the paleographical character of the Heb originals. These were written on flimsy papyrus rolls, in a script probably in a transitional stage between the archaic and the later square characters; the words were not separated, and the difference in the ratio of the radicals (yāqōb and yōdāh) were also frequently omitted. Add to this the absence at Alexandria, for parts at least of the Scriptures, of any sound tradition as to the meaning. On the other hand the vocalization adopted for the translation, e.g. e.g. in the proper names, is of great value in the history of early Sem pronunciation. It must further be remembered that the Sem language most familiar to them was not Heb but Aram., and some mistakes are due to Aram. or even Arab. colloquialisms (Swete, Intro, 310).
very full lists in Swete's _Intro_ and the bibliographies by Nestle in _PEP_, III. 1–24, and XXIII. 207–10 (1913); _HDB_, IV. 453–54.

H. ST. J. TRICKERAY

SEPULCHRE, _sepul-ch_ (2 Ch 21 20; 32 33; Jn 19 41f; Acts 2 29, etc). See BURIAL; JERUSALEM, VIII.

SERAH, _sera_ (םֶרֶא, _serah_, “abundance”): Daughter of Asher (Gen 46 17; Nu 26 46, AV “Sarah”); 1 Ch 7 30.

SERAIЯ, _sera_ (םֶרֶא, _serah_, _serah_): (1) Secretary of David (2 Sam 17); in 2 Sam 20 25 he is called Sheva, in 1 K 4 3 the name appears as Shisha. This last or Shasha would be elsewhere restored elsewhere; others prefer the form Shavsha, which is found in 1 Ch 19 16.

(2) A high priest in the reign of Zedekiah; executed with other prominent captives at Riblah by order of Nebuchadnezzar (2 K 25 18.21; Jer 52 24.27). Mentioned in the list of high priests (1 Ch 6 4). Ezra claims descent from him (Ezr 7 13). See AZARIAH; SARAS.

(3) The son of Tanhumeth the Netophathite, and one of the heroic band of men who saved themselves from the fury of Nebuchadnezzar when he stormed Jerusalem. They repaired to Gedaliah, the son of Ahikam, but killed him on account of his allegiance to the Chaldeans (2 K 25 23.25).

(4) Son of Kenaz, and younger brother of Othniel, and father of Joab, the chief of Ge-harashim (1 Ch 4 13.14).

(5) Grandfather of Jehu, of the tribe of Simeon (1 Ch 4 35).

(6) A priest, the third in the list of those who returned from Babylon to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2 2; Neh 7 7, here called Azariah; 12 1), and third also (if the same person is meant) in the record of those who sealed the covenant binding all Jews not to take foreign wives (Neh 10 2). As the son of Hilkiah, and consequently a direct descendant of the priestly family, he became governor of the temple rebuild (Neh 11 11). He is mentioned (under the name Azariah) also in 1 Ch 9 11. Neh 12 2 adds that “in the days of Joiakin” the head of Serah's house was Merariah.

(7) Son of Arzel, one of those whom Jehoiakim commanded to imprison Jeremiah and Baruch, the son of Neriah (Jer 36 26).

(8) The son of Neriah, who went into exile with Zedekiah. He was also called Sar M'nâkah (“prince of repose”). The Tg renders _Sar_ M'nâkah by _Rabh_ T'khâbârâh, “prince of battle,” and _LXX_ by _sêpâr_ ᵉpotential, ᵉdorân ᵉdôrân, “prince of gifts,” reading M'nâkah for M'nâkah. At the request of Jeremiah he carried with him in his exile the passages containing the prophet's warning of the fall of Babylon, written in a book which he was hidden to bind to a stone and cast into the Euphrates, to symbolize the fall of Babylon (Jer 51 59–64).

HORACE J. WOLF

SERAPHIM, _sera_-(םֶרֶא, _seraphim_): A pl. word occurring only in Isa 6 2ff—Isaiah’s vision of Jehovah. The origin of the term in Heb is uncertain, when it was rebuilt. _Sêraphî_ in Nu 21 6; Isa 14 20, etc, signifies a fiery serpent. A Bab name for the fire-god, Nergal, was Sharrapu. In Egypt there have been found eagle-lion-shaped figures guarding a grave, to which is applied the name _seraph_. The equivalent Egr term is “girân.”

It is probable enough that popular mythology connected fire with the attendants of the deity in various ways among different peoples, and that burning lies at the base of the idea in all these suggested etymologies. It remains, however, that in Isaiah’s use there is nothing of the popular legend or superstition. These seraphim are august beings whose forms are not at all fully described. They had faces, feet, hands and wings. The six wings, in three pairs, covered their faces and feet in humility and reverence, and were used for sustaining them in their positions about the throne of Jehovah. One of them is the agent for (burning with a coal off the altar, not with his own power or person) the sin from the lips of the prophet.

Seraphim are in Jewish theology connected with cherubim and the dome as the three highest orders of attendants on Jehovah, and are superior to the angels who are messengers sent on various errands. As the cherubim in popular fancy were represented by the storm-clouds, so the seraphim were by the serpentine flashes of the lightning; but none of this appears in Isaiah’s vision.

In the NT the only possible equivalent is in “the living ones” ("beasts" of _AV_) in Rev 4, 5, etc. Here, as in Isa, they appear nearest Jehovah’s throne, supreme in praise of His holiness.

WILLIAM OWEN CARYER

SERAR, _sera_ (סֶרֶא, _Serar_; AV _Asser_): Name of one of the families which returned with Zerubbabel (1 Esd 6 52) = "Sera" of Ezr 2 53; Neh 7 53.

SERED, _sered_ (םֶרֶד, _sered_): Son of Zebluun (Gen 46 14; Nu 26 26).

SERGIUS PAULUS, _sûr'ji-us_ pôlûs. See PAULUS, SERGIUS.

SERJENTS, _sërj-nts_ (pâbôôivox, _rabôôchoi_): In Acts 16 35.38 the word (lit. "holders of rods") corresponding to Rom "lectors," thus RVm is used of the officers in attendance on the Philippian magistrates, whose duty it was to execute orders in scourging, etc, in this case in setting prisoners free. Paul and Silas, however, as Romans, refused thus to be "privily" dismissed.

SERMON, _sûr'mun_, ON THE MOUNT, THE:

I. PARALLEL ACCOUNTS

II. HISTORICITY OF THE DISCOURSE

III. TIME AND OCCASION

IV. SCENE

V. THE HEARERS

VI. THE MESSAGE: SUMMARY

1. Analysis

2. Argument: The Kingdom of God (Heaven)
   (1) Characteristics of the Subjects
   (2) Vocation of the Subjects
   (3) Relation of New Righteousness to Mosaic Law
      (a) The Relation Defined
      (b) The Relation Illustrated
   (4) Motives and Principles of Conduct
      (a) In Worthy
      (b) In Life’s Purpose
   (5) Hortatory Conclusion
      (a) The Narrow Way
      (b) The Tests of Character

VII. PRINCIPLES

LITERATURE

The Sermon on the Mount is the title commonly given to the collection of sayings recorded in Mt 5–7 and in Lk 6 20–49. The latter is sometimes called the Sermon on the Plain from the fact that it is said to have been delivered on a level space somewhere on the descent of the mountain. The Sermon appears to be an epitome of the teachings of Jesus concerning the kingdom of heaven, its subjects and their life. For this reason it has always held the first place of attention and esteem among the sayings of Jesus. See SERMON ON THE PLAIN.

I. PARALLEL ACCOUNTS.—As indicated above, the Sermon is reported by both Matthew and Luke.
A comparison of the two accounts reveals certain striking differences. A total of 47 verses of the account in Mt have no parallel in Lk, while but 44 verses of the latter are wanting in the former. On the other hand, many of Mt that are lacking in the Sermon of Lk, amounting in all to 34 verses, appear elsewhere distributed throughout the Lukan narrative and in some instances connected with different incidents and circumstances.

These facts give rise to some interesting literary and historical questions. There are evidently two distinct discourses dealt with in the same general theme but spoken on different occasions, or are they simply different repetitions of the same discourse? If it be held that the Sermon was delivered but once, which of the aspects, the pedagogic, the apocalyptic, or the ethical address, is the discourse in Mt homogeneous or does it include sayings originally spoken on other occasions and early incorporated in the Sermon?

II. Historicity of the Discourse. — There have been attempts to regard the sermons recorded in Mt and Lk as collections of sayings spoken on different occasions, and maintain that they do not represent any connected discourse ever delivered by Jesus. In their view the Sermon is either a free compilation by the evangelists or a product of apostolic teaching and oral tradition.

The prevailing opinion among NT scholars is, however, that the Gospel reports represent a composite historical discourse. The Sermon as recorded in Mt bears such marks of inner unity of theme and exposition as to indicate the likelihood of a single delivery. Jesus should deliver a discourse of this kind accords with all the circumstances. His ministry was a continuous and purposeful undertaking. Besides, we know that in His teaching He was accustomed to speak to the multitudes at length, and we should expect Him to give early in His ministry some formal exposure of the kingdom, the burden of His first preaching. That such a continuous and important discourse should have been preserved is altogether probable.

On the other hand, it may be conceded that the accounts need not necessarily be regarded as full or exact reports of the discourse but possibly and probably much abridged summaries of its theme and substance. Our Lord was accustomed to teach at length, but this discourse was delivered in a few words. And while His popular teaching was marked by a unique wealth of illustration the Sermon is mostly gnomic in form. This gnomic style and the paucity of the usual concrete and illustrative elements suggest the probability of condensation in transmission. Moreover, it is hardly probable that such an address of Jesus would be recorded at the time of its delivery or would be remembered in detail by the evangelists.

There is evidence that the account in Mt 5–7 contains some sayings not included in the original discourse. This view is confirmed by the fact that a number of the sayings are given in Luke's Gospel in settings that appear more original. It is, however, easy to show that other occasions may have been associated with the Sermon in apostolic teaching and thus handed down with it, but if the discourse were well known in a specific form, such as that recorded in Mt, it is hardly conceivable that Luke or anyone else would break it up and distribute the fragments or associate them with other incidents, as some of the sayings recorded in both Gospels are found associated in Lk.

III. Time and Occasion. — Both Matthew and Luke agree on the scene of the delivery of the Sermon to the first half of the Galilean ministry. The former apparently places it a little earlier than the latter, in whose account it follows immediately after the appointment of the twelve apostles. While the time cannot be accurately determined, the position assigned to it by Luke and the Gospels is approximately correct and is supported by the internal evidence. Portions of the Sermon imply that the opposition of the religious teachers was already in evidence, but it clearly belongs to the first year of Our Lord's ministry before the opposition had become serious. On the other hand, the occasion was sufficiently late for the popularity of the new Teacher to have reached its climax. In the early Galilean ministry Jesus confined His teaching to the synagogues, but later, when the great crowds pressed about Him, He resolved to open-air preaching after the manner of the Sermon. Along with the growth in His popularity there is observed a change in the character of His teaching. His teaching in Mt that amounts to a unique lack in the Sermon of Lk, amounting in all to 34 verses, appears elsewhere distributed throughout the Lukan narrative and in some instances connected with different incidents and circumstances.

These facts give rise to some interesting literary and historical questions. There are evidently two distinct discourses dealt with in the same general theme but spoken on different occasions, or are they simply different repetitions of the same discourse? If it be held that the Sermon was delivered but once, which of the aspects, the pedagogic, the apocalyptic, or the ethical address, is the discourse in Mt homogeneous or does it include sayings originally spoken on other occasions and early incorporated in the Sermon?

IV. Scene. — According to the evangelists, the scene of the delivery of the Sermon was one of the mountains or foothills surrounding the Galilean plain. Probably one of the hills lying N.W. of Capernaum is meant, for shortly after the Sermon we find Jesus and His disciples entering that city. There are no data justifying a closer identification of the place. There is a tradition dating from the time of the Crusades that identifies the mount of the Sermon with Carmel, a two-peaked hill on the road from Tiberias to Nazareth. But there is no means of confirming this late tradition and the identification is rather improbable.

V. The Hearers. — The Sermon was evidently addressed, primarily, to the disciples of Jesus. This is the apparent meaning of the account of both evangelists. According to Matthew, Jesus, "seeing the multitudes, ... went up into the mountain: and when he had sat down, his disciples came unto him: and he opened his mouth and taught them." The separation from the multitude of "some distance" and of His words to the disciples seem clear, and the distinction appears intentional on the part of the writer. However, it must be observed that in the closing comments on the Sermon the presence of the multitudes is implied. In Luke’s account the distinction is less marked. Here the order of events is: the night of prayer in the mountain, the choice of the twelve apostles, the descent with them into the presence of the multitude of His disciples and a great number of "round about Judaea, and Jerusalem, and the coasts of the sea country," and, finally, the address. While the continued presence of the multitudes is implied, the plain meaning of the words, "And he lifted up his eyes on them, and blessed them: and he addressed them a word," is that His address was intended esp. for the latter. This view is borne out by the address itself as recorded in both accounts. Observe the use of the second person in the reference to suffering, poverty and persecution for the sake of the Son of Man. Further the sayings concerning the "salt of the earth" and the "light of the world" could hardly have been addressed to any but His disciples. The term disciple, however, was doubtless employed in the broader sense by both evangelists. This is clearly the case in Matthew’s account in which the Twelve had not yet been appointed.

VI. The Message: A Summary. — It is hardly proper to speak of the Sermon on the Mount as a digest of the teaching of Jesus, for it does not include any reference to some very important subjects discussed by Our Lord on other occasions in the course of His ministry. It is, however, the most comprehensive and important collection or summary of His sayings that is preserved to us in the gospel record. For us, as modern readers, the Sermon on the Mount in Christian thought the first place of esteem among all the NT messages. As an exposition of the ideal life and the program of the new society which Jesus proposed to create, its interpretation is of the deepest interest and the profoundest concern.
It may assist the student of the Sermon in arriving at a clear appreciation of the argument and the salient features of the discourse if the whole is presented in outline. There is some difference of opinion among scholars as to the relative order of features of the discourse, and consequently various outlines have been presented by different writers. Those of C. W. Volmar in HDB, Canon Gore in The Sermon on the Mount, and H. C. Kline in The Ethics of Jesus are worthy of special mention. The following outline as given by Matthew is given as the basis of the present discussion. It is not implied that there was any such formal plan before the speech as He made it, but it is believed that the outline presents a faithful syllabus of the argument of the Sermon as preserved to us.

**Theme:** The Kingdom of God (Heaven), its Subjects and Righteousness (5:1–27).

1. The subjects of the kingdom (5:3–16).
   1. The qualities of character essential to happiness and influence (vs. 3–12).
   2. The vocation of the seeker (vs. 13–16).

2. The relation of the new righteousness to the Mosaic Law (5:17–18).
   1. The relation defined as that of continuance in a higher fulfillment (vs. 17–20).
   2. The higher fulfillment of the new righteousness illustrated by a comparison of its principles with the Mosaic Law as currently taught and practiced (vs. 21–48).
   (1) The higher law of brotherhood judges ill will as murder (vs. 21–26).
   (2) The higher law of purity condemns lust as adultery (vs. 27–30).
   (3) The higher law of truth forbids oaths as witness for good and evil (vs. 33–37).
   (4) The higher law of rights substitutes self-restraint and generosity for retaliation and resistance (vs. 38–40).
   (5) The higher law of love demands universal goodwill as a supernatural quality like that of the Father (vs. 45–48).

3. The new righteousness. Its motives as applied to religious, practical, and social duties, or the principles of conduct (6:1–7:12).
   1. Reverence toward the Father essential in all acts of worship (6:1–18).
   (1) In all duties (ver 1).
   (2) In self-denying (ver 2).
   (3) In prayer (ver 5–10).
   (4) In fasting (ver 16–18).
   2. Loyalty toward the Father fundamental in all social relations (6:19–34).
   (1) Critical estimate of self instead of censorious judgment of others (vs. 1–5).
   (2) The communication and communication of spiritual values (vs. 6–8).
   (3) Kindness toward others in all things (vs. 9–11). One's kindness toward all His children (vs. 7–12).

IV. Hortatory conclusion (7:13–27).
   1. The two gates and the two ways (vs. 13–14).
   2. The tests of character (vs. 15–27).

*(1) Characteristics of the subjects (5:3–12).*—The Sermon opens with the familiar Beatitudes. Unlike many reformers, Jesus begins the exposition of His program with a promise of happiness, with a blessing rather than a curse. He thus connects His program directly with the hopes of His hearers, for the central features in the current Messianic conception were deliverance and happiness. But the conditions of happiness proposed were in strong contrast with those in the popular thought. Happiness does not consist in the Jesus, in what one possesses, in lands and houses, in social position, in intellectual attainments, but in the wealth of the inner life, in moral strength, in self-control, in spiritual insight, in the character one is able to form within himself and in the service he is able to render to his fellowmen. Thus, like character, is a by-product of right living. It is presented as the fruit, not as the object of endeavor.

It is interesting to note that character is the secret of happiness both for the individual and for society. There are two groups of Beatitudes. The first four deal with personal qualities: humility, penitence, self-control, desire for righteousness. These are the sources of inner peace. The second group deals with social qualities; mercifulness toward others, purity of heart or reverence for personality, peace-making or solicitude for others, self-sacrificing loyalty to righteousness. These are the sources of social rest. The blessings of the kingdom are social as well as individual.

*(2) Vocation of the subjects (5:13–16).*—Men of the qualities described in the Beatitudes are called "the salt of the earth," the "light of the world." True happiness is not, then, in themselves or for themselves alone. Their mission is the hope of the kingdom: Salt is a preservative element; light is a life-giving one; but the world is not eager to be preserved or willing to receive life. Therefore such men must expect opposition and persecution, but they are not on that account to withdraw from the world. On the contrary, by the leave of character and the light of example they are to help others in the appreciation and the attainment of the ideal life. By their character and deeds they are to make their influence a force for good in the lives of men. In this sense the men of the kingdom are the salt of the earth, the light of the world.

*(3) The relation of the new righteousness to the Mosaic Law (5:17–48).*—(a) Relation defined (5:17–20): The qualities of character thus set before the citizens of the kingdom were so surprising and revolutionary as to suggest the inquiry: What is the relation of the new teaching to the Mosaic Law? This Jesus defines as continuance and fulfillment. His hearers are not to think that He has come to destroy the law. On the contrary, He has come to fulfill and fulfill. The old law is imperfect, but God does not despair of what is imperfect. Men and institutions are judged, not by the level of present attainment, but by character and direction. The law moves in the right direction and is so valuable that those who violate even its least precepts have a very low place in the kingdom.

The new righteousness then does not set aside the law or offer an easier religion, but one that is more exacting. The kingdom is concerned, not so much with ceremonies and external rules, as with motives and with social virtues such as purity, honesty and generosity. So much higher are the new standards of righteousness that Jesus is constrained to warn His hearers that to secure even a place in the kingdom, their righteousness must exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees.

(b) The relation illustrated (5:21–48): In illustration of the deeper meaning of the new righteousness and its relation to the Mosaic Law, Jesus proceeds to deal in detail with the precepts of the old moral law, deepening it as He proceeds into the higher law of the kingdom. In each instance the standard of judgment is raised and the individual precepts are deepened into spiritual principles that call for perfect fulfillment. In considering specific precepts no account is taken of overt acts, for in the new righteousness they are impossible. All acts are treated as expressions of the inner life. The law is carried back to the impulse and the will to sin, and these are judged as in the old law the completed acts were judged. Therefore all anger and lust in the heart are strictly enjoined. Likewise every word is raised to a sacredness equal with that of the most solemn religious vow or oath. Finally, the instinct to avenge is entirely forbidden, and universal love is that of the Father and the fundamental law of the new social life. Thus Jesus does not abrogate any law but interprets its precepts in terms that call for a deeper and more perfect fulfillment.
(4) Motives and principles of conduct (6 1—7 12).—The relation of His teaching to the law defined, Jesus proceeds to explain the motives and principles of conduct as applied to religious and social duties.

(a) In worship (6 1—18). In the section 6 1—12 there is one motive in particular that makes its appearance. It is a motive of personal aspiration and hope. It looks toward God. He is at once the source and the aim of life. Therefore worship aims alone at Divine praise. If acts of worship are performed before men to be seen of them there is no reward for the Father. In this Jesus is passing no slight on public worship. He Himself instituted the Lord’s Supper and authorized the continuance of the rite of baptism. Such acts have their proper value. His censure is aimed at the love of ostentation so often associated with them. The root of ostentation is selfishness, and selfishness has no part in the new righteousness. Any selfish desire for the approval of men thwart the purpose of all worship. The object of almsgiving, of prayer or of fasting is the expression of brotherly love, commination with God or spiritual enrichment. The possibility of any of these is excluded by the presence of the desire for the approval of men. It is not merely a Divine fiat but one of the deeper laws of life which decrees that the only possible reward for acts of worship is such motives is the cheap approval of men as well as the impoverishment of the inner life.

(b) In life’s purpose (6 19—34): The same principle holds, says Jesus, in the matter of life’s purpose. There is only one treasure worthy of man’s search, only one object worthy of his highest endeavor, and that is the kingdom of God and His righteousness. Besides, there can be no division of aim. God will be first and only. Material blessing can be set over men. With any lower aim the new righteousness would be no better than that of the Gentiles. And such a demand is reasonable, for God’s gracious providence is ample guaranty that He will supply all things needful for the accomplishment of the purposes He has planned for our lives. So in our vocations as in our worship, God is the supreme and effectual motive.

(c) In social relations (7 1—12): Then again he begins to explain that the Father and the supreme object of desire for all men, great reverence is due toward others. Considerate helpfulness must replace the censorious spirit. For the same reason men will have no greater reverence for spiritual values to cast them carelessly aside. Furthermore, men must be set on guard and men. With any lower aim the new righteousness would be no better than that of the Gentiles. Thus in the perfect law of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men the new righteousness makes perfect the Law and the Prophets.

VII. Sermon on Mount is

(b) The tests of character (7 15—27): The test of the higher fulfilment is fruit. By their fruits alone the subjects of the kingdom will be known. In the presence of the Father there is no room for those who bring nothing but the leaves of empty professions. The kingdom is for those alone who do His will. The test of righteousness is illustrated in conclusion by a beautiful picture of brothers and Builders. The difference between the two is essentially one of character. It is largely a question of fundamental honesty. The one is superficial and thinks only of that which is visible to the eye and builds only for himself. In the other is honest enough to build well where only God can see, to build for others and for all time. Thus he builds also for himself. The character of the builder is revealed by the building.
SERMON ON THE PLAIN, THE: This title is sometimes given to the discourse recorded in Lk 6:20–49, because according to the Gospel (ver 17) it was delivered on a plain at the foot of the mountain. In many respects this address resembles the one recorded in Mt 5–7, but in general the two are so different as to make it uncertain whether they are different reports of the same discourse or reports of different addresses given on different occasions. See SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

In contrast with the Sermon on the Mount which is assigned a place early in the Galilean ministry, and prior to the appointment of the Twelve, this event is further represented as the occasion of this discourse. If the two accounts are reports of the same address the setting of Lk is probably the historical one.

The Sermon of Lk includes a little less than one-third of the matter recorded in the Sermon on the Mount. The Lukan discourse includes

1. The Occasion: That event which is represented as the occasion of this discourse. If the two accounts are reports of the same address the setting of Lk is probably the historical one.

2. Contents: Only a portion of the Beatitudes, with a set of four " woes," a rather brief section on the social duties, and the concluding parable of the Two Houseos.

3. Message: Prominent in the Sermon. Here the Beatitudes deal with social differences. In Mt they refer to spiritual conditions. Here Jesus speaks of those who hunger now, probably meaning bodily hunger. In Mt the invectives are addressed against the self-satisfied religious teachers and their religious formalism. Here the rich and their unsocial spirit are the subject of the woes. This social interest is further emphasized by the fact that in addition to this social bearing of the Beatitudes, Lk's discourse omits the remainder of the Sermon on the Mount, except those portions that deal with social relations, such as those on the Golden Rule, the duty of universal love, the equality of servant and master, and the obligation of a charitable spirit.

RUSSELL BENJAMIN MILLER

SERON, sérōn (Σέρων, Strōn): "The commander of the host of Syria" of Antiochus Epiphanes, who was defeated at Beth-horon by Judas in 166 BC (1 Mac 3:13ff). Not a Gr name; "perhaps it represents the Phoen Hiram" (Rawlinson, ad loc.).

SERPENT, sarpent: Serpents are not particularly abundant in Pal, but they are often mentioned in the Bible. In the Heb there are 11 general names. The NT has four Gr names and LXX employs two of these and three others as well. A compound of expressions, such as ὁ ἄγαλμα, ὁ ἀριστομέλης, "flying serpent," ὁ ἄραχνα, ὁ ἄραχνιον, "deadly serpent," and ὁ ἄγαλμα, ὁ ἄγαλμιον, "biting" or "stinging serpent." Notwithstanding this large vocabulary, it is impossible to identify satisfactorily a single species. Nearly every reference states or implies poisonous qualities, and in no case is there so much as a hint that a snake may be harmless, except in several expressions referring to the millennium, where their harmlessness is not natural but miraculous. In Arab. there is a score or more of names of serpents very few of them are employed at all definitely. It may be too much to say that the inhabitants of Syria and Pal consider all snakes to be poisonous, but they do not clearly distinguish the non-poisonous ones, and there are several common and well-known serpents which are universally believed to be poisonous, though actually harmless. Of nearly 25 species which are certainly known to be found in Syria and Pal, four are deadly poisonous, five are somewhat poisonous, and the rest are absolutely harmless. With the exception of kippoz, "dart-serpent" (Jaa 34:15), which is probably the name of a bird and not of a snake, every one of the Heb and Gr names occurs in passages where poisonous character is expressed or implied. The deadly poisonous snakes have large perforated poison fangs situated in the upper jaw, an efficient apparatus like a hypodermic syringe for conveying the poison into the depths of the wound. In the somewhat poisonous snakes, the poison fangs are less favorably situated, being farther back, and nearly under the eye, which are usually taken into the stomach while living, the peculiar structure of the jaws and the absence of a breastbone enabling snakes to swallow animals which exceed the ordinary size of their own bodies.

The following list includes all the serpents which are certainly known to exist in Pal and Syria, omitting the names of several which have been reported but whose occurrence does not seem to be confirmed. A few of each species is given.


2. Somewhat poisonous serpents. — Tarbophis saururus Bgr., Syria, Pal, Egypt; T. tesselatus Fitz., Balkan Peninsula, Iran, Syria, Pal; Ophiosaurus carinatus L., Turkey, Greece, Italy, Asia Minor, Syria, Pal; Ophiophagus hannah Leach., Turkey, Greece, Italy, Asia Minor, Syria, Pal.


To this list should be added the sceloporus, a large snake-like lizard, harmless except to Arabs. Found throughout Southwestern Europe, Asia Minor, Persia, Syria, and Pal, which while perfectly harmless is commonly classed with vipers. Of all these the commonest is Zamenis numifer, Arabian adder, "string of walnuts," a fierce but non-poisonous snake which attains the length of a meter. Its ground color is pale yellow and it has a dorsal series of indistinct diamond-shaped spots, each terminating with spots of the dorsal row on each side two lateral rows of less distinct dark spots. It is everywhere considered to be fatal. Another common snake is Zamenis gemonensis, Arabian snake, which attains the
length of two meters. It is usually black and much resembles the American black snake, Zamenis constrictor. Like all species of Zamenis, these are harmless. Other common harmless snakes are Zamenis daubii, Tropidonos
tus tesselatus which is often found in pools and streams. Certain caloselphus a small, nearly
toothless snake with the crown of the head coal black. Among the somewhat poisonous snakes, a very common
one is Coelopeltis mouspessulana, Arab. (2
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hanash, "to hiss." It is about a
tiger long, slender, and white with dark stripes. Many
marvelous and utterly improbable tales are told of its
jumping powers, as for instance that it can shoot through
the air for more than a hundred feet and penetrate a
tree like a rifle bullet. The commonest of the deadly poisonous snakes is
Vipera lebetina, which attains the length of a meter, has a
thick body, a short tail, a broad head and a narrow
neck. It is spotted somewhat as Zamenis numifer, but
the spots are less regular and distinct and the ground
color is grey rather than yellow. It does not seem to
have a distinct name. Cerastes cornutus, having two
small horns, which are modified scales, over the eyes, is
a rather common species. It is found in the desert. Not
only are the species of poisonous serpents fewer than
the non-poisonous species, but the individuals also appear
to be less numerous than the latter. The vast majority of
the snakes which are encountered are harmless.

As stated above, all of the Heb and Gr names except kippôs, which occurs only in Isa 34 15, are
used of snakes actually or supposedly poisonous. This absence of discrimi-
nation between poisonous and non-
poisonous kinds makes determination of the species
difficult. Further, but few of the Heb names are
from roots whose meanings are clear, and there is
time evident that many names to Arab.
five to Arab.

(1) The commonest Heb word is סנֵרָפ, nâhâsh, which occurs 31 t and seems to be a generic word
for serpent. While not always clearly indicating a
venomous serpent, it frequently does: e.g. Ps 58
4; 140 3; Prov 23 32; Eccl 10 8 11; Isa 14 29;
Jer 8 17; Am 8 19. According to BDB it is
perhaps from an onomatopoetic נ nâhâsh, "to hiss." It may be akin to the Arab. ﷲ، hâsh, which means "snake" in general, or esp.
the black snake. Cf Ir-nâhâsh (Ch 4 12);
Nahash (a) (1 S 11 1; 2 S 10 2), (b) (2 S 17 27),
(c) (2 S 17 25); also אֲרָפָ, m'âshâth, "copper"
or "brass"; and הַשָּׁ, hâshshāh (Nehushtan),
the brazen serpent (2 K 18 4). But BDB derives
the last two words from a different root.

(2) נֵרָפ, sarâph, apparently from נ, sarâph, "to burn," is used of the fiery serpents of the wilder-
ness. In Nu 21 8, it occurs in the sing.: "Make
thee a fiery serpent, and set it upon a standard."
Ver 6 we have נַסָּרָפ, ha-nâsârîm
ha-sârîhâm, "fiery serpents"; in Dt 8 15 the same
in the sing.: נֵרָפ, nâhâsh sarâph, also tr-
"fiery serpents"; in Isa 14 29; 30 6 we have
נָרָפ, sarâph m'ôphâph, "fiery flying
serpent." The same word in the pl. נָרָפ, sarîphm,
is trl "seraphim" in Is 6 2 5.

(3) נֵרָפ, sarâph, elsewhere "dragon" or "sea-
serpent" (q.v.), is used of the serpents into which
the rods of Aaron and the magicians were trans-
formed (Ex 7 9 10 12), these serpents being desig-
nated by nâmâsh in Ex 4 3; 7 15. Tannîn is
rendered, "serpent" (AV "dragon") in Dt 32 33;
their special species of poisonous serpents, and Ps 91
13, "the young lion and the serpent shalt thou
trample under foot." On the other hand, nâmâsh
seems in three passages to refer to a mythical
creature or dragon: "His hand hath pierced the swift
serpent" (Job 26 13); "In that day Jeh . . .
will punish leviathan the swift serpent and leviathan
the crooked serpent" (Isa 27 1); " . . . though
they be hid from my sight in the bottom of the sea,
then will I command the serpent, and it shall bite
them" (Am. 9 3)

(4) נֵרָפ, zôhâlêh, is tr, "crawling things" in Dt 32
24 (AV "serpents") and in Mic 7 17 (AV "worms").

(5) נֵרָפ, 'akkâbâhâsh, occurs only in Ps 140 3,
where it is trd "adder" (LXX Íkóis, Ípsi, Vulg
asîps, "adders' poison is under their lips." It has
been suggested (BDB) that the reading should be
נֵרָפ, 'akkâbâhâsh, "spider" (q.v.). The word in
the previous line is nâmâsh.

(6) נֵרָפ, peîhes, like most of the other names of
a word of uncertain etymology, occurs 6 t and it is
trd "asp," except in Ps 91 13, "Thou shalt tread
upon the lion and adder." According to Liddell
and Scott, asîps is the name of the Egyptian cobra,
Naâa haîe L, which is not included in (2) above,
because it does not certainly appear to have been
used. The name "adder" is applied to various snakes all of which may perhaps be supposed
to be poisonous but some of which are actually
harmless. Asîps occurs in Rom 3 13 in a para-
phrase of Ps 140 9 (see [5] above), it occurs
frequently, though not uniformly, in LXX for (2), (5),
(6), (7), (8) and (10).

(7) נֵרָפ, cepha', occurs only in Isa 14 29 where
it is tr "adder" (AV "cockatrice"); ERV "basilisk," LXX
kâsivos Íkris, Ípsi asîpsîn, Vulg regu-
la. The word Ìkâsivos, of (7) and (8) may be an
onomatopoetic word meaning "to hiss" (BDB).

(8) נֵרָפ, or נֵרָפ, qôphînt, occurs, in Prov
32 33, "At the last it biteth like a serpent [nâmâsh],
and stungeth like an adder" (qôphînt). In Is 11
8; 59 5, and Jer 8 17, ARV has "adder," while
AV has "cockatrice" and ERV has "basilisk."

(9) נֵרָפ, shâphîphôn, occurs only in Gen 49
17: "Dan shall be a serpent [nâmâsh] in the way,
An adder (shâphîphôn) in the path.
That biteth the horse's heels,
So that his rider falleth backward."

This has been thought to be Cerastes cornutus,
the authority of Tristram (NNB), who says
that lying in the path it will attack the passer-by
and sometimes bite the legs of the person who tries
to approach a person of large animal. He adds
that his horse was much frightened at seeing one
of these serpents coiled up in a camel's footprint.
The word is perhaps akin to the Arab.

sîf, or עַפָּש, suff, which denotes a spotted
and deadly snake.

(10) נֵרָפ, 'eph'eh, is found in Job 30 16; Isa
30 6; 59 5, and in EV is uniformly trd "viper."
It is the same as the Arab. ﷲ، af'a, which is
usually trd "viper," though the writer has never
found anyone who could tell what snake the name
belongs to. In Arab. as in Heb a poisonous snake is
always understood.

(11) נֵרָפ, kippôs, ARV "dart-snake," ERV
"arrowsnake," AV "great owl," only in Isa 34 15,
"There shall the dart-snake make her nest, and lay,
and hatch, and gather under her shade;" yes, there
shall the kites be gathered, every one with her

Adder.
mate." This is the concluding verse in a vivid picture of the desolation of Edom. The renderings "dart-snake" and "arrowsnake" rest on the authority of Bochart, but LXX has ἥξιων, echinos, "hedgehog," and Vulg ericetus, "hedgehog." The rendering of AV "great owl" seems preferable to the others, because the words "make her nest, and lay" and "and gather under her shade" are as a whole quite inapplicable to a mammal or to a reptile. The derivation from ἐ_buffers, ἐ襁as (cf Arab. ḏąaf, "to spring," "to dart," suits it, it is true, a snake, and not a hedgehog, but may also suit an owl. Finally, the next word in Isa 34:15 is "kites," ר'א, yayyāh; cf Arab. ɓālāt, "bird of prey.

See BITTERN; OWL; PORCUPINE.

(12) ὑβων, ὁφις, a general term for "serpent," occurs in numerous passages of the NT and LXX, and is fairly equivalent to נָבָשׁ.

(13) אֱרִיס, ascis, occurs in the NT only in Rom 3:13 | to Ps 140:3. See under (5) ἀκτήσωλθ or and (6) then found in LXX for these words, and also for ἑφθϊκ (Isa 30:6).


That the different Heb and Gr names are used without clear distinction seen from several examples of the employment of two different names in one expression:

Their poison is like the poison of a serpent [נָבָשׁ];

... twine round their close places (Mic 7:17).

... and they shall bite thee, saith Jehovah (Ps 99:8).

... Thus shall the herb seem a like a serpent [נָבָשׁ];

... 'Their wine is the poison of serpents (ךውן); and the venom of asps (ךואן), and the venom of adders and vipers, and the venom of all unclean things,' (Dt 8:16).

... "And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp [ךואון], and the weaned child shall put his hand on the adder's [ךְֽוִָבָּנָא] den" (Isa 11:8). See also (8) and (9) above.

Most of the Biblical references to serpents are of a figurative nature, and they usually imply poisonous qualities. The wicked (Ps 68:4), the persecutor (Ps 140:4), and the enemy (Jas 17:17) are likened to venomous serpents. The effects of wine are compared to the bites of serpents (Prov 23:32). Satan is a serpent (Gen 3:5; Rev 12:9; 20:2). The term "serpent" of vipers" is applied by John the Baptist to the Pharisees and Sadducees (Mt 3:7) or to the multitudes (Lk 3:7) who came to hear him; and by Jesus to the scribes and Pharisees (Mt 12:34; 23:33). Dan is a "serpent in the way" (Gen 49:17). Serpents are among the terrors of the wilderness (Dt 8:15; Isa 30:6). Among the signs accompanying believers is that "they shall take up serpents" (Mt 16:18; cf Acts 28:8). It is said of him that trusts in Jehovah:

"Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder; The young lion and the serpent shalt thou trample under foot" (Ps 91:13).

In the millennium, "the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the adder's den" (Isa 11:8). The serpent is subtle (Gen 3:1; 2 Cor 11:3); wise (Mt 10:16); accused (Gen 3:14); eats dust (Gen 3:14; Isa 65:25; Mic 7:17). The adder is deaf (Ps 58:4). The serpent lurks in unexpected places (Gen 49:17-19; Eccl 10:8; Am 5:19). Serpents may be charmed (Ps 58:5; Eccl 10:11; Jer 8:17). Among four wonderful things is "the way of a serpent upon a rock" (Prov 30:19).

ALFRED ELY DAY

SERPENT, BRAZEN, בִּרְצַן. See NEHEM. SHAN.

SERPENT-CHARMING. -charming: Allusion to this art, widely practised by the ancients (see references in DB, s.v.; esp. Bochart, Hieron., III, 161, 164, etc.), as by modern Orientals, is found in Ps 68:5; Ex 10:11; Jer 8:17; Sir 12:13, perhaps in Isa 3:7. The skill displayed in taming snakes, often without removing the poison fangs, is very surprising. Bruce, Davy and other travelers give striking illustrations. See esp. the interesting account of serpent-charming in Hengstenberg's Egypt and the Books of Moses, ET, 100-104.

SERPENT, CROOKED, קָרְךֶּק. With reference to the constellation round the North Pole, in mention of which "serpent-charming" (Gen 49:17) is changed in RV to "swift serpent," in "gliding" or "slithering." See ASTRONOMY, 11, 1.

SERPENT, FIERY. See Serpent, 3, (2).

SERPENT WORSHIP, wūrShip: Traces of this superstition are thought by certain critics to be discoverable in the religion of Israel. Stade mentions that W. R. Smith supposed the serpent to be the totem of the house of David (Geschichte, I, 465). H. P. Smith says: "We know of a Serpent's Stone near Jerus, which was the site of a sanctuary (1 K 1:9), and this sanctuary was dedicated to Jeh" (Hist of OT, 233, 240).

Special reliance is placed on the narrative of the bruised serpent, which, according to Num 21:8, is declared to have destroyed the idolatry (2 K 18:4). "In that case," says H. P. Smith, "we must treat the Nehushtan as a veritable idol of the people of Israel, which had been worshipped in the temple as a charm of the same type as his resentment. Serpent worship is so widespread that we should be surprised not to find traces of it in Israel" (ut supra). In the same line, see G. B. Gray, Nu, 275-76. The fancifulness of these deductions is obvious. See NEHEMIAH.

JAMES ORR

SEURUG, סֵּרֵעַ (Serrēq, sē'rōgh; Σαροκχ, Scratch): Son of Reu and great-grandfather of Abraham (Gen 11:20 f; 1 Ch 1:26; Lk 3:33).

SERVANT, sūrŠē (םֶּרֶשֶׁת; δουλος, doulos, doulos): A very common word with a variety of meanings, all implying a greater or less degree of inferiority and want of freedom: (1) The most frequent usage is as the equivalent of "slave" (q.v.), with its various shades in position (Gen 9:25; 24:9; Ex 21:5; Mt 10:24; Lk 17:7, and often); but also a hired worker where "hired servant" translates Heb and Gr expressions which differ from the above. (2) An attendant in the service of someone, as Joshua was the "servant," RV "minister," of Moses (Nu 11:28). (3) In a term of respectful self-deprecation: referring to one's self, "thy servant" or "your servant" is used in place of the personal pronoun of the first person: (a) in the presence of superiors (Gen
19 2; 32 18, and often); (6) in addressing the Supreme Being (1 S 3 9; Ps 19 11; 27 9; Lk 2 20, and often). (4) Officials of every grade are called the 'servants' of kings, princes, etc (1 S 29 3; 2 S 16 19; 1 K 12 25; Prov 14 35, and often). (5) The position of the king is often reflected in the phrase 'the people in 1 K 12 7). (6) One who is distinguished as obedient and faithful to God or Christ (Josh 1 2; 2 K 8 19; 2 Sa 6 20; Col 4 12; 2 Tim 2 24). (7) One who is ensnared by sin (Hb 8 34).

WILLIAM JOSEPH MCCOLLUM

SERVANT OF JEHovaH (THE LORD):

1. Historical Situation.
3. The Prophet of the Exile.
4. The Unity of Chs 40—66.
5. Principal Ideas of Chs 40—66.
6. The Servant Passages.
   (a) Date of the Servant Passages.
   (b) Discussion of the Passages.
   (c) Whom Did the Prophet Mean by the Servant?
   (d) The Psychology of the Prophecy.
7. Place of the Servant Passages in OT Prophecy.
8. Large Messianic Significance of the Servant Passages.

A century and a half had passed since the great days of Isaiah in Jerusalem. The world had vastly changed during those long decades when politicians had planned, armies summoned back and forth, and tribes and nations had lost or won in the struggle for existence, place and power. The center of the world had changed—for Assyria had gone to its long home, and the city claiming pre-eminence was not Nineveh but Babylon.

Nowhere perhaps had time left a heavier hand than on the city of Jerusalem and the country of Judah. For city and land had come to desolation, and the inhabitants of the country had become familiar with the strange sights and sounds of Babylon, whither they had been carried by their conquerors. Many had found graves in the land of the exile, and new generations had arisen who had no memory of the hill country of their fathers. It is the situation of these captive Jews in Babylon wh ich is reflected and the people who are addressed at the waning of the long night of captivity by the stirring message recorded in Isa chs 40—66 (leaving out of account here disputed passages in chs 40—66).

The more one studies the problem of the authorship of these chapters, the more unlikely does it seem that their author penned them 150 years before the time with which they are vitally connected. It is obviously impossible to treat that problem here. But one may sum up the arguments by saying that in theological ideas, in style, and in use of words they show such differences from the assured productions of Isaiah's pen as to point to a different authorship. And the great argument, the argument which carries the most weight to the author of this article, is that these late chapters are written from the standpoint of the exile. The exile is assumed in what is said. These chapters do not prophesy the exile, do not say it is coming, but they all the time speak as though it had come. The message is not that an exile is to be, but beginning with the fact that the exile already is, it foretell s deliverance. Now of course it is conceivable that God might inspire a man to put himself forward 150 years, and with some excuse to prophesy how the life was considered being their circumstances as a background of what he said, but it is improbable to the last degree. To put it in plain, almost gruff, English, it is not the way God did things. The prophet's message was always primarily a message to his own age. Then there is nothing in the chapters themselves that Isaiah was their author. And having once been so that it was supposed they were by Isaiah—placed so through causes we do not know—the fact that in speaking of passages from these chapters NT authors referred to them by a name the people would recognize, is not a valid argument that they meant to teach anything as to their authorship. The problem has been debated in NT times by Rom 9 10—44, Gal 4 24—31, Rom 11 20—25, and 1 Tim 4 1—6, as Professor Davidson has suggested, has a parallel in the Book of Job, each the production of a great mind, each from an author we do not know (cf. Isaiah).

OUT of the deep gloom of the exile—when the Jew was a man without a country, when it seemed as if the nation's sins had murdered hope—

3. The Prophet of the Exile:

The Prophets of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel are known to have written in the OT life. In the midst of the proud, confident civilization of Babylon, with its seeming wealth and exhaustless splendor, came a man who dared to speak for Jehovah—a man of such power to see reality that to him Babylon was already doomed, and he could summon the people to prepare for God's deliverance.

In recent criticism, esp. in Germany, there has been a strong tendency to assign the last chapters of this section to different authors and to different auditors. But the background it is claimed is not Bab; rather K is a group of people who were at home in Judea, and in at least one passage the temple at Jerusalem seems to be standing. That these chapters need not be disputed, but it seems to me that again and again in them one can find the hand of Second Isaiah. Then undoubtedly the author quotes from previous prophesies which we can recognize, and the suggestion that some of the difficult passages may be quotations from other older prophesies which are not preserved to us, I think an exceedingly good one. The quotation of passages and the use of words in the prophets' mouths and the prophet's feeling of the need of the people, would seem to me not at all unnatural. If a later hand is responsible for some utterances in the latter part of the section, it seems to me fairly clear that most of it is from the hand of the great unknown prophet of the OT.

The questions regarding the Servant-passage as affecting the unity of the book will be treated later.

The first part of this section vividly contrasts Jehovah and the idols worshiped with such splendor and ceremony. All the resources of irony and satire are used to point and effect the contrast. The prophet's satirical style is genuine. The Satanic as instrument in the deliverance. The Idols are described in process of manufacture; they are addressed in scornful apostrophe, they are seen carried away helpless. On the other side Jehovah, with imitable foresight and incisive judgment, reveals the future. They know and reveal nothing. He brings to pass what He has planned. They do nothing. Not only the idols but Babylon itself is made the victim of satire—and the prophet hurst a taunt song at the proud but impotent city.

Israel—the people of Jehovah—the elect of God—is given the prophet's message. The past is called up as a witness to Jehovah's dealings. His righteousness—His faithfulness to His people—shall not fail. They are worshiping all the wrong gods, but their salvation is provided. And with joy of this salvation from exile and from sin the book rings and rings. The Zion of the restored Israel is pictured with all the power of color and richness of imagery at the prophet's command. And I think we are to have a world mission. His light is to fall upon all lands. It is to minister salvation to all races of men.

But back of and under these pictures of great hope is the prophet's sense of his people's sin and their struggle with it. In Isaiah 5:1—6, 16:9—12, 65:24—25, and 66:4—16 this comes out clearly. And the mood of these chapters is exposed as the saying out of the deep things of the Servant-passages came. There is no need to insist that the chapters as they stand are in the order
in which they were written. We know from other prophecies that this was not always true. But even if a man were convinced that the chapters now occurring as the Servant-passages were all written after them, he could still hold, and I think would be justified in holding, that places in those chapters the reader finds the record of a state of the prophet’s mind before the writing of those passages. The former view would be, I think, the preferable one, and that places in those chapters the point of view is logically that out of which some of the deep things in the Servant-passages came.

In profoundness of meaning the climax of the book is reached in these passages where the deliverance from the sin and guilt, once the man’s sin and guilt connected with one great figure—the Servant of Jeh.

The word “servant,” as applied to servants of God, is not an unfamiliar one to readers of the OT. It is applied to different individuals and by Jeremiah to the nation (of Jer Servant- Passages 30 10; 46 27); but its message is on the whole so distinct and complete in Second Isa that we can study it without any further reference to previous usage.

The “servant” first appears in Isa. 41 8. Here the reference is undoubtedly to Israel, chosen and called of God and to be upheld by Him. Here Israel is promised victory over its enemies. In vivid picture their destruction and Israel’s future triumph over them are portrayed.

There are several incident references to Israel as Jeh’s servant: created by Jeh and not to be forgotten (41 8); Cyrus is said to be called for the sake of His servant Jacob (44 4); Jeh is said to have redeemed his servant Jacob (48 20).

In 44 20 “servant” seems to be used with the meaning of prophet. It is said of Jeh that He “confirmeth the word of his servant, and performeth the counsel of his messiah.”

In 45 19 we find the failure and inadequacy of Israel presented in the words, “Who is blind, but my servant? or dumb, but the prophet that I send? This passage is an explanation of the exile. Israel proved unworthy and sinned, hence His punishment, but even in the exile the lesson had not been taken to heart.

In 43 8 if Jeh summons Israel the servant, who in spite of blindness and deafness yet is His witness. It has at least seen enough to be able to witness for Him in the presence of the heathen.

In 44 1–3, leaving the unworthiness of the actual Israel, there comes what seems to me a summons in the name of a Servant. The prevailing thought is call to the high future which God has ready to give.

This covers the reference to the servant outside the great Servant-passages to which we now come. There are four of these: 42 1–9; 49 1–20; 50 4–11; 52 13–53 12. 61 1–4 perhaps represents words of the prophet, but may refer to words of the prophet; and, as at any rate it adds no new feature to the picture of the Servant already given in the passages undoubtedly referring to him, we will not discuss it.

(1) Date of the Servant-passages.—Ewald long ago suggested that the last of the Servant-passages must have been borrowed from an earlier composition, which he assigned to the age of Manasseh. “If we find in the study of the passage reason for its vividness, we shall not need to seek its origin in the description of some past martyrdom.”

Cheyne thinks the Servant-passages post-exilic. The gentleness and quiet activity of the Servant for one thing, according to Duhm, suggest the age of the scribes, rather than that of the exile. But might not an age of suffering be the explanation of gentleness? According to Skinner, Duhm thinks the passages were inserted almost haphazard, but Skinner also refers to Kosters, showing that the passages cannot be lifted without carrying some of the succeeding verses with them. This is particularly significant in view of recent popularity of other theories which deny the Servant-passages to the hand and time of Second Isa. The theory that these passages form by themselves a poem or a set of poems which have been inserted here can boast of distinguished names.

There does not seem much to commend it, however. As to the argument from difference as to rhythm, there is disagreement, and the data are probably not of a sort to warrant much significance between the writing of those passages. The former view would be, I think, the preferable one. The fact that the passages are not always a part of a connected narrative, but give to the reader points of view that are logically that out of which some of the deep things in the Servant-passages came.

This passage concludes with a promise to Jeh. He is promised victory over his enemies. It is a vivid picture their destruction and Israel’s future triumph over them are portrayed.

(2) Discussion of the passages.—42 1–9: In these verses Jeh Himself is the speaker, describing the Servant as His chosen, in whom His soul delights, upon whom He has put His spirit. He is to bring justice to the Gentiles. He is to be quiet and gentle, and the very forlorn hope of goodness He will not quench. He is to set justice in the earth, and remote countries are described as waiting for His law. Then comes a declaration by the prophet that Jeh, the Creator of all, is the speaker of words declaring the Servant’s call in righteousness to be a covenant for the people, a light to the Gentiles, a helper to those in need—the blind and imprisoned. His glory is not to be given to another, nor to use the phrase of Deutero-Isaianic prophecies have come to pass. New things He now declares. One’s attention needs to be called to the distinction of the Servant from Israel in this passage. He is to be a covenant of the people: according to Delitzsch, “in whom and through whom Jeh makes a new covenant with His people in place of the old one that has been broken.”

49 1–20: Here the Servant himself speaks, telling of his calling from the beginning of his life, of the might of his word, of his shelter in God, of a time of discouragement andplash, of deliverance and praise, of the bonds that are broken. “It is a difficult matter to decide whether the prophecy is a true picture of the Servant or not. But it may be pointed out that the picture parts of the Servant as the Servant。”

50 4–11: In the first part of this passage the Servant is not mentioned directly, but it seems clear that he is
speaking. He is taught of God continually, that he may bring a message to the weary. He has opened his ear so that he may fully understand Jeth's message. The Servant and after Him coming to the fullness of time will be distinguished because of his obedience. He was not rebellious and did not turn back from his mission. Flint-like he set his face and walked in the confidence in God, that the shame which came upon him. After language vivid with a sense of personal confessions, assured consciousness of victory and faith in God are expressed.

In vs 10-11, according to Delitzsch, Jeth speaks, first explaining that he addressed the Servant, then addressing those who despise his word. Cheyne thinks this passage is not illy understood in vs 10 may be the prophet, I prefer Delitzsch's view.

52 13—53 12: The present division of 52 13—53 12 is unfortunate, for obviously it is all of a piece and ought to stand together in one chapter. In 52 13-15 Jeh speaks of the humiliation and later of the exaltation of the Servant. He shall deal wisely—the idea here including the success resulting from wisdom—and shall be exalted. Words are piled upon each other here to express his exaltation. But the appearance of the Servant is such as to suggest the very opposite of his dignity, which will astonish nations and kings when they come to understand all this. Entering upon ch 53 we find the people of Israel speaking confessing their former unbelieving, and giving as a reason the repulsive aspect of the Servant—despised, sad, sick with a visage to make men turn from him. They are described as though he had been a leper. They thought all this had come upon him as a stroke from God, but they now see how he went even to death, not for his own transgression but for theirs. Their peace and healing came through his suffering and death. They have been sinful and erring; the result of it all God has caused to light upon him.

They look back in wonder at the way he bore his sufferings—like a lamb led to the slaughter, with a false judicial procedure he was led away, no one dividing his spoils and greatness—the phrases suggesting kingly glory: all this is to be his because of his suffering. The great fact of ch 53 is vicarious suffering.

(3) Whom did the prophet mean by the Servant?—(a) Obviously not all of Israel always, for the Servant is distinguished from Israel. (b) Not the godly remnant, for he is distinguished from them. Then the godly remnant does not attain to any such proportions as to fit the description of ch 53. (c) And other passages as Deutero-Isaiah's too, show what the prophet's order is intended. The whole order is not great enough to exhaust the meaning of one of a half-dozen of the greatest lines in ch 53.

Professor A. B. Davidson's OT Prophecy contains a brilliant and radical new interpretation of the whole basis of the approaches from the standpoint of Bib. rather than simply exegetical theology. His fundamental position is that in the prophet's outlook the restoration is the consummation. In his mind the Servant and his work do not come at the restoration. The Servant, if a real person, must be one whose work lies in the past or present, as there is not room in the future for him, for the restoration which is at the door brings felicity, but no victory over sin, and is not realized receivable. But there is no actual person in the past and none in the present who could be the Servant. Hence the Servant cannot be to the prophet's mind a real person (see CONIAH).

Of course Davidson relates the result to his larger conception of the Servant, but I consider his interpretation of the Messianic significance of the passages in relation to their fulfillment in our Lord. The ideas they contain are realized in Him.

But coming back to the prophet's mind—if the Servant was not a personal figure to him, what figure is it? The answer according to Davidson is, He is a great personification of the ideal Israel, and Israel according to its ideal. To quote more fully, "The prophet has created out of the Divine determinations imposed on Israel, election, creation and forsaking, endowment with the word or spirit of Jeth, and the Divine purpose in those operations, an ideal Being, an inner Israel in the heart of the phenomenal or actual Israel, an indestructible Being having these Divine attributes or endowments, present in the outward Israel in all ages, powerful and effectual because really composed, if I can say so, of Divine forces, who cannot fail in God's purpose, and who as an inner power within Israel by his inspiration causes all Israel to become a true servant" (cf. Davidson, OT Prophecy, p. 263).

Now it seems to me that Davidson is more effective in his destructive than in his constructive work. One must confess that he presents real difficulties in holding to a personal Servant as the prophet's conception. But on the other hand when he presents a more adequate conception, I do not think he conspicuously succeeds.

The greatest of the Servant-passage's (it seems to me) presents more than can be successfully dealt with under any conception of the Servant as the ideal Israel. The very great emphasis on vicarious suffering in ch 53 simply is not answered by the theory. Words would not leap with such a flame of reality in describing the suffering of a personification. The case of sin back to the passage is not a thing whose problem could be solved by a glittering figure of speech. There it surges—the movement of an aroused conscience—and the answer to it could never be anything less than a real deed by a real person. My own feeling is that if language can express anything it expresses the fact that the prophet had a real personal Servant in view.

But what of the difficulties Davidson suggests? Even if the answer were not easy to find, one could rest on the total impression the passages make. One cannot consider a passage not in the environment in which it belongs. As Cheyne in other days said, "In the sublime descriptions of the Servant I am unable to resist the impression that we have the presentment of an historical personage, each forcibly stated, each cut off, yet each really seen in the colors of the present. Then we must remember that the prophets did not relate all their conceptions. They stated truths whose meaning and articulation they did not understand. They were not philosophers for a total view of life, and when we try to read them from this standpoint we misjudge them. Then we must remember that the prophet may here have been lifted to a height of prophetic receptiveness where he received and uttered what went beyond his understanding. To be sure there was a point of contact, but I see no objection to the thought that in a place of unique
significance and importance like this, God might use a man to utter words which reached far beyond the limits of his own understanding. In this connection revealed to him Professor Hermann Schultz are worth quoting: "If it is true anywhere, in the history of poetry and prophecy, it is true here that the writer being full of the spirit has said more than he himself meant to say and more than he himself understood."  
(4) The psychology of the prophecy.—This does not mean that something may not be said about the connection of the Servant-passages with the prophet's own thought. Using Delitzsch's illustration, we can see how from regarding all Israel as the servant the prophet could narrow down to the godly part of Israel as experience taught him the faithlessness of many, and it ought not to be impossible for us to see how all that Israel really meant at its best could have focused itself in his thought upon one person. Despite Davidson's objection, I can see nothing artificial about this movement in the prophet's mind. There was probably more progression in his thought than Professor Davidson is willing to allow. If it is asked, Where was the prophet when he spoke of the prophet could ascribe such greatness, conceiving as he did that he was to come at once? surely a similar question would be fair in relation to Isaiah's Messiah. The truth is that even on the threshold of the restoration there was typological surety boldly to assert. As John the Baptist on the Jordan watched for the coming One whom he knew not, yet who was 'aliter,' so the great prophet of the exile may have watched even day by day for the coming Servant whose work had been revealed to him.

But deep in the psychology of the prophecy is the sense of sin out of which these passages came and indications of which I think are found in the latter part of the book. The great guilt-laden past lay terribly behind the prophet, and as he mused over the sufferings of the righteous, perhaps esp. drawn to the heart-rent Jeremiah, the thought of redemptive suffering may haveawned upon him. And if in its light, and with a personal sense of sin drawn from what experiences we know not, he grapples with the problem, can we not understand, can we not see that God might flash upon him the great conception of a sin-bearer?

At last the idea of vicarious suffering had been connected with deep things of the nation's life, and henceforward was a part of its heritage. To the profoundest souls of the Servant— it would be a part of the nation's forward look. The priestly idea had been deepened and filled with new moral meaning. The Servant was a prophet too—so priest and prophet met in one. And I think Cheyne was right when he suggested that in the Servant's exultation in ch 53, the Servant is brought near to this in a fashion which we shall want to be more told, and which we shall want to be more suggested. In his thought to him as we do not think. So in suggestion, at least, prophet, priest and king meet in the great figure of the suffering Servant.

A new rich stream had entered into prophecy, full of power to fertilize whatever shores of thought it touched. In the thoughts of these passages prophecy seemed pressing with impatient eagerness to its goal, and though centuries were to pass before that goal was reached, its promise is seen here, full of assurance and of knowledge of the kind of goal it was. But whatever our view of the meaning of the prophet, we must agree (of Mt 8 17; 12 18-21; 26 67; Jn 12 41, et al.) that the conception he so boldly and powerfully put upon his canvas had its realization in its fulfillment in the One who spoke to the world from the cross on Calvary. And in its

darkly glorious shadow the Christian, with all the sadness and joy and wonder of it, with a sense of its solving all its problems and meeting in the deepest and most secret of his life, can feel a strange companion-ship with the exilic prophet whose

Significance with of the the yearning for a sin-bearer and belief in the Servant— His coming call across the long and slowly moving years. In the light and penetration of that hour he may be trusted to know what the prophet meant. Professor Delitzsch well said of that passage, "Every word is as it were written under the cross at Golgotha."  
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH

SERVANTS. SOLOMON'S. See SOLOMON'S SERVANTS.

SERVICE, sêr'vis; Six Heb, two Aram. and four Gr words are so rendered.

1. In the OT the word most used for "service" is 1 'abhadh, from 'abhadh, which is the general word, meaning "to work" and so "to serve," "to till," also "to enslave." The noun means "bondage," "labor," "ministering," "service," "service," "work," "use." This word is used in desert work in the fields (Ex 1 14, et al.), work in the tabernacle (Ex 27 19, et al.), sanctuary service (Nu 7 9), service of Jeh (Nu 8 11), Levitical or priestly service (Nu 8 22), kingly service (1 Ch 26 30, etc.). Reference is made to instruments, wood vessels, cattle, herbs, shekels for the service in the house of Jeh. (2) 'Abhadh itself is t°r service in Nu 8 15; 18 23; Jer 22 13. (3) Serdâ means "standing," i.e. piercing with a needle; it occurs only 4 t, and in each case in RV instead of "service" is used finely wrought garments" (Ex 31 10; 35 19; 39 11). (4) Shôdâth means primarily "to attend" as a servant or worshipping, and to contribute to or render service, wait on, and hence service; occurs only 3 t (Ex 35 19; 39 141 AV) and in ARV is rendered "for ministering." (5) Câbâl is found 7 t, used in the same connection each time, and refers to those numbered for service in the tent of meeting. Its primary root meaning refers to service for war, campaign, hardship (Nu 4 30 35 39 43; 8 24). (6) Yâh means 'to give,' lit. an "opening," a direction, power, and so ministry as in 1 Ch 6 31, where David appoints certain ones to have direction of the music, in 1 Ch 29 5, RV not service, but himself. (7) 'Abhadh means "business," "labor," "service," "work," "service," "service," "service," "service," "work." (8) Pôldân, from root meaning "to worship," "minister to," and so in Ez 7 19 vessels given for service.

The following are the use in the NT: (1) Diakonia, from root meaning "to run on errands," and so attendance, aid as a servant, ministry. 2. In the OT, instead, of NT Eng. word "deacon"; Paul: "that I might minister unto you" (2 Cor 11 8); also found in Rom 15 31 ("ministration") and Rev 2 19 ("ministry"). (2) Doulos, lit. "to be a slave," in bondage, service (Gal 4 8, "bondage"); Eph 6 6, "service"; 1 Tim 6 2, "serve"). (3) Latría, from root meaning "to render religious homage," menial service to God, and so worship (Jn 15 2, "service"; Rom 12 1, "service"; Rom 12 1, "service"; He 9 11, "service"; "services"). (4) Leitourgía, from root "to perform religious or charitable functions," worship, relieve, obey, minister, and hence a public function, priestly or charitable (liturgy) (2 Cor 9 12, "service"); also in Phil 2 17 30). See Servant of Jehovah.

WILLIAM EDWARD RUFFETTY
Thus (a) To attack: Jgs 9 33, AV "and set upon the city." (b) To impiant: Gen 4 15, AV "The Lord saw that a mark was upon Cain." (c) To stand: 1 K 2 15, "And that all Israel set their faces on me." (d) To place: 1 K 20 12, Ben-hadad shouted one word to his allies: "Set," i.e. set the armies in array, the battering-rams and engines of attack in their place. (e) To incline toward: Ezk 40 4, "Set thy heart upon all that I shall show thee." (f) To trust: Ps 62 10, "If riches increase, set not your heart thereon." (g) To place before: Ps 90 8, "Thou hast set our iniquities before thee;" Ps 141 3, "Set a watch, O JeH, before my mouth." (h) To go down: of the setting of the sun: Mk 13 19; Lk 4 4; He 12 22. To be proud: Mal 3 15, AV "They that work wickedness are set up." (j) To fill in: Ex 36 9, "stones to be set for the ephod." (k) To plant: Mk 12 1, "set a hedge about it." (l) To mock: Lk 23 11, "Herod . . . set him at nought." (m) To honor: 1 S 18 30, "so that his name was much set by." (n) To start: Acts 21 2, "We went aboard, and set sail." As may be seen the word is used in an endless variety of meanings.

HENRY E. DÓKER

SETH, sett, SHETH, sheth (סֵתָה; יָאָשָׁה; סֵתָה; סֵתָה),

(1) The son born to Adam and Eve after the death of Abel (Gen 4 25f.; 5 3f.; 1 Ch 1 1; Sir 49 16; Lk 3 38). In Gen 4 25 the derivation of the name is not given in the text, but E. Ellenhorn (Gen Name Schriften, 1899, p. 22), says God hath appointed [Sha'ah] me another seed instead of Abel. In 1 Ch 1 1 AV, the form is "Seth"; elsewhere in AV and in RV throughout the form is "Seth." (2) AV "the father of Sheth," RV "the sons of Tumak." According to AV rendering, the name of an unknown race mentioned in Balaam's parable (Nu 24 17).

S. F. HUntER

SETHUR, seth-ur (םַתּוּר), Sethur (Σαθοῦρ, Greek: An Asherite spy (Nu 13 13 [14]).

SETTING, set'ing (מַסָּטָה; μίλλυ'αθ, lit. "a filling"); The word is used in the description of the manufacture of the breastplate of judgment (Ex 28 17). The instruction runs: Thou shalt set in it settings of stones, four rows of precious stones. The same word is rendered "inclosings" in ver 20, and in 39 13 AV.

SETTLE, set'l (מַסַּטַּר, תַּתָּה), "a settling": For this word in Ex 43 14,17,20; 46 10, AVs and ERVs substitute more correctly "ledge." See Temple.

SETTLE: The Heb language has 8 words which are thus trs: יָאָשָׁה, נִבָּע, עַנָּא, שֶׁבַּת, תַּתָּה, נַעַב, מַצָּב, כְּבָדָה. Now the meaning is to settle down, to cause to occur (Ex 43 11; AV, 1 Ch 17 14); then it denotes fixedness (2 K 8 11; Ps 119 89; Prov 8 25) again it points to a condition of absolute quiescence, as the settings on the les (Jer 48 11); and in still another place it means packing solidly together (Ps 66 10). In the NT the words ἐγκαταστάσεως, ἐγκαθίστασιν, ἀποκατάστασιν, and ἐστήσατο, ἐκκαθάρισαν, have been trs "settle." RV in 1 Pet 5 10 has trs "establish," and the context unquestionably points to the idea of a fixed establishment in the faith. In Lk 21 14 the word the "settle" evidences points to a fixed determination. HENRY E. DÓKER

SEVEN, sev'n (שֶׁבָּה; שֶׁבָּה; שֶׁבָּה), See Number.

SEVEN CHURCHES. See Churches, Seven.

SEVEN STARS. See Astronmy.
SEVENEH, sē-ven'ē, se-ve'ne (Seveneh, gweneth): For AV "the tower of Syene," in Exk 29 10; 30 6, RV reads, "the tower of Seveneh," with note n, "or, from Migdol to Syene." Seveneh is the town at the First Cataract on the Nile at Assuan. Fresh interest has recently been given to it by the Elephantine discoveries bearing on the ancient Jewish colony and temple of Jeh in that place in the 5th cent. BC. See ARAMAIC; EGYPT; PAPYRI; SANC

SEVENTH, sev'nth, DAY. See SABBATH.

SEVENTY, sev'n-ty (Heb. sev'yan, sev'yâ'â, sôyôûkh-yôâ, hebdomôkhôna). See NUMBER.

SEVENTY DISCIPLES: The account of the designation and mission of these is found only in Lk 10. Some have therefore sought to maintain that we have here only a confused variant of the appointment of the Twelve; but this is impossible in the light of Luke's account of the Twelve in ch 9.

The documents vary as between the numbers seventy and seventy-two, so that it is impossible to determine which is the correct reading; and internal evidence cannot help settle the question in this case. There is nothing in the function or circumstances of the TWELVE to indicate any reason for the specific number.

Commentators have sought parallels in the seventy elders chosen to assist Moses (Nu 11) and supposed that Jesus was indicating His kinship with the "prophet like unto Moses" whom God would raise up.

Again, the Jews popularly reckoned the "number of the nations of the earth" at seventy (cf Gen 10); and some have supposed Jesus to be thus indicating that His Church would embrace the whole world. But the variation of the angel's declaration is the same as that of the Seventy are not forbidden to go to Gentiles, and that their commission probably included Persia, where the Seventy were to be found. Some, again, have supposed that Jesus had in mind the Jewish Sanhedrin, composed of seventy (or seventy-two), and that the appointment of a like number to extend the work of His kingdom was a parabolic recognition that as the Jews were officially rejecting Him, so He was rejecting them as agents for the work of the kingdom. It is impossible to speak with any certainty as to any of these suggestions. It is to be noted that there is the same confusion between the numbers seventy and seventy-two in all four Jewish traditions as to the number of translators of the LXX.

Inasmuch as no further mention is made of these workers, it is to be understood that they were appointed to a temporary ministry. Tradition assigns to them no further or permanent role after Pentecost. While it is probable that some of these were witnesses later, the tradition is worthless in details. The mission of these and this reason assigned for their appointment are essentially the same as in the case of the Twelve. Jesus is now completing His last public campaign in preaching and introducing the kingdom of heaven. The employing of these in this service is in line with the permanent ideal of Christian ministry which is not a distinction between the "laymen" and the "clergy" in responsibility and service. Jesus was perhaps employing all whose experience and sympathy made them fit for work in the harvest that was so plenteous while the laborers were few. He found seventy-two weeks from the ascension and He would find a hundred and twenty such after His ascension (Acts 1 15). WILLIAM OWEN CARVER

SEVENEH YEARS: The period assigned by Jeremiah for the duration of the Jewish exile in Babylon (Jer 25 11 12; 29 10; cf. 2 Ch 36 21 f; Ezr 1 1; Dn 9 2). If the period be reckoned from the date of the first deportation in the 4th year of Jehoiachin (2522 BC) Dn 36 6 f, Dn 1 1 by another reckoning calls it the 3d year), i.e. 606 BC, till the decree of Cyrus, 536 BC, the prediction was fulfilled to a year. See CAPTIVITY.

SEVER, sev'ér: The three Heb words bâdhal, pâdâth and parâdâth are thus tr 1. The idea conveyed is that of setting apart (Lev 20 26 AV) or of setting someone or something apart in a miraculous way (Ex 8 22; 9 4 AV, ERV), or, again, of simple separation on one's own volition (Jgs 11 11 AV, ERV). The Gr word âphorís, aphorís (Mt 26 23) stands for final judicial segregation.

SEVERAL, sev'er-al, SEVERALLY, sev'er-al-ly: The Heb word usually sevâh, sevâh is rendered tr 1 "several" in AV, ERV, 2 K 15 5; 2 Ch 26 21; in both cases tr 1 "separate!" in ARV, and indicate
ceremonial uncleanness and consequent severance on account of leprosy. In the parable of the Talenta (Mt 25:15) and also in 1 Cor 12:11 the word ἄγαν̣, ἄδιος, is τρίτον “several,” “severally.” In both cases it points to the individuality of the recipients of the gift bestowed.

SHAALBIM, shā-a-lb'īn (םשׁלָבִים, sha'lālab'īn; B, שֶׁלֶבָּה, Shelelah, A, סֶלֶבָּה, Salcelim): A town in the Dan area of Ben-shemesh and Ajalon (Josh 19:42). It seems to be identical with Shaalbim.

SHAALBONITE, shā-al-bōnīt (םשׁלָבּוֹנִי, sha'lābōnī); A, שֶלֶבּוֹן, Shelbon; in Josh B A, Shelabim, Salceleim): The place of residence of the Amorites who forced the children of Dan to seek new homes. Elahha the Shaalbonite. This village is the site of the ancient city of Arad, and the name of a people who were descended from Shemesh, listed in 1 Ch 11:33, which again is probably identical with Shaalbim. Onom identifies it with Salaha, a large village in the district of Sebaste (Samaria), which apparently Eusebius and Jerome thought to be in the territory of Dan. It seems, however, too far to the N. Jerome in his comm. on Ezk 48:19 speaks of the towers of Ajalon and Selebi and Emmaus. Conder would identify Selebi with Selbí, 3 miles N.W. of Ajalon (Yādo), and 8 miles N. of Beth-shemesh. This would suit for Shaalbim, as far as position is concerned; but it is difficult to account for the heavy τ, if the name, derived from Shaalbonite.

W. EWING

SHAALBIM, shā-al-bīm (םשׁלֹבִים, sha'lābīm; B, שֶלֶבּי, Shelbī; A, סֶלֶבּי, Salbī): A town in the Dan area of Ben-shemesh and Ajalon (Josh 19:42). It seems to be identical with Shaalbim.

SHAALIM, shā'a-līm, LAND OF (םשׁלָלִים, sha'lālīm), one of the territory of Judah, given to Caleb the son of Jefuneh (Josh 15:30). It includes both the Shephelah and the district of Jerahmeel, Jeshua the son of Nun and Caleb are said, (Josh 15:17), to pass through this land.

W. EWING

SHAAPH, sha‘af (שׁאַפָּה, sha‘aph): (1) A son of Jablai (1 Ch 2:47). (2) The son of Masach, a convert of Caleb, the brother of Jerahmeel. Shapph is called the “father,” or founder, of the city Madmannah (1 Ch 2:48 f).

SHAARAIM, shā-a-rā'im (שׁאורַיָם, sha‘ārayim), “two gates”; A, שֶׁלֶרְיָם, Shelarim; AV Sharamim): (1) A city in the Shephelah or “lowland” of Judah mentioned (Josh 15:36) in close association with Sooch and Azekah; the vanquished army of the Philistines passed a Shaaraim in their flight from Sooch toward Gath and Ekron (1 S 17:52). It is possible that in this latter reference the “two gates” may refer—as LXX implies—to the two Philistine strongholds of themselves. Shaaraim has been identified with Tell Zakariya (see however Azekah) and with Kh. Sa‘rekh (PEF, III, 114, Sh XVII), an old site W. of Beth Atîb. Both proposals are hazardous.

(2) One of the towns of Simeon (1 Ch 4:31), called (Josh 19:6) “Shaarhun” and, as one of the uttermost cities of Judah, called (Josh 18:32) “Shekhim.” This town was in Southwestern Pal and is very probably identical with the fortress Sharrana, a place of some importance on the road from Gaza to Egypt. Ashmus (XVIIIth Dynasty) besieged and captured this city in the 5th year of his reign in his pursuit of the flying Hyksos (Petrie, Hist, II, 22, 35), and a century later Tahutmes III, in the 23rd year of his reign, took the city of Sharrana on his way to the siege and capture of Megiddo (Petrie, Hist, II, 104). On philological grounds Tell esh-Sherkiya, 12 miles N.W. of Beerseba, a large ruin, has been proposed, but it does not suit at all the Egypt data (PEF, III, 399, Sh XXIV).

E. W. WESTCOTT

SHAAHGAZ, sha‘ah-gaz (שׁאָהַגָּז, sha‘agaz): LXX reads Ρακί, Gai, the same name it gives to the official referred to in Est 2:15; the name may go back to the Old Bactrian word Ζάσκακάντω, “one anxious to learn” (Scheff); most commentators suggest no explanation: A chamberlain of Ahasuerus, king of Persia; as keeper of “the second house of women,” he had Esther under his charge (ver 14).

SHABBETHAI, shab‘ē-thāi (שׁבְבֶתְי, sabḥothay), “one born on the Sabbath”; B, סָבָטָּה, Sabatha; A, קַבְבָּתָּה, Kabbathah; “Sabbatute” of 1 Esd 3:14: A Levite who opposed (?) Ezra’s suggestion that the men who had married foreign wives put them aside (Ezk 10:15). Kenken, however, renders the phrase פַּרְשֵׁי עֵדָה, Pārṣē‘i ‘al ‘odh, of which Ashiel and Jahaziah are the subjects, to mean “stand against,” “oppose” (Gesammelte Abhandlungen, 247 f); this would make Shabbethai, who was in accord with the two men mentioned above, an ally rather than an opponent of Ezra. We incline toward Kenken’s view of the people’s interest with a position attained by Shabbethai under Nehemiah—one he would have been unlikely to attain had he been hostile to Ezra. He is mentioned among those appointed to explain the Law (Neh 8:7), and as one of the chiefes of the Levites who had the oversight of “the outward business of the house of God” (Neh 11:16).

HORACE J. WOLF

SHACHIA, sha-ki’a, shak‘i-ā (שׁחֵיא, sakh‘yā; so Baer, Ginsberg; some see red sakh‘rā, or מִכת, sakhr‘yā; also מִכת, sakhr‘yāh, and מִכת, shaḥhr‘yāh, sakhhr‘yāh). This last reading is favored by the Syriac and the LXX [B, סָבָתָה, Sabia, A, סָבָתָה, Sabith; but Luke, יָבָת, Yabat, Sequiah]: the form in ḫh (2) instead of b (2) have the support of the Vulg, Sequia, “Yahweh has forgotten”?: A name in a genealogy of Benjamin (1 Ch 10:10).

SHADDAI, shad‘ā-i, shad‘i. See God, Names of, 11, 8.

SHADE, shād, SHADOW, shad‘ā-ing (נִשְׂאָד, nis‘ā-ad; skud, skid): A shadow is any obscuration of the light and heat with the form
of the intervening object, obscurly projected, constantly changing and passing away. "Shadow" is used lit. of a roof (Gen 19:8), of mountains (Jgs 9:36), of trees (Jgs 9:15, etc.), of wings (Ps 17:8, etc.), of a cloud (Isa 25:5), of a great rock (Isa 30:32), the Name of Jehovah (Acts 5:15), of the shadow on the dial (2 K 20:9, etc.), of Jonah’s gourd (Jon 4:5f). It is used also figuratively (1) of shelter and protection (of man, Gen 19:8; Cant 2:3; Isa 16:3, etc.; of God, Ps 36:7; 91:1; Isa 4:6, etc.); (2) of anything fleeting or transient, as of the days of man’s life on earth (1 Ch 29:15; Job 8:9; Ps 109:23); (3) with the idea of obscurity or imperfection (in He 8:5; 10:1, of the Law; of Col 2:17); (4) of darkness, gloom, see Shadow of Death. In Jps 1:17, we have in AV, “the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning” (aposkiasma), RV “shadow that is cast by turning”; the reference is to the unchangeableness of God as contrasted with the changes of the heavenly bodies. RV “has of the most frequent usage, for ‘shadowing with wings’ in Isa 18:1; ARV has ‘shade’ for ‘shadow’ in various places (Jgs 9:15; Job 40:22; Isa 4:6, etc.). In Job 40:21-22, for “shady trees” RV has “lotus-trees.”

W. L. WALKER

SHADOW OF DEATH (דָּיָּם, qalma’ath): The Heb word דָּיָּם “shadow of death” is used poetically for thick darkness (Job 3:5), as descriptive of Sheol (Job 30:21; 12:22; 38:17), figuratively of deep distress (Job 12:22; 16:16; 24:17bis; 28:3; 34:22 [in the last three passages ARV has “thick darkness” and “thick gloom”]; Ps 23:4, RV “deep darkness [and so elsewhere]”); 44:19; 107:10; 14:2; Jer 2:6; 13:16; Am 5:8; Mt 4:16; Lk 1:79, 80). The word of Jehovah and the Heb word used for “shadowing with wings” in the last two passages is כֵּל, “shadow,” and מַעֲעָת, “death,” and the idea of “the valley of the shadow of death” was most probably derived from the deep ravines, darkened by over-hanging briers, etc., through which the shepherd had sometimes to lead or drive his sheep to new and better pastures.

W. L. WALKER

SHADRACH, sha’drmk: The Bab name of one of the so-called Heb children. Shadrach is probably the Sumerian name of the Bab Kudurri-U-Aki, “servant of Sin.” It has been suggested by Meinhof that we should read Merodach instead of Shadrach. Since there were no vowels in the original Heb or Arum, and since sh and m as well as r and d are much the same in the old alphabet in which Dnl was written, this change is quite possible.

Shadrach and his two companions were trained along with Daniel at the court of Nebuchadnezzar, who had carried all four captive in the expedition against Jerus in the 5th year of Joho’akim (Dnl 1:1). They all refused to eat of the food provided by Ashpenaz, the master who had been set over them by the king, but preferred to eat pulse (Dnl 1:12). The effect was much to their advantage, as they appeared far fatter and fatter than those who ate of the king’s meat. At the end of the appointed time they passed satisfactory examinations, both as to their physical appearance and their intellectual acquirements, so that none were found like them among all with whom the king communed, and they stood before the king (see Dnl 1).

When Daniel heard that the wise men of Babylon were to be slain because they could not tell the dream of Nebuchadnezzar, after he had gained a relative from the king, he made this thing known to his three companions that they might unite with him in prayer to the God of heaven that they all might not perish with the rest of the wise men of Babylon. After God had heard their prayer and the dream was made known to the king by Daniel, Nebuchadnezzar, at Daniel’s request, set Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego over the affairs of the province of Babylon (Dnl 2). With Meshach and Abed-nego, Shadrach was cast into a fiery furnace, but escaped unhurt (Dnl 3). See Abed-nego; Hananiah; Song of Three Children.

R. Dick Wilson

SHADY, shad’di, TREES (Job 40:21f). See LOTUS TREES.

SHAF'T, shaft: Isa 49:2 for תַּמָּם, hág “an arrow”; also Ex 25:31; 37:17; Nu 8:4 AV for a part of the candlestick of the tabernacle somewhat vaguely designated by the word יֹתֶה, yárēkh, “thigh.” The context in the first 2 verses shows that the upright stem or “shaft” is intended, but in Nu 8:4 a different context has caused RV to substitute “base.” See also Archery; Armor, Arms.

SHAGEE, sha’gē (שַּגֵּה, shagēh); B, Sôla, Sôla, A, Sâği, Sâgê; AV Shage: The father of Jonathan, one of David’s heroes (1 Ch 11:34).

SHAHARAIM, sha-ha’rîm (צַהְרָיִים, shâhâr’ayim); B, Sâleri katâ Shâdôn, Sulejm katâ Thêthûn, Sulejm katâ Thulûs, Sulejm katâ Shôlûs, Saarem; AV Shchem; SSA. A Benjamite name (1 Ch 8:8). The passage is corrupt beyond only the most tentative emendation. “Sharáim” has no connection with the foregoing text. One note of varia, readings: “And Shahraraim dwelt in the field of Moab, after he had driven them [i.e. the Moabites] out, from Hodesh his wife, Jobah,” etc (Curtis, ICC).

SHAHAZUMAH, sha-ha-zo’ma, shah-ha’dô-ma (צַהֲזוּמָה, shâhâzûmâh; B, Sulejm katâ Thâdôn, Sulejm katâ Thalûs, Sulejm katâ Thulûs, Sulejm katâ Shôlûs, Shaarem; AV Shchem; SSA. A Benjamite name (1 Ch 8:8). A town in the territory of Issachar on the boundary which run from Tabor to the Jordan (Josh 19:22). The site, which has not yet been recovered, must be sought, probably, to the S.E. of the mountain.

SHALEM, sha’lem (שַּלֵּם, shâlêm; es Sâlôm, es Salîm): The word as a place-name occurs only in Gen 34:18. With Luther, following LXX, Pesh and Vul, AV reads “And Jacob came to Shalem, a city of Shechem, with the Tgs Orkôlos and the Sôla [Sulém, Sulejm, Sulejm].” This should be emended to: “And Sharahaim dwelt, came in peace to the city of Shchem.” There is a heavy balance of opinion among scholars in favor of the latter reading. It is certainly a remarkable fact, supporting AV, that about 4 miles E. of Shechem (Wâbluos), there is a village bearing the name Sâlôm. If AV is right, this must represent the city referred to; and E. of Sâlôm would transpire the events recorded in Gen 44. Against this is the old tradition locating Jacob’s well and Joseph’s tomb near to Shechem. Onam gets over the difficulty by identifying Shechem with Shalem. W. Ewing

SHALIM, sha’lîm. See SHALIM.

SHALISHAH, sha-lî’asha, sha-lî’e-hâš, LAND OF (נְפָיִשׁ, efer shališâhâh; B, h 24 Sâlek, h 24 Sâlek, h 24 Selîk, A, h 24 Sâlem, h 24 Salîsâh): If the general indication of the route followed by the Soul, given under Sâlem, is correct, the land of Shališah (1 S 8:9) will lie to the N.E. of Lydica on the western slope of the range. Baal-shalishah would most likely be in the district, and may indeed have given its name to it. If Conder is right in identifying this city with Khirbet Kefr Thilith, about 10 miles N.E. of Jaffa, it meets well enough the general indication given above. Onom knows the name, but gives no guidance as to where the district is.

THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA
Menahem, then at Tirah, one of the minor capitals of the kingdom, went up to Samaria, slew him and took his place.

It was probably at this time that Syria threw off the yoke of Assyrian to Israel (see Jer 3:12), as when next we meet with that kingdom, it is under its own king and in alliance with Samaria (2 K 15 5).

The 10 years of rule given to Menahem (2 K 15 17) may be taken to include the last stage of his military violence under Zechariah and Shallum, and cover the full years 758-750, with portions of years before and after counted as whole ones. The unsuccessful usurpation of Shallum may therefore be put in 758 BC (some date lower).

W. Shaw Caldecott

SHALLUN, shall'um, shall'ān, not in LXX; another form of Shallum, son of Col-hozeh. He was the ruler of the district of Mizpah. He assisted Nehemiah in building the wall of Jerus and in repairing the gate by the Pool of Siloah at the King's Gardens (Neh 3 13).

SHALMACH, shall'mān, AV form in Ezr 2 46; "Samlam"; Neh 7 45 "Salmai" (q.v.).

SHALMANESER, shall-mān'ē-sēr (םלמנכ, shallmeneser; LXX Σαλμανας, Sammansas, Σαλμάνας, Salmanasor, Salmanazar): The name of several Assyrian kings. See Assyria; Assyrian Captivity.

It is Shalmaneser IV who is mentioned in the Bible under this name (2 K 17 3; 18 9). He succeeded Tiglath-pileser on the throne in 727 BC, but whether he was a son of his predecessor, or a usurper, is not apparent. His reign was short, and, as no annals of it have come to light, we have only the accounts contained in 2 K for his history. In the passages referred to above, we learn that Hoshea, king of Israel, who had become his vassal, refused to continue the payment of tribute, relying upon help from So, king of Egypt. No help, however, came from Egypt, and Hoshea had to face the charging forces of his suzerain with his own unaided resources, the result being that he was taken prisoner outside Samaria and most likely carried away to Nineveh.

The Bible narrative goes on to say that the king of Assyria came up throughout all the land, and went up to Samaria and besieged it 3 years. There is
reason to believe that, as the siege of Samaria was proceeding, Shalmaneser retired to Nineveh and died, for, when the city was taken in 722 BC, it is Sargon who claims, in his copious annals, to have captured it and carried its inhabitants into captivity. It is just a contradiction that Shalman (Hos 10 14) is a contraction for Shalmaneser, but the identity of Shalman and of Beth-arbel named in the same passage is not sufficiently made out.

LITERATURE.—Schrader, COT. I. 258 ff.; McCurdy, HPM. I. 387 ff.

T. NIOOL

SHAMA, šā'ma (שָׁמָא, šāmā): One of David's heroes (1 Ch 11 44).

SHAMAI, šam'ā-ri. See Salm.

SHAMARIAH, šam-ar'i-a, ša-mār'-ya. See Shemariah.

SHAMBLES, shamb'liz (mackellon, makdellen): A slaughter-house; then a butcher's stall, meat-market. The word is once used in the NT in 1 Cor 10 25.

SHAME, šā'm (שָׁמָה; bōshh, "to be ashamed," בוש, "shame," בוש, "bāsheth; shame," בָּשָׁה; ʿāshān; ašān, ašān, "ignominy," ʿātūm, ṣattūm, "dishonor," and other words): An oft-recurring word in Scripture almost uniformly bound up with a sense of sin and guilt. It is figuratively set forth as a wild beast (Jer 3 24), a Nessus-garment (3 25), a blight (20 18), a sin against one's own soul (Hab 2 10), and twice as the condensed symbol of Heb abomination—Baal (Jer 11 13; Hos 9 10 m; see Isa-Borheith). It is bracketed with defeat (Isa 30 3), reproach (Ps 69 7; Isa 64 4; Mic 2 6), confusion (Isa 6 7), nakedness (Isa 47 3; Mic 1 11), everlasting contempt (Dan 12 2), folly (Prov 18 13), cruelty (Isa 50 6; He 12 2), poverty (Prov 13 18), nothingness (Prov 9 7 AV), unseemliness (1 Cor 11 6; 14 35 AV; Eph 5 12), and "those that go down to the pit" (Ezk 32 25). In the first Bib. reference to this emotion, "shame" appears as "the correlative of sin and guilt" (Delitzsch, New Comm. on Gen and Bib. Psychology). Shamelessness is characteristic of abandoned wickedness (Phil 3 19; Jude ver 13, n "Gr 'shames').

Manifestly, then, shame is a concomitant of the Divine judgment upon sin; the very worst that a Hebrew could wish for an enemy was that he might be carried away before some (Ps 109 29; Mic 2 6): confusion, the judgment of God might rest upon him visibly.

Naturally, to the Hebrew, shame was the portion of those who were idolaters, who were faithless to Jeh or who were unfriendly to themselves—the elect people of Jeh. Shame is to come upon Moab because Moab held Israel in derision (Jer 48 39 27), and upon Edom "for violence against his brother Jacob" (Ob ver 10). But also, and impartially, shame is the portion of faithless Israelites who deny Jeh and follow after strange gods (Ezk 7 18; Mic 7 10; Hos 10 6, and often). But shame, too, comes upon those who exult themselves against God, who trust in earthly power and the show of material strength (2 Ch 31 21; Isa 30 3); and upon those who make a mock of righteousness (Jeb 8 22; Ps 56 26; 132 18). With a fine sense of ethical distinctions the Bib. writers recognize that in confessing to a sense of shame there is hope for better things. Only in the most desperate cases is there no shame (Isa of 15; Zeph 3 5; Phil 3 19; Jude ver 13); in pardon God is said to remove shame (Isa 64 4 bis; 61 7).

On conditions beyond the grave the Bib. revelation is exceedingly reticent, but here and there are hints that shame waits upon the wicked here and hereafter. Such an expression as that in Dn 12 2 cannot be ignored, and though the writing itself may belong to a late period and a somewhat sophisticated theological development, the idea is but a reflection of the earlier and more elementary period, when the voice of crime and cruelty went up from earth to be heard in the audience chamber of God (Gen 4 11; 6 13). In the NT there is similar reticence but also similar implications. It cannot be much amiss to say that in the mind of the Bib. writers sin was a shameful thing; that part of the punishment for sin was a consciousness of guilt in the sense of shame; and that from this consciousness of guilt there was no deliverance while the sin was unconfessed and unforgiven. "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt.

From one's own past there is no deliverance, save through contrition of spirit and the grace and forgiveness of God. While the sense of shame persists, or, in other words, while the moral constitution of man's nature remains as it is, there will never be wanting an avenger of sin.

CHARLES M. STUART

SHAMED, šā'med. See Shem.

SHAMEFACEDNESS, šām-fas'-nes, šām-f'as'-ned. See Shamefacedness.

SHAMEFACEDNESS, šām-fas'-nes: The original AV tr of ἀἰδής, aībā, in Sir 41 16 and 1 Tim 2 9. Perhaps half a century later the term, "shamefacedness" supplant the better form, and continues in the ordinary editions of the King James Version. RV, however, rightly restores "shamefacedness."

SHAMER, šā'mer. See Shem.

SHAMGAR, sham'gār (סָמָגָר, shagār): One of the judges, son of Anath (Anathah), in whose days, which preceded the time of Deborah and Barak (Jgs 5 7), there was no deliverance in Israel, from the oppression of the Moabites and Ammonites, and which was the last of the most celebrated of the "judges" of Israel (Jgs 3 31). According to a tradition represented in Jos (Ant. V. iv. 8), Shaggar died in the year he became judge.

Several writers have challenged the Bib. account on the following grounds: that in Jgs 6 no mention is made of any deliverance; that the 2. Critical name "Shaggar" resembles the name Hypotheses of a Hittite king and the name "Anath" that of a Syrian goddess; that the deed recorded in Jgs 3 31 is analogous to that of Samson (Jgs 15 15), and that of Shamshon, son of Age (2 8 23 11 f); and lastly, that in a group of Gr MSS and other VSS this verse is inserted after the account of Samson's exploits. None of these is necessarily inconsistent with the traditional account. Nevertheless, they have been used as a basis not only for overthrowing the tradition, but also for constructive theories such as that which makes Shaggar a foreign oppressor and not a judge, and so the father of the anathah. There is, of course, no limit to which this kind of interesting speculation cannot lead.

(For a complete account of these views see Moore, 'Jgs,' in ICC, 1805, 104 f, and same author..."
in Journal of the American Oriental Society, XIX, 2, 159-60.)

SHAMHUTH, sham'uth. See SHAMMUAH, IV.

SHAMIR, šāmîr (םָמִיר, šāmîr; Σαμείρ, Sameir): (1) Mentioned along with Jattir and Socoh (Josh 16 48) as one of the cities of Judah in the hill country. Possibly it is Kh. (or Umm) Sômerah, 2,000 ft. above sea-level, a site with ancient walls, caves, cisterns, and tombs not far W. of Debir (Edh Dhatberghi) and 2 miles N. of Anab (Anah) (PEF, III, 262, 286, Sh XIX). (2) A place in the hill country of Ephraim (Jgs 10 1) from which came "Tola, the son of Pual, a man of Issachar," who judged Israel 23 years; he died and was buried by Jesse and brother of David. Together with his two other brothers he fought under Saul in the campaign against the Philistines and was with the army in the valley of Elah when David slew Goliath (1 Sam 17 12). One reductor states that his name is rendered by David by the name of Shamueli (1 Sam 16 13). He was the father of Jonadab, the friend of Amnon (2 Sam 13 3), and that Jonathan whose victory over the Philistines is narrated in 2 Sam 21 20 was also his son. His name is rendered "Shamir" (1 Sam 16 9; 17 13), "Shimshah" (2 Sam 13 32), "Shemei" (2 Sam 21 21), and "Shime" (1 Ch 2 13; 20 7). (3) The son of Agee, a Hararite, one of the "three mighty men" of David (2 Sam 23 11), LXX Σαμαίον, Samadai, who held the field against the Philistines. The passage (1 Ch 11 10) ascribes this deed to Eleazar, the son of Dodo. The succeeding incident (2 Sam 23 13), viz., the famous act of three of David's heroes who risked their lives to bring their leader water from the well of Bethlehem, has frequently been credited to Shamshah and two other members of the "three brothers"; but the three warriors are plainly said (ver 13) to belong to "the thirty"; ver 33 should read "Jonathan, son of Shamshah, the Hararite." Jonathan, one of David's "thirty," was a son of Shamshah; the word "son" has been accidentally omitted (Driver, Buide, Kittel, etc.). The passage (1 Ch 11 34) has "son of Shacheh," which is probably a misreading for "son of Agee." Lucian's version, "son of Shamshah," is most plausible. "Shimei the son of Elea" (1 K 4 18) should also appear in this passage if Lucian's reading of "Ela" for "Agee" (2 Sam 23 11) be correct. (4) A Harodite (2 Sam 25 33), i.e., probably a native of 'Ain-barod ('Ain Jalid, Jgs 7 1; see Harod). One of the "thirty" and captain of Solomon's 5th month course. In the lists (1 Ch 11 27) he is called "the Harorite" (this last being a scribal error for Harodite) and "Shamhuth the Izrahite" (1 Ch 27 8).

SHAMMAI, sham'mā, sham 'mā (םָמָא, šamma':) (1) A Jerahmeelite (1 Ch 2 28 32). (2) The son of Dekem and father of Maon (1 Ch 2 44 ft). (3) A Judahite (1 Ch 4 17).

SHAMMOTH, sham'oth, sham 'oth. See SHAM- man, (4).

SHAMMUAWA, SHAMMUAH, sha-mu'a, sham'a-a (םָמָעָה, šammu'ah): (1) The Reubenite spy (Nu 13 4, Σαμουα, Samouah, and other forms). (2) One of David's sons (2 S 5 14; 1 Ch 14 4, Σαμουα, Samoah). In 1 Ch 3 5 he is called "Shimea."] (3) A Levite (Neh 11 17); he is called "Shemaijah" in 1 Ch 9 16. (4) The head of a priestly family (Neh 12 18); a contemporary of Joiakim.

SHAMSHERA, sham'shē-ri, sham-shē-ri (םָמָשֵּׁר, shamshēry): A Benjamite (1 Ch 8 26).

SHAPA, sháp, shāp (שָׂפָה, šāpah): In AV the tr of elōs, elōs, "form," "appearance" (Lk 3 22; In 5 37), and of ḫāṣoq, homolōma, "likeness," "semblance" (Rev 9 7). The meaning of these words is not so much "tangible shape," in which sense we use the word in modern Eng., but rather "aspect," "appearance," the looks of a person or a thing. This is especially the case where the word is joined with the adj. shawāra, shōmēs, "bodily," as in the passage Lk 3 22, "The Holy Spirit descended in a bodily form [i.e. "in a corporeal appearance," AV "in a bodily shape"], as a dove, upon him." The second passage also refers to the "appearance" of God, and cannot therefore be regarded as material shape: "Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his form" (AV "shape") (Jn 5 37). As has been seen from the above quotations, RV, which retains the tr "shape" for homolōma, has tr elōs with "form" which also serves to render several other Gr synonyms, such as μορφή, morφhē (Mk 16 12; Phil 2 6), μορφωσις, morφhōsis (Rom 2 20; 2 Tim 3 5), τάφος, táphas (RvM "pattern," RvM "form," Rom 6 17), and ἵππος, ἵππωσις (RvM "pattern," 2 Tim 1 13). In AV Wisd 18 1 "shape" translates morφhē, RV "form.

H. L. E. LUERING

SHAPHAM, šāfām (שָׁפָם, šāfām; Σαφαμ, Sapham, Σαφά, Σαβά): Name of a Gadite chief, who had the second place in command of his tribe (1 Ch 5 12). So far as the fragmentary genealogies are intelligible, they seem to indicate that Shapham and his chief, Joel, lived in the time of Saul and shared in the war against the Hagarites (1 Ch 5 7-10 18 22), but it is to be noted that these lists were first recorded between the years 750 and 740 BC, just before the eastern tribes were carried into captivity.

SHAPHAN, šāfān (שָׁפָן, šāfān, "rock-badger," EV "coney"; Σαφάν, Saphān): An old totem clan name (so W. R. Smith; cf, however, art. Totemism: Gray, HPN. 103 fi, and Jacob's Studies in Bib. Archaeology, 54 ff). (1) Son of Azaliah and scribe of King Josiah. He received from Hilkiah the Book of the Law
which had been found in the Temple (2 K 22 3 ff; 2 Ch 34 8–28). It was from Shaphan’s lips that Josiah heard the Law read. Shaphan was also one of those sent by the king to the prophetess Huldah (2 K 22; 2 Ch 34). He was undoubtedly one of the staunchest supporters of Josiah in his work of reform. He was the father of Ahikam (2 K 22 12; 2 Ch 24 30; Jer 26 54), who befriended and protected the prophet Jeremiah. Another son, Elasah, was one of the two men instigated by Jeremiah with his letter to the captives in Babylon (Jer 29 2). A third son, Gemariah, vizi (of Judah) and prophetic adviser to King Jehoiakim from burning “the roll” (Jer 36 10.11.12. 25). The Micaiah of Jer 36 11.12, and Gedaliah, the governor of Judaea after the captivity of 586 BC, were his grandsons (Jer 39 14).

(2) Perhaps the father of Jaaazaniah, one of the 70 men whom Ezekiel saw in his vision of the Temple, sacrificing to idols (Ezk 8 11).

HORACE J. WOLF

SHAPHAT, shāfət ([שָׁפָט], šaphēt):
(1) The Simeonite spy (Nu 13 5, Ṣaphər, Saphat).
(2) The father of the prophet Elisha (1 K 19 16; 2 K 4 1, LXX Saphath).
(3) A name in the royal genealogy of Judah (1 Ch 3 22).
(4) A Gadite (1 Ch 5 12).
(5) One of David’s herdsman (1 Ch 27 29).

SHAPFER, shāfər. See SHEEPER.

SHAPHIR, shāfər ([שָׁפִּיר], šaphir), “glittering”;
ḵaləsōš, kalōš; AV Saphir): One of a group of towns mentioned in Mic 1 10–15. From the association with Gath, Aschur (of Judah) and Mareshah, it would seem that the places mentioned were in Southwestern Pal. According to Onom, there was a Ṣafēph, Saphir, “in the hill country” (from a confusion with Shamir [Josh 15 48], where LXX A ḫaš Saphir) between E琉theropolis and Aṣcalon. The name probably survives in that of three villages called es-Saiṭār, in the plain, some 34 miles S.E. of Ashdod (PEF, 11, 413, 5b XV). Cheyne (EB, col. 432) suggests the white “glittering” hill Tell es-Saïṭār, at the entrance to the Wādy es-Sant, which is known to the Crusaders as Blanchegarde, but this site seems a more probable one for Gath (q.v.).

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

SHARAI, shārə’ā, šā’rī ([שָׁרִי], šāroy): One of the sons of Bani who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10 40).

SHARAIM, ša-rə’ām. See SHARAIM.

SHARAR, ša-rə’ār. See SACAR.

SHARE, šār. See FLOW.

SHAREZER, ša-rə’ēzər ([שָׁרֵזֶר], sar’er, ‘ẓ; ša-rēzər): Connected to the Assyrian Shar-usur, “protect the king”; found otherwise, not as a complete name, but as elements in personal names, e.g. Bel-shar-usur, “may Bel protect the king,” which is the equivalent of Belshazzar (Dan 5 1). The name is borne by two persons in the OT:
(1) The son of Sennacherib, king of Assyria, who was active in Judah in the days of Ahaz (2 K 18 37; Isa 37 38). The Bab Chronicle says concerning Sennacherib’s death: “On the 20th day of Tibet Sennacherib, king of Assyria, was slain by his son in a revolt.” This differs from the OT account in that it speaks of only one murderer, and does not give his name. How the two accounts can be harmonized is still uncertain. Hitzig, (Kritik, 1914), following Ahlström, as quoted by Eusebius, completed the name of Sennacherib’s son, so as to read Nergal-shar-ezer = Nergal-shar-usur (Jer 30 3.13), and this is accepted by many modern scholars. Johns thinks that Sharezer (šar-e’er or sar-e’er) may be a corruption from Shar-etir Ashur, the name of a son of Sennacherib (1-vol HDB, s.v.). The question cannot be definitely settled.

(2) A contemporary of the prophet Zechariah, mentioned in connection with the sending of a delegation to the spiritual heads of the community to inquire concerning the propriety of continuing the “sacred harlotry” of Sennacherib (Zez 7 2). This creates a difficulty in connection with the succeeding words, lit. “and his men.” The Revisers place in the margin as an alternative rendering, “They of Beth-el, even Sharezer, . . . had sent.” Sharezer sounds peculiar in apposition to “they of Beth-el”; hence some have thought, esp. since Sharezer seems incomplete, that in the two words Beth-el and Sharezer we have a corruption of what was originally a single proper name, perhaps Bel-sharezer = Bel-shar-usur = Bel-shazzar. The present text, no matter how it is presented, presents difficulties. See REGEM-MELECH.

SHARON, šārə’n ([שָׁרוֹן], ha-sharon, with the det. art. possibly meaning “the plain”; ℓο ῥόμος, to pedion, S. and L. ὁ δρόμος, ho drumos, ho Sarōn):
(1) This name is attached to the strip of fairly level land which runs between the mountains and the shore of the Mediterranean, stretching from Nahr Robin in the S. to Mt. Carmel in the N. There are considerable rolling hills; but, compared with the mountains to the E., it is quite properly described as a plain. The soil is a deep rich loam, which is favorable to the growth of cereals. The orange, the vine and the olive grow to great perfection. Withal the many-colored flowers are in bloom it is a scene of rare beauty.

Of the streams in the plain four carry the bulk of the water from the western slopes of the mountains to the sea. They are also perennial, being fed by fountains. Nah el-Mɛfîr enters the sea to the N. of Jaffa; Nahar el-Iranceh makes its way to Caesarea; and Nahar ez-Zerâb (“Crocodile River”), 1/2 miles N. of Caesarea. Naher el-Fâlik runs its short course about 12 miles N. of Nahar el-Mefîr, and at almost any point it may be obtained by digging. Deep, finely built wells near some of the villages are among the most precious legacies left by the Crusaders. The breadth of the plain varies from 8 to 12 miles, being broadest in the S. There are traces of a great forest in the northern part, which accounts for the use of the term drusom. Jos (Art, XIV, xiii, 3) speaks of “the woods” (hōi drōmol) and Strabo (xvi) of “a great wood.” There is still a considerable oak wood in this district. The “excellency” of Carmel and Sharon (Isa 35 2) is probably an allusion to the luxuriant oak forests.

As in ancient times, great breadths are given up to the pasturing of cattle. Over David’s herds that fed in Sharon was Shimi (the Sharonite (1 Ch 27 29).

In the day of Israel’s exaltation, “within the land shall be a fold of flocks” (Isa 66 10). Jerome speaks of the fine cattle fed in the pastures of Sharon, and also sings the praises of its wine (Comm. on Isa 33 and 65). Toward the S. no doubt there was more cultivation than there is at present. On the day.

The Ger. colonists to the N. of Jaffa, preserving in its name, Sarōn, the old Gr. name of the plain, and several Jewish colonies are proving the wonderful productiveness of the soil. The orange groves of Jaffa are famous far and wide.
Sharon is mentioned in the NT only in Acts 9:35.
(2) A district E. of the Jordan, occupied by the tribe of Gad (1 Ch 5:16; here the name is without the art.). Kittel ("Ch.," SBOT) suggests that this is a corruption from "Sirion," which again is synonymous with Hermon. He would therefore identify Sharon with the pasture lands of Hermon. Others think that the mtsəh or table-land of Gilead is intended.

(3) In Josh 12:18 we should perhaps read "the king of Aphek in Sharon." See Lasharon. The order seems to point to some place N.E. of Tabor. Perhaps this is to be identified with the Sarona of Onom in the district between Tabor and Tiberias. If so, the name may be preserved in that of Sarona on the plateau to the S.W. of Tiberias.

W. Ewing

Canaanitish descent. The patronymic Shaulites is found in Nu 26:13.
(3) An ancestor of Samuel (1 Ch 6:24 [Heb 9]); in ver 36 he is called "Joel."

SHAVEH, shā've, VALE OF (אש מים, amph); "emek shaveh). See King's Vale.

SHAVEH-KIRIAITHAIM, shā've-keir-ya-thā'īm (אש מים, shaveh kiryathaim; אש מים לוד, en Soud tê polei): Here Chedorlaomer is said to have defeated the Enim (Gen 14:5). RV reads "the plain of Kiriaithaim." If this rendering is right, we must look for the place in the neighborhood of Kiriaithaim of Moab (Jer 48:1, etc), which is probably represented today by el-Kareyūt, about 7 miles to the N. of Dibon.

SHARONITE, shār'ōn-īt, "ha-shāren; אֱֶ֑ם שֶׁרֶן, ho Sarovenitā): Applied in Scripture only to Shitrai (1 Ch 27:29). See SHARON.

SHARUHEN, sha-ro'hen (אֵשׁ מים, shārench; Οψαλ, ὁ ἀγρός αὐτοῦ): One of the cities in the territory of Judah assigned to Simeon (Josh 19:6). In 13:32 it is called "Shilhim," and in 1 Ch 4:31, "Shaaraim" (q.v.).

SHASHAI, šā'shāi (אש שָׁשָּה, šāshay; סֵס, Sees): One of the sons of Bani who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:40) = "Sesai" in 1 Esd 9:34.

SHASHEL, šā'shāk (אֵשׁ שָׁשָּה, šāshak): Eponym of a Benjamite family (1 Ch 8:14:25).

SHAUL, šā'ul, SHAULITES, ša'ǔl-ītēs (אשׁ בּוּל, sha'ül; סאואל, Seaul):
(1) A king of Edom (Gen 36:37 ff = 1 Ch 1:48 ff).
(2) A son of Simeon (Gen 46:10; Ex 6:15; Nu 26:13; 1 Ch 24:24). The clan was of notoriety in stock, and, therefore, Saul is called "the son of a Canaanitish woman" (Gen 46:10; Ex 6:15); the clan was of mixed Israelitish and

SHAVING, shaving (in Job 1:20, אֵשׁ, gāzaz, usually אֵשׁ, gālāh; in Acts 21:24, ἀπόθεμνατο, xurdo): Customs as to shaving differ in different countries, and in ancient and modern times. Among the Egyptians it was customary to shave the whole body (cf Gen 41:14). With the Israelites, shaving the head was a sign of mourning (Dt 21:12; Job 1:20); ordinarily the hair was allowed to grow long, and was only cut at intervals (cf Absalom, 2 S 14:26). Nazarites were forbidden to use a razor, but when their vow was expired, or if they were defiled, they were to shave the whole head (Nu 6:5.9.18 ff; cf Acts 21:24). The shaving of the beard was not permitted to the Israelites; they were prohibited from shaving off even "the corner of their beard" (Lev 21:5). It was an unpardonable insult when Hanaun, king of the Ammonites, cut off the half of the beards of the Israelites whom David had sent to him (2 S 10:4; 1 Ch 19:4).

Shaving "with a razor that is hired" is Issiah's graphic figure to denote the complete devastation of Judah by the Assyrian army (Isa 7:20).

James Orr

SHAVSHA, shav'sha (אֶשׁ וְ, shavesh'; in 2 S 20:25, קְתִיב, נָשׁ, shay'd; קְתִיב, נָשׁ, sh'va', EV "Sheva," are refuted by LXX; in 2 S 8:15-18,
in other respects identical with Ch, "Seraiah" is found in LX. Determinies greatly in all passages; it is the general consensus that Shavesha is correct: State secretary or scribe during the reign of David (1 Ch 18:16; 2 S 20:25). He was the first occupant of this office, which was created by David. It is significant that his father's name is omitted in the very exact list of David's officers of state (1 Ch 27:15-16). This fact, coupled with the foreign sound of his name, points to his being an 'alien': the assumption that the state secretary handled correspondence with other countries may explain David's choice of a foreigner for this post. Shavesha's two sons, Eliehoth and Aiah, were secretaries of state under Solomon; they are called "sons of Shisha" (1 K 4:3), "Shisha" probably being a variant of "Shavesha."

HORACE J. WOLF


SHEAF, shôf. SHEAVES, shâv (םשָׁב, †דמָמָה, יָמִר, אַמֶּר, יָמִר, יָמִּיר): When the grain is reaped, it is laid in handwheels back of the reaper to be gathered by children or those who cannot stand the harder work of reaping (Ps 129:7). The handwheels are bound into large sheaves, two of which are laden at a time on the shoulder of the reaper (cf Neh 5:19). In some districts carts are used (cf Am 2:13). The sheaves are piled about the threshing-floors until threshing time, which may be several weeks after harvest. It is an impressive sight to see the huge stacks of sheaves piled about the threshing-floors, the piles often covering an area greater than the nearby villages (see Agriculture). The ancient Egyptians bound their grain into small sheaves, forming the bundles with care so that the heads were equally distributed between the two ends (see Wilkinson, Ancient Egyptians, 1878, II, 22; cf Joseph's dream, Gen 37:5-8). The sheaves mentioned in Lev 32:10-12,15 must have been handwheels. It is a custom in parts of Syria for the gatherers of the sheaves to run toward a passing horseman and wave a handful of grain, shouting kemehti, kemeht (lit. "handful"). They want the horseman to feed the grain to his horse. In OT times forgotten sheaves had to be left for the sojourner (Dt 24:19); cf the kindness shown to Ruth by the reapers of Boaz (Ruth 2:7,10).

Figurative: "Being hungry they carry the sheaves" is a picture of torment similar to that of the hungry horse urged to go by the bundle of hay tied before him (Job 24:10). The joyful sight of the sheaves of an abundant harvest was used by the Psalmist to typify the joy of the returning captives (Ps 126:6).

JAMES A. PATCH

SHEAL, shē' al (םשֵׁל, shē' al, "request"): One of the Israelites of the sons of Bani who had taken foreign wives (Ezr 10:29, LXX, Saldou, LXX Luc, Asshid; 1 Esd 1:90, "Jahudus").

SHEALTIEL, shē-ôlt'î-uhl (םשָׁלִתֶל, shēôlt'î-uhl), but in Hag 1:12,14; 2:2, letsh'î-uhl; LXX and the NT always Zechariah, Salathiel, hence "Sala-thiel" of 1 Esd 5:48,56; 6:2; AV of Mt 1:12; Lk 3:27: Father of Zerubbabel (Ex 3:2:8; 5:2; Mt 1:12,14; 2:1; Lk 3:27; and Mt 2:2). But, according to 1 Ch 3:17, Shealtiel was the oldest son of King Jeconiah; in ver 19 the NT makes Pedaiah, a brother of Shealtiel, the father of Zerubbabel (cf Curtis, ICC).

SHEAR, shâr. See Sheep; Sheep Tending.

SHEAH, shē-a'-ri'a, shē-är'ya (שֵׁיָרִיָּה, shē'aryâ): A descendant of Saul (1 Ch 8:38; 9:44).

SHEARING, shêr'ing, HOUSE (מִשְׂרָאֵל, mish'râ'âl, bêt mish'râ'âl, "house of binding of the shepherds"); B, Bashârah [A, Bashârah] בָּשַׁרָה (Bashârah) followed by "a man" (Gen 30:42). Here in the course of his extinction of the house of Ahab, Jehu met and destroyed 42 men, "the brethren of Aha-ziah king of Judah" (2 K 10:12-14). Onom takes the phrase as a proper name, Bethacath, and locates the village a few miles from Legion in the plain. This seems to point to identification with Beil Kâd, about 3 miles E. of Jenin.

SHEAR-JASHUB, shē-är-jash'ub or jash'ub (םשֶׁר יָשֹׁב, shē' yer yash'ob, "a remnant shall return"); LXX ho katarakephtheis Jassoub: The son of Isaiah, who accompanied him when he set out to meet Ahaz (Isa 7:3). The name like that of other children of prophets (cf "Immanuel," "Mahe-sha'al-hash-baz," "Lo-ruhamah," etc) is symbolic of a prophecy or message which the prophet wishes to emphasize. Thus Isaiah uses the very words shē' yer yash'ob to express his oft-repeated statement that a remnant of Israel will return to Jeh (Isa 10:21).

SHEATH, shēth. See Sword.

SHEBA, shē'ba (ספר, shē'bah); Zebâ, Saba: (1) Sheba and Dedan are the two sons of Raamah son of Cush (Gen 10:7). (2) Sheba and Dedan are the two sons of Jokshan the son of Abraham and Keturah (Gen 25:3). (3) Sheba the son of Eber who was a descendant of Shem (10:28).

From the above statements it would appear that Sheba was the name of an Arab tribe, and consequently of Sem descent. The fact that Sheba and Dedan are represented as Cushite (Gen 10:7) would point to a migration of part of these tribes to Ethiopia, and similarly their derivation from Abraham (25:3) would indicate that some families were located in Syria. In point of fact Sheba was a South-Arabian or Joktanite tribe (Gen 10:26), and his own name and that of some of his brothers (e.g. Hazarravem = Hadhramaut) are place-names in Southern Arabia.

The Sabaeans or people of Saba or Sheba, are referred to as traders in gold and spices, and as inhabiting a country remote from Pal (1 K 10:1; Isa 60:6; Jer 6:20; Ezek 27:22; Ps 72:15; Mt 12:42), also as slave-traders (Joel 3:8), or even desert-rovers (Job 1:15; 6:19; cf CTS 84:3).

By the Arab genealogists Saba is represented as great-grandson of Kajlah (=Joktan) and ancestor of all the South-Arabian tribes. He is the father of Himyar and Kahlah. He is said to have been named Saba because he was the first to take prisoners (shâbah) in war. He founded the capital of Saba and built its citadel Marib (Mariba), famous for its mighty barrage.

The authentic history of the Sabaeans, so far as known, and the topography of their country are derived from South-Arabian inscriptions.

1. History begins, which began to be discovered about the middle of the last century, and from coins dating from about 150 BC to 150 AD, the first collection of which was published in 1850, and from the South-Arabian geographer Marzandân, who was later made known to European scholars. One of the Sabaeans kings is known in Assyrian inscriptions of the year 715 BC; and he is apparently not the earliest. The native monuments are scattered over the period extending from before that time until the 6th cent. AD, when the
Sabaeans.

2. Religion (Bib. 'isra')—Rimmon, the Sun, and others. The Sun and Athtar were further defined by the addition of the name of a place or tribe, just as Baal in the OT. Worship took the form of gifts to the temples, of sacrifices, and incense, of pilgrimages and prayers. Ceremonial ablution, and abstinence from certain things, as well as formal dedication of the worshipper and his household and goods to the deity, were also religious acts. In return the deity took care of his people's castle, storehouses, and belongings, and supplied him with cereals, vegetables and fruits, as well as granted him male issue.

(1) The chief occupations of the Sabaeans were riding and trade. The chief products of their country are enumerated in Isaiah 60:6, which agrees with the Assyrian inscriptions. The most important of all commodities was incense, and it is significant that the same word which in the other Sem languages means "gold," in Sabean means "perfume" (and also "gold"). To judge, however, from the number of times they are mentioned upon the inscriptions, agriculture bulked much more largely in the thoughts of the Sabaeans than commerce, and was of equal importance with religion.

(2) The high position occupied by women among the Sabaeans is reflected in the story of the Queen of Sheba and Solomon. In almost all respects women appear to have been considered the equal of men, and to have discharged the same and other religious and even military functions. Polygamy does not seem to have been practised. The Sabean inscriptions do not go back far enough to throw any light upon the queen who was contemporary with Solomon, and the Arab tradition that she was the mother of Ishmael is merely due to the latter being the only Sabaean queen known to them. Bilkis must have lived several centuries later than the Heb monarch.

(3) The alphabet used in the Sabean inscriptions is considered by some scholars to be the original Sem alphabet, from which the others are derived. In other respects Sabean art seems to be dependent on that of Assyria, Persia and Greece. The coins are Gr and Rom in style, while the system of weights employed is Persian. See further Sabaeans.

3. Civilization


Sheba, shebal, sheba (ם) Sheba; Dábas, Dáber, or Dáma, Dáma); The name of one of the towns allotted to Simeon (Josh 19:2). AV mentions it as an independent town, but as it is not mentioned at all in the parallel list (1 Chr 4:28), and is omitted in Josh 19:2 in some MSS, it is probable that RV is correct in its tr "Iteer-sheba or Sheba." Only in this way can the total of towns in this group be made 13 (Josh 19:6). If it is a separate name, it is probably the same as Shema (v. q.).

Sheba, queen of. See Queen of Sheba.

Shebah, sheba. See Shehba.

Shebham, shebham. See Shebam.

Shebaniyah, sheb-an-m‘a, she-ban‘ya (ם) Shebanyah, in 1 Ch 15:24, shebanyahā; (1) Name of a Levite or a Levitical family that participated in the religious rites that followed the reading of the Law (Neh 9:4). The name is given in Neh 10:10 among those that sealed the covenant.

(2) A priest or Levite who took part in the sealing of the covenant (Neh 10:4; 12:14). See Shecaniah.

(3) Another Levi who sealed the covenant (Neh 10:12).

(4) A priest in the time of David (1 Ch 15:24).

Shebarim, sheb‘arim, she‘barim (ם), shebarim, ka-sh‘barim; c‘tir‘bu, c‘tir‘pu; After the repulse of the first attack on their city the men of Ai chased the Israelites "even unto Shebarim" (Josh 7:5). RV reads "the quarries"; so Keil, Steuerwald, etc. LXX reads "until they were broken," and still the sense is complete. The direction of the flight was of course from Ai toward Gilgal in the Jordan valley. No trace of such a name has yet been found.

Shebat, she-bat (ם, sh‘bat); The 11th month of the Jewish year (See 1:7), corresponding to February. See Calendar.

Sheber, sheb‘er (ם, sh‘ber); Sheber, B. Zabib, Zabib, A. Zabib, Sibeb; A son of Caleb by his concubine Maacah (1 Ch 2:48).

Shebna, sheb‘na (ם, sh‘bna); Zebinos, Sames; but sh‘bna, Shebna, in 2 K 18:13,26; meaning uncertain [2 K 18 18:26,37 and 19 2 = Isa 36 3.11.22 and 37 2; Isa 22 15]:

In Isa 22 15 Shebna is referred to as "he who is over the house," or household, apparently that of the king. The phrase is tri "steward of the house"; in RV of Gen 43:16,19; 44; in Isa 22 and occurs also in 39 4, "overseer"; 44 4. It is used of an officer of the Northern Kingdom in 1 K 16 9; 22 2; 24 5; 1 K 10 5. This officer is distinguished from him "that was over the city" in 2 K 10 5, and it is said in 2 K 15 5 that after his father Azariah was stricken with leprosy, "Jotham, the king's son, was over the household, judging all the people of the land." Again Isa 22 15 speaks of "this shebna," a phrase that must apply to Shebna if the prophecy refers to him. This word is the participle of a vb. meaning "to be of use or service," so to 'benefit in Job 16 3; 22 2; 34 9. The fem. participle is employed of Ahishag in 1 K 1 24, where AV translates "cherisher"; DBD renders it "servitor" or "steward" in Isa 22 15. It occurs also as a Can. gloss in the Am Talm (Wickemer no. 2379). The shebna was a high officer: Shebna had splendid chariots (v. 48), but what the name exactly was is not certain. The other reference to Shebna in the title of the prophecy would lead one to conclude that it denoted him "who was over the household,"
i.e. governor of the palace, probably, or major-domo. The word sōkēn is thus a general title; others deny this, maintaining that it would then occur more frequently.

In 2 K 18 f = Isa 36 f we find too a Shebna mentioned among the officers of Hezekiah. There he is called the ἱπήρη, “scribe” or “secretary,” the position of state of some kind, whereas Eliakim is he “who is over the household.” Is then the Shebna of Isa 22 the same as this officer? It is of course possible that two men of the same name should hold high office about the same time. We find Shebna (Heb. Shubhal) mentioned (a) under Hezekiah (2 K 18 18) and a Joash (ben Joahzz) having the very same position under Josia a century later (2 Ch 34 8). But such a coincidence is rare. Had there been two high officers of state bearing this name, it is most probable that they would somehow have been distinguished one from the other. Shebna’s name is thought to be Aram., thus pointing to a foreign descent, but G. B. Gray, “Isa.,” ICC, 373 f., denies this. We can perhaps safely infer that he was a native from the fact that he was hewing himself a sepulchre in Jerus., apparently among those of the Heb nobility, whereas a native would have an ancestral burial-place in the land.

However, in 2 K 21, Shebna is the scribe and not the governor of the palace. How is this to be explained? The answer is in Isaiah’s prophecy.

The prophecy of Isa 22 divides itself into 3 sections. The words “against [not as RV “unto”] the man who is over the house,” or over the palace, are properly the title of the 15 ff. prophecy, and should come therefore at the very beginning of ver 15.

(1) Vs 15–18 form one whole. In ver 16 the words “hewing him out a sepulchre, etc. should be placed immediately before the rest of the verse as ver 16a with the rest of the section is in the second person. We thus read (vs 15–17): “Against Shebna who was over the house. Thus saith the Lord, Jeh of hosts, Go unto this steward [RVM] that is hewing him out a sepulchre on high, graving a habitation for himself in the rock, [and say] What dost thou here and whom hast thou here that thou hast hewed thee out here a sepulchre? Be hold, Jeh of hosts.” Box (Isa) would further transpose some parts of vs 17 f. Shebna is to be tossed like a ball into “a land wide of sides,” i.e. a broad extensive land. He is addressed as a disgrace to the house of his royal master. The prophet’s language is that of personal invective and one asks what had made him so indignant. Some (e.g. Dillmann, Delitzsch) suggest that Shebna was the leader of a pro-Egypt party, while others (e.g. Cheyne) believe that the party was pro-Assyr (c. 650–640). The actual date of the prophecy can only be inferred.

(2) Isa 22 19–23 contains a prophecy, which states that Eliakim is to be given someone’s post, apparently that of Shebna, if this section be by Isaiah; ver 23, however, is held by many to be a gloss. These verses are not so vehement in tone as the previous ones. Some maintain that the section is not by Isaiah (Duhm, Marti). It can, however, be Isaiahic, only later in date than vs 15 ff., being possibly meant to modify the former utterance. The palace governor is to lose his office and to be succeeded by Eliakim, who is seen to hold that post in 2 K 18 f (see Eliakim).

(3) Vs 24 f are additions to the two utterances by a later hand; they predict the ruin of some such office to his own family.

There is nothing a priori against believing that these three sections are entirely independent one of another, but there seems to be some connection between (1) and (2), and again between (2) and (3). No one question the necessity of being added.

4. Date is that of the relation of Isa 22 15 ff. of the Prophecy given the events of 701 BC. We have the following facts: (a) Shebna is scribe in 701, and Eliakim is governor of the palace in Isa 22 15, and is to be deposed; (b) if Isa 22 18–22 be by Isaiah, Eliakim was to succeed Shebna in that post. Omitting for the moment everything but (a) and (b), the only solution that is to any extent satisfactory is that vs 15–18 is to be dated prior to 701 BC. This is the view preferred by G. B. Gray, op. cit. And this is the most satisfactory theory if we take (2) above into consideration. The prophecy then contained in (1) had not been as yet fulfilled in 701, but (3) had come to pass; Shebna was no longer governor of the palace, but held the position of scribe. Exile might still be in store for him.

Another explanation is put forward by K. Fullerton in 2 Ch 36 17, 19; (see 2 K 21 16) and in X, 675–86 (1900). Fullerton rejects vs 24 f as not due to Isaiah, and maintains that Isa 22 15–18 was spoken by the prophet early in his career, i.e. later than 2 K 18 f. “not so much as a prophecy, a simple pronouncement as an attempt to forsake the office.” ... It must be admitted that Isaiah probably did not succeed. The reactionary party seems to have remained in control during the reign of Manasseh. Fortunately, the moral significance of Isaiah does not depend on the fulfillment of this or of that specific prophecy. We are dealing not with a walking oracle, but with a great character and a noble life” (p. 659). He then infers from vs 23 onwards “that a conspiracy had been formed against him by the prophetic party which proposed to place Eliakim on the throne” (p. 660). Isaiah he thinks would not “resort to such violent measures,” and so the character of Isaiah makes it questionable whether he was the author of vs 20–23. This part would then be due to the prophetic party who went a step farther than their great leader would approve.” This view assumes too much. (a) that the terms that in vs 20–23 refer to kingy power; (b) that Eliakim was of Davidic descent, unless we have a man of non-Davidic origin aiming at the throne, which is again a thing unheard of in Isaiah; and (c) that there was such a plot in the reign of Manasseh, of which we have no proof.

DAVID FRANCIS ROBERTS

SHEBUEL, she-bu’el, sheb-’el, shēb’a-el, shēb’-a-el, Shēb’un, Shēbūn, Shōba‘el, Shōb vehículo; (LXX), Suaubal.

(1) A son of Gershom and grandson of Moses (1 Ch 23 10). He was “ruler over the treasures” (26 24). In 24 20 he is called “Shubahel,” which is probably the original form of the name (see Gray, HPN, 310).

(2) A son of Heman (1 Ch 25 4), called in ver 20 “Shubahel” (LXX as in ver 4).

SHECANIAH, SHECHANIAD, shek-ah-ni’a, shek-ah-nya, shek-an’ya, shek-ah-ni’a, shek’-ah-na, shek’-ah-na, ish-ah-ni’a. Ish-i-ah-ni’a, ish-ah-ni’a, shek’-ah-na, Shekaniah; Sekenai;

(1) A descendant of Zerubbabel (1 Ch 3 21 22). This is the same Shecaniah mentioned in Ezr 8 8.

(2) “The sons of Shecaniah,” so the MT of Ezr 8 5 reads, were among those who returned with Ezra, but a name appears to have been lost from the text, and we should probably read “the sons of Shecaniah the son of Jahanai” (cf 1 Esd 8 32, “of the sons of Zathan, or Szecheni the son of Jezliah”).

(3) Chief of the tenth course of priests (1 Ch 24 11).

(4) A priest in the reign of Hezekiah (2 Ch 31 15).

(5) A contemporary of Ezra who supported him in his opposition to foreign marriages (Ezr 10 2).

(6) The father of Shecaniah, “the keeper of the east gate” (Neh 3 29).
(7) The father-in-law of Tobiah the Ammonite (Neh 6:18).

(8) The eponym of a family which returned with Zerubbabel (Neh 12:3). It is the same name which, by an interchange of (2) bh and (2) kh, appears as Shebaniah (see SHEBANIAH, [2]) in Neh 10:4-12.14.

SeaCHEM, she'kem (Σήκημ; sh'khem, “shoulder”); Συχέμ, Suchém, ΔΣκίμα, ἴδι Σικίμα, ΤΣικίμα, τὰ Σικίμα, τά Σικίμα, etc; AV gives “Shechem” in

1. Historical—Gen 12:6; and “Sychem” in Acts 7:16; 15:2. This place is first mentioned in connection with Abraham’s journey from Haran. At the oak of Moreh in the vicinity he reared his first altar to the Lord in Pal (Gen 12:6 f). It was doubtless by this oak that Jacob, on his return from Paddan-aram, buried “the strange [ARV “foreign”] gods” (35:4). Hither he had come after his meeting with Esau (33:18). Onom here identifies Shechem with Shalem; but see SHALEM. To the E. of the city Jacob pitched his tent in a "parcel of ground" which he had bought from Hamor, Shechem’s father (ver 19). Here also he raised an altar and called it El-Elohe-Israel, “God, the God of Israel” (ver 20). Then follows the story of Dinah’s defilement by Shechem, son of the city’s chief; and of the treacherous and terrible vengeance exacted by Simeon and Levi (ch 34). To the rich pasture land near Shechem Joseph came to sell his brethren (37:2). It is mentioned as lying to the W. of Michmethath (el-Mu’khneh) on the boundary of Manasseh (Josh 17:7). It was in the territory of Ephraim; it was made a city of refuge, and assigned to the Kohathite Levites (20:7; 21:21). Near the city the Law was promulgated (Dt 27:11; Josh 8:33). When his end was approaching Joshua gathered the tribes of Israel here, and addressed to them his final words of counsel and exhortation (ch 24). Under the oak in the neighboring sanctuary he set up the stone of witness (ver 26).

The war of conquest being done, Joseph’s bones were buried in the parcel of ground which Jacob had bought, and which fell to the lot of Joseph’s descendants (ver 33). Abimelech, whose mother was a native of the city, persuaded the men of Shechem to make him king (Jgs 9:1-6), evidently seeking a certain consecration from association with "the oak of the pillar that was in Shechem."

Joatham’s parable was spoken from the cliff of Gerizim overhanging the town (vs 7 f). After a reign of three years Abimelech was rejected by the people. He captured the city, razed it to the foundations, and sowed it with salt. It was then the seat of Can. idolatry, the temple of Baal-berith being here (Jgs 9:44). In the time of the kings we find that the city was once more a gathering-place of the nation. It was evidently the center, esp. for the northern tribes; and hither Rehoboam came in the hope of getting his succession to the throne confirmed (1 K 12:1; 2 Ch 10:1). At the disruption Jeroboam fortified the city and made it his residence (ver 25; Ant, VIII, viii, 4). The capital of the Northern Kingdom was moved, however, first to Tirzah and then to Samaria, and Shechem declined in political importance. Indeed it is not named again in the

NABLUS AND MT. EBAI.
history of the monarchy. Apparently there were Israelites in it after the captivity, some of whom on their way to the house of the Lord at Jerusalem passed through the hands of Ishmael and Nebuchadnezzar (Jer 41 5 ff). It became the central city of the Samaritans, whose shrine was built on Mt. Gerizim (Sir 50 26; Asc. XI, viii, 6; XII, i, 1; XIII, iii, 4). Shechem was captured by John Hyrcanus in 135 B.C. (A.V. XIII, ix, 1; B. J. i, 6). It appears in the NT only in the speech of Stephen (Acts 7, 16, A.V. “Sychem”). Some (e.g. Smith, DB, s.v.) would identify it with Sychar of Jn 4 5; but see SYCHAR. Under the Romans it became Philocharis. In later times it has been a bishopric; the names of five occupants of the see are known.

There is no doubt as to the situation of ancient Shechem. It lay in the pass which cuts through the plateau of Ephraim, Ebal and Gerizim. It is in a position guarding it on the N. and S. respectively, and physically. Along this line runs the great inland road which from time immemorial has formed the easiest and the quickest means of communication between the E. of the Jordan and the sea. It must have been a place of strength from antiquity. The name seems to occur in Travels of a Mohar (Max Muller, Asien u. Europa, 394), “Mountain of Sahams” probably referring to Elbal. One of the ancient cities may have been the somewhat farther E. than the modern Nablus, in which the Rom name Neapolis survives. The situation is one of great beauty. The city lies close to the foot of Gerizim. The terraced slopes of the mountain rise immediately on the S. side of the valley, musical with the sound of running water, the great bulk of Ebal rises on the N., its sides, shaggy with prickly pear, sliding down into corn fields and orchards. The equis springs which supply abundance of water rise at the base of Gerizim. The fruitful and well-wooded valley winds westward among the hills. It is traversed by the carriage road leading to Jaffa and the sea. Eastward the valley opens upon the plain of Makheeh. To the E. of the city, in a recess at the base of Gerizim, is the sanctuary known as Ḥaj el-Emad, lit. “men of the column” or “pillar,” where some would locate the ancient “oak of Moreh” or “of the pillar.” Others would find it in a little village farther E. with a fine spring named Ballati, which may be connected with ballati, “oak.” Still farther to the E. and near the base of Ebal is the traditional tomb of Joseph, a little white-domed building beside a luxuriant orchard. On the slope of the mountain beyond is the village of Shechar, see SYCHAR, on the S. of the vale is the traditional Well of Jacob; see JACOS’S WELL. To the S.W. of the city is a small mosque on the spot where Jacob is said to have mourned over the blood-stained coat of Joseph. In the neighboring minaret is a stone whereon the Ten Commandments are engraved in Samaritan characters. The main center of the town is the synagogue of the Samaritans, with their ancient MS of the Pent.

The modern town contains about 20,000 inhabitants, the great body of them being Moslems. There are some 700 or 800 Christians, chiefly belonging to the Gr Orthodox church. The Samaritans do not total more than 200. The place is still the market for a wide district, both E. and W. of Jordan. A considerable trade is done in cotton and wool. Soap is manufactured in large quantities, oil for this purpose being plentifully supplied by the olive groves. Sheep raising and manufacture of leather goods are carried on. In old times the slopes of Ebal were covered with vineyards; but these formed a source of temptation to the “faithful.” They were therefore removed by authority, and their place taken by the prickly pears mentioned above.

SHECHEMITES, shek’em-its (םשךמ, hašshēḵmim; סֵפִּיָּם, Suchemi); The descendants of Shechem the son of Gilead, a clan of Eastern Mannasseh (Nu 26 31; Josh 17 3).

SHEDEUR, she’d’ur, she’d’è-r, “daybreak”; B. Seboul, Sedouir, “daybreak” (Gen. xi, 26). The name of Reubem (Nu 1 5; 2 10; 7 30). Fr. Delitzsch correctly conceives the name as an Assyrian compound, sad uri, “daybreak.” Cf., however, Gray, HPN, 169, 197, who emends the text to read Shaddai’Ur, “Shaddai is flame.”

SHEEP, šēp, the usual Heb word is נֵי (N, cōn), which is often trsl “flock,” e.g. “Abel... brought of the firstlings of his flock” (Gen 4 4).

1. Names “butter of the herd, and milk of the flock” (De 32 14). A.V. and ERV have “milk of sheep.” Cf Arab. دُّكَان, ḍān. The Gr word is ἐκζαφαῖον, probatōn. For other names, see notes under CATTLE; EWE; LAMB; RAM.

The origin of domestic sheep is unknown. There are 11 wild species, the majority of which are found in Asia, and it is conceivable that they may have spread from the highlands of Central Asia to the other portions of their habitat. In North America is found the “bighorn,” which is very closely related to a Kamchatkan species. Two species, the so-called “Ovis” that may be, are the Barbary sheep, Ovis aegagrus, also known as the ovicapricorn or argali, which inhabits the Arctic region of North-West Africa. It is thought by Tristram to be zemer, EV “chamois” of Dt 14 5, but there is no good evidence that this animal ranges eastward into Biblical lands. Geographically nearest is the Armenian wild sheep, Ovis aries, of Asia Minor and Persia. The Cyprian wild sheep may be only a variety of the last, and the moufond of Corseca and Sardinia is an allied species. It is not easy to draw the line between wild and sheep and goats. Among the more obvious distinctions are the chin beard and strong odor of male goats. The pelage of all wild sheep consists of hair, not wool, and this indeed is true of some domestic sheep as the fat-rumped short-tailed sheep of Abyssinia and Central Asia. The yellowish or tawny shades of this breed have short curly wool which is the estrachan of commerce. Sheep are geologically recent, their horns and teeth not being as early as those of the pliocene or pleistocene. They were, however, among the first of domesticated animals.

The sheep of Syria and Pal are characterized by the possession of an enormous fat tail which weighs many pounds and is known in Arab. "līyāt. This is the הָנֶּן, "alghā, "fat tail" (AV “rump”) (Ex 29 22; Lev 3 9; 7 3; 8 25; 9 19), which was burned in sacrifice. This is at the present day esteemed a great delicacy. Sheep are kept in large numbers by the Bedawin, but a large portion of the supply of mutton for the cities is from the sheep of Armenia and Kurdistan, of which great droves are
literally crammed by one of the women of the household, who keeps the creature's jaw moving with one hand while with the other she stuffs its mouth with vine or mulberry leaves. Even after noon she washes it at the village fountain. When slaughtered in the fall it is called ملأ, *maːl̚af*, "fed," and is very fat and the flesh very tender. Some of the meat and fat are eaten at once, but the greater part, fat and lean, is cut up fine, cooked together in a large vessel with pepper and salt, and stored in an earthen jar. This, the so-called لَغْرُض, *laγraːnat*, is used as needed through the winter.

In the mountains the sheep are gathered at night into folds, which may be caves or enclosures of rough stones. Fierce dogs assist the shepherd in warding off the attacks of wolves, and remain at the fold throughout the day to guard the slight bedding and simple utensils. In going to pasture the sheep are not driven but are led, following the shepherd as he walks before them and calls them. "When he hath put forth all his own, he goeth before them, and the sheep follow him: for they know his voice" (Jn 10:4).

The sheepfolds of Reuben on the plain of Gilead are referred to in Nu 32:16 and Jgs 5:10. A cave is mentioned in 1 S 24:3 in connection with the pursuit of David by Saul. The shepherd origin of David is referred to in Ps 78:70: "He chose David also his servant, / And took him from the sheepfolds..."

Cf also 2 S 7:8 and 1 Ch 17:7.

The shearing of the sheep was a large operation and evidently became a sort of festival. Absalom invited the king's sons to his sheep-shearing in Baal-hazor in order that he might find an opportunity to put Amasa to death while his heart was "full of wool" (2 S 13:23-29). The character of the occasion is evident also from the indignation of David at Nabal when the latter refused to provide entertainment at his sheep-shearing for David's young men who had previously protected the flock of Nabal (1 S 25:2-19). There is also mention of the sheep-shearing of Judah (Gen 38:12) and of Laban (Gen 31:19), on which occasion Jacob stole away with his wives and children and his flocks.

Sheep were the most important sacrificial animals, a ram or a young male being often specified.


In the Books of Ch we find statements of enormous numbers of animals consumed in sacrifice: "And king Solomon offered in peace offerings and burnt offerings before the LORD our God a very great offering: twelve thousand oxen, and a hundred and twenty thousand sheep" (2 Ch 7:5); "And they sacrificed unto Jehovah in that day in the Valley of Asa comforts, seven hundred oxen and three thousand sheep" (2 Ch 15:11); at the cleansing of the temple by Hezekiah: "he consecrated things to Jehovah, two thousand head of oxen, and three thousand sheep, but the priests were too few that they could not kill all the burnt offerings: wherefore their brethren the Levites did help them" (2 Ch 29:33); and "Hosekiah king of Judah did give to the assembly offerings for burnt offerings, two thousand head of oxen and seven thousand sheep; and the princes gave to the assembly a thousand bullocks and ten thousand sheep" (2 Ch 30:24). In the account of the war of the sons of Reuben and their allies with the Hagrites, we read: "And they took away their cattle; of their camels fifty thousand, and of sheep two hundred and fifty thousand, and of asses two thousand, and of men a hundred thousand" (1 Ch 5:21). Josiah king of Judah is called a "sheep-master," and we read that he "rendered unto the king of Israel the wool of a hundred thousand lambs, and of a hundred thousand rams" (2 K 3:4).

Christ is represented as the Lamb of God (Isa 53:7; Jn 1:29; Rev 5:6). Some of the most beautiful passages in the Bible represent God as a shepherd: "From thence is the shepherd, the stone of Israel" (Gen 49:24); "Jeh is my shepherd; I shall not want" (Ps 23:1; cf Isa 40:11; Ezek 34:12-16). Jesus said "I am the good shepherd; and I know mine own, and mine own know me... and I lay down my life for the sheep" (Jn 10:14). The people without leaders are likened to sheep without a shepherd (Nu 27:17; 1 K 22:17; 2 Ch 18:16; Ezek 34:5). Jesus at the Last Supper applies to Himself the words of Zec 13:7; "I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad" (Mt 26:31; Mk 14:27). The enemies of Jeh are compared to the fat of the sacrifice that is consumed away in smoke (Ps 37:20). God's people are "the sheep of his pasture" (Ps 79:13; 96:7; 100:3). In sinning they become like lost sheep (Isa 53:6; Jer 50:6; Ezek 34:6; Lk 15:3). In the mouth of Nathan the poor man's one little ewe lamb is a vivid image of the treasure of which the king David has robbed Uriah the Hittite (2 S 12:3). In Cant 6:6, the teeth of the bride are likened to a flock of ewes, so that "the wolf shall dwell with the lamb" (Isa 11:6) and that "the wolf and the lamb shall feed together" (Isa 65:25). Jesus says to His disciples, "I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves" (Mt 10:16; cf Lk 10:3). In the parable of the lost sheep Shepherd we read: "He is a hireling, and not a shepherd, whose own sheep are not, beholdeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth" (Jn 10:12).

ALFRED ELY DAY

SHEEPFOLD, שֵׁפֶּלֶד, shewflep, shewflid (שׁפֶלֶד, gâvehôdâh, פֶּלֶד, mikhâlah, פֶלֶספֶלֶד, mishp̄ṭayhum, פֶּלֶכ, nāshôh; אָעָלָה, qôleh): At night the sheep are driven into a sheepfold if they are in a district where there is danger from robbers or wild beasts. These folds are simple walled enclosures (Nu 32:16; Jgs 5:16; 2 Ch 32:28; Ps 78:70; Ezek 2:6; Zeph 2:6). In the north of Israel a shed or even a heap of earth and brushwood is used as a further safeguard. Sometimes there is a covered hut in the corner for the shepherd. Where there is no danger the sheep huddle together in the open until daylight, while the shepherd feeds them (Gen 33:13; 1 S 28:3; 2 S 2:8). In the winter time caves are sought after (1 S 24:3; Zeph 2:6). The antiquity of the use of some of the caves for this purpose is indicated by the thick deposit of potassium nitrate formed from the decomposition of the sheep dung.

JAMES A. PATCH
SHEEP GATE (אַשְׁפָּה תַּחְתָּא), sha'or ha-go'ón (Neh 3 1,32; 12 39): One of the gates of Jerusalem, probably near the northeast corner. See Jerusalem: Sheep Market.

SHEEP MARKET (Jn 5 2, RV 'sheep gate'): The Gr (πορτας, ἡ προβατική) means something simply that pertains to sheep. See Bethesda; Sheep Market.


SHEEP-SHEARING, šep'še-ring: The sheep-shearing is done in the springtime, either by the owner (Gen 31 19; 38 15; Dt 15 19; 1 S 26 24) or by regular "shearers" (יִמֵּשָׁנ, gōsa'ān) (1 S 26 7,11; Isa 63 7). There were special houses for this work in OT times (2 K 10 12,14). The shearing was carefully done so as to keep the fleece whole (Jgs 6 37). The sheep of a flock are not branded but spotted: Lime or some dyestuff is painted in one or more spots on the wool of the back as a distinguishing mark. In 2 K 5 4, Mesha, the chief or sheik of Moab, was a sheep-master, lit. "a sheep spotter." JAMES A. PATCH

SHEEPSKIN, šep'skin. See Bottle; Dress; Rams' Skins, etc.

SHEEP TENDING, ten'ding: The Scriptural allusions to pastoral life and the similes drawn from that life are the most familiar and revered in the Bible. Among the first verses that a child learns is "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want" (Ps 23 1 AV, ERV). What follower of the Master does not love to dwell on the words of the "Good Shepherd" chapter in the Gospel of John (Jn 10)? Jesus must have drawn a sympathetic response when he referred to the relationship of sheep to shepherd, a relationship familiar to all His hearers and doubtful shared by some of them with their flocks. As a rule the modern traveler in the Holy Land meets with disappointment if he comes expecting to see things as they were depicted in the Bible. An exception to this is the pastoral life, which has not changed one whit since Abraham and his descendants fed their flocks on the rich plateaus E. of the Jordan or on the mountains of Pal and Syria. One may count among his most prized experiences the days and nights spent under the spell of Syrian shepherd life. JAMES A. PATCH

SHEERAH, še'era (אַשְׁפָּה, še'ērāh; A, Še'eād, Saorā, B omits): A daughter of Ephraim, who, according to the MT of 1 Ch 7 24 (AV "Sheerah"), built the two Beth-horons and Uzzen-sheerah. The verse has been suspected because elsewhere in the OT the founders of cities are men. Uzzen-sheerah as a place is unidentified; Conder suggests as the site Beth She'rā, a village 2 miles S.W. of the Lower Beth-horôn (Mem 3 10).

SHEET, še't. See Dress; cf Acts 10 11, "as it were a great sheet" (δεσμόν, othōnē). H. PORTER

SHEHARIAH, še-ha-ra'ā (שֶׁהָרִיא, šeharyaḥ): A Benjamite (1 Ch 8 26).

SHEKEL, šek'ēl, šek'el, šek'ēl (שְׁכֵל, shekel): A weight and a coin. The Hcb shekel was the 50th part of a mina, and as a weight about 224 grains, and as money (silver) was worth about 2s. 9d., or 66 cents. No gold shekel has been found, and hence it is inferred that such a coin was not used; but as a certain amount of gold, by weight, it is mentioned in 2 Ch 3 9 and is probably intended to be supplied in 2 K 5 5. The gold shekel was 1/60 of the heavy Bab mina and weighed about 252 grains. In value it was about equal to £2 1s. 9d., or $10. See Money; Weights and Measures. In RV of Mt 17 27 "shekel" replaces "piece of money" of AV, the tr of σηχνή, stater. See Stater.

SHEKEL OF THE KING'S WEIGHT, or ROYAL SHEKEL (תְּשֶׁלֶק, 'ebhen ha-melekh, "stone r. of the king"): The shekel by which Absalom's hair was weighed (2 S 14 26), probably the light shekel of 130 grains. See Weights and Measures.

SHEKEL OF THE SANCTUARY, or SACRED SHEKEL (תְּשֶׁלֶק לִי, shekel ha-kódsheh [Nu 7 passim]): The same as the silver shekel mentioned under shekel (q.v.), except in Ex 38 24, where it is used in measuring gold. The term is used for offerings made for sacred purposes.

SHEKINAH, še-kī'nah (עַשְׁקִינָה, še'kînāh, "that which dwells," from the vb. לִשְׁקַן, lishkan, or לִשְׁקָה, lishkā, "to dwell," "reside"): This word is not found in the Bible, but there are allusions to it in Isa 60 2; Mt 17 5; Lk 2 9; Rom 9 4. It is first found in the Tgs. See Glory.

SHELAL, še-ləl (שֶׁלָל), še'lāh; Zōhā, Sālā): (1) The youngest son of Judah and the daughter of Shan the Canaanite (Gen 36 11,14,26; 46 12; Nu 26 20 [16]; 1 Ch 2 3; 4 21). He gave his name to the family of the Shelalites (Nu 26 20 [16]). Probably "the Shelalite" should be substituted for "the Shilonite" of Neh 11 5; 1 Ch 9 5.

(2) (תְּשֶׁלֶק, shelēk): The son or (LXX) grandson of Arpachshad and father of Eber (Gen 10 24; 11 13 [12],14,15; 1 Ch 1 18,24; Lk 3 35).


SHELEMIAH, shel-ə-mi'ā, še-lē-mī'ya (שֶׁלֶם יָה, šelēmyāh; B, Șălēmi, Selemé, A, Șălēmis, Selemiās): (1) One of the sons of Bani who married foreign wives in the time of Ezra (Ezr 10 39), called "Selemites" in 1 Esd 9 34.

(2) Father of Hananiah who restored part of the wall of Jerusalem (Neh 3 30) (B, Tēsâud, Telēmiū, N, Tēmulas, Telēmius).

(3) A priest who was appointed one of the treasurers to distribute the Levitical tithes by Nehemiah (Neh 13 13).

(4) The father of Jehucal (or Jucal) in the reign of Zedekiah (Jer 37 3; 38 1); in the second passage the name is 'Thelemiah (Jer 39 1). (5) The father of lrijah, the captain of the ward, who arrested Jeremiah as a deserter to the Chaldeans (Jer 37 13).

(6) 1 Ch 26 14. See Meshelemiah.

(7) Another of the sons of Bani who married foreign wives in the time of Ezra (Ezr 10 41). It is of interest to note that the order of names in this passage—Shari, Azarel, and Shelemiah—is almost identical with the names in Jer 30 26, viz. Semariah, Azriel, Shelemiah.

(8) Ancestor of Jehudi (Jer 36 14).

(9) (LXX omits.) Son of Abedel, one of the men sent by Jehoiakim to seize Baruch and Jeremiah after Baruch had read the "roll" in the king's presence (Jer 36 26).

HORACE J. WOLF
SHELEPH, shē'lef (שְֹלֶף, šāleph), in pause; LXX Σαλα'φ, Salaph; Son of Joktan (Gen 10:26; 1 Ch 1:20). Sheleph is the name of a Yemenite tribe or district, named on Sabaean inscriptions and also by Arab transcriptionists, located in Southern Arabia.

SHELESH, shē'lesh (שְֹלֶשׁ, šēlōsheh; B, Σαλα'θ, Σαβαθ; A, Σαλαθ, Salōth); An Asherite, son of Helam (1 Ch 7:35).

SHELOMITH, shē'lō'mīth, shē'lo-mith (שְֹלוֹמִית, šēlōmīṯ); in Ezra 8:10, קֶשֶׁלוֹמִית, keshēlōmīṯ; (1) The mother of the man who was stone for blasphemy (Lev 24:11) (B, Sələw̄mēḏ, Salomēḏ, Luc., Σαλομήθ, Salomith). (2) Daughter of Zerubbabel (1 Ch 3:19) (B, Sələw̄mēḏ, Salomēḏ, A, Sələw̄mēḏ, Salomēḏ, Luc., Σαλωμήθ, Salomith). (2a) One of the “sons of Ishah” (1 Ch 2:18) (B, Sələw̄mēḏ, Salomēḏ, A, Sələw̄mēḏ, Salomēḏ, Luc., Σαλωμήθ, Salomith), called “Shelemith” in 24:22. (4) The name of a family whose representatives returned with Ezra (Ezr 8:10) (B, Sələw̄mēḏ, Salomēḏ, A, Sələw̄mēḏ, Salomēḏ, Luc., Σαλωμήθ, Salomith). The MT here should read, “and the sons of Bani; Shelomith, son of Josephiah” and in 1 Esd 8:36, “of the sons of Banias, Salimoth, son of Josiphas.”

HORACE J. WOLF

SHEMOT, shē'mō'th, she'lo-moth, -moth (שֵֹם, shēm; שֹמֹת, shōmōṯ); both the punctuation and interpretation are in doubt. MT punctuates the first element as a passive participle; the use of the participle in compounds is common in Assyri but rare in Heb (cf Gen 21:13, Tiberian, ה'ת, ה'ת). The meaning of the present form, if it be correct, is “as peace with God” (Gen 24:25, KJV; 26:30, “my friend is God”). LXX reads Σαλωμῆθ, Salomēḏ; Prince of the tribe of Simeon (Nu 1:6; 2:12; 7:36-41; 10:19). The genealogy of Judith (8:1) is carried back to this Shelumiel or Shelamiel, called here “Salamiel.”

HORACE J. WOLF

SHEM, shē'm (שֵֹם, sham; Σήμ, Sēm); The eldest son of Noah, from whom the Jews, as well as the Semitic (“Semitic”) nations in general have descended. When giving the names of Noah’s three sons, Shem is always mentioned first (Gen 9:18; Gen 10:21) and the “elders” in “Shem the brother of Japheth the elder” (10:21 m) is explained as referring to Shem, though the rendering of “elders” (qayyim) is common in the translation of the MT into Greek. His five sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth, are the people of the greater part of West Asia’s finest tracts, from Elam on the one end of the Mediterranean to the West, though traditionally regarded as a “black” (cf the Assyrian Bnon—also Ham—possibly “black,” Japheth, “fair”); it is considered possible that Shem may have been the usual Heb word for “name” (shēm), given him because he was the firstborn—a parallel to the Assy-Sabine usage, in which “son.”

“name” (šēm) are synonyms (W. A. INSCRIPTIONS, V, pl. 23, lii. 29-32a). Shem, who is called “the father of all the children of Eber,” was born when Noah had attained the age of 500 years (Gen 5:32). Though he married at the time of the Flood, Shem and Japheth, with their children. Alied by Japheth, the Nations which Ham, the youngest brother, had from him revealed to them; but unlike the last, Shem and Japheth, in their filial piety, approached their father walking backward, in order not to look at him. Two years after the Flood Shem was then 100 years old, his son Arpachshad was born (Gen 11:10), and was followed by further sons and daughters during the remaining 500 years which preceded Shem’s death. Noah’s prophecic blessing, on awakening from his sleep, may be regarded as having been fulfilled in his descendants, who occupied Syria (Aram), Pal (Canaan), Chaldaea (Arpachshad), Assyria (Asshur), part of Persia (Elam), and Arabia (Joktan). In the first three of these (as well as in Elam, Canaanites had settled in the other districts), but Shemites were ruled, at some time or other, over the Canaanites, and Canaan thus became “his servant” (Gen 9:25). The tablets found in Cappadocia seem to show that Shemites (Assyrians) had settled in that district also, but this was apparently an unimportant colony. Though designated sons of Shem, some of his descendants (e.g. the Elamites) did not speak a Semitic language, while other nationalities, not his descendants (e.g. the Canaanites), did. See Ham; Japheth; Table of Nations.

T. G. PINCHES

SHEMA, shē'ma (שֵֹמה, shēma'), Σαμα'Δ, Samāḏ; A city of Judah in the Negeb (Jos 15:26). If, as some think, identical with SHEMA (q.v.) of Josh 19:2, then the latter must have been inserted here from Jos 15:26. It is noticeable that the root letters (שֵֹמה) were those from which Simeon is derived. SHEMA is probably identical with Joshua (Neh 11:26). The place was clearly far S., and it may be Kh. Sa’wah, a ruin upon a prominent hilltop between Kh. Alīf and Kh. al-Milh. There is a wall around the ruins, of large blocks of conglomerate flint (PEF, III, 409, Sh XXV).

E. W. G. MASTERMAN

SHEMAH, shē'ma' (שֵֹמה, shēma'); (1) A Reubenite (1 Ch 5:8, 8, BA, Σαμα', Sāma', Luc., Σαμα'Δ, Samāḏ). See Samāḏ. (2) One of the heads of “fathers’ houses” in Aijalon, who put to flight the inhabitants of Gath (1 Ch 12:3, BA, Σαμα, Sāma', Luc., Σαμα'Δ, Samāḏ); in ver 21 he is called “Shemai.” The statement is very obscure and the whole incident is probably due to some marginal note.

(3) One of those who stood at Ezra’s right during the reading of the Law (Neh 8:4, Σαμα'Δ, Samāḏas). He is called “Samaias” in 1 Esd 9:43.

HORACE J. WOLF

SHEMAH, shē'ma' (שֵֹמה, shēma'); hō-šēm'āḏ; B, Αμα', Amā', A, Σαμα', Samāḏ, Luc., Αμα', Amā'Δ, Asmā'D; A Benjamite, who was the father, according to the MT, of Ahiezer and Joash; but according to the LXX, hōusōis = hōsāma' (ben) instead of しか (bne) of Joash alone (1 Ch 12:3). The original text may have read שֶֹמָא, šēma'āḏ; a son of hōshēmāḏ' (cf שֶֹמָא, šēma'āḏ) of 3:18; then a dittography of the following S. (h) caused the error (Curtis, ICC).

SHEMAIH, shē'ma'īya, shē'ma'īya' (שֶֹמָיָה, šēma'īya', šēma'īya'), Son of Jacob in 2 Ch 11:2; 17:8; 31:15; 35:9; Jer 26:20; 29:24; 36:12, shēma'īyaḥh, “Jaheb hears”;

SHEMAIAH, shē'ma'īya, shē'ma'īya' (שֶֹמָיָה, šēma'īya', šēma'īya')...
The name is most frequently borne by priests, Levites and prophets. 

(1) B, *Σαμιας, Samias, A, ᾿Σαμιας, Samaías* (2 Ch 12 5.7). A prophet who, together with Ahijah, protested against Rehoboam's contemplated war against the ten revolted tribes (1 K 12 22-24 = 2 Ch 11 2-4). He declared that the rebellion had Divine sanction. The second Gr account knows nothing of Ahijah in this connection and introduces Shemaiah at the gathering at Shechem where both Jeroboam and Rehoboam were present; it narrates that on this occasion Shemaiah (not Ahijah) rent his garment and gave ten parts to Jeroboam to signify the ten tribes over which he was to become king. (This version, however, is not taken very seriously, because of its numerous inconsistencies.) Shemaiah also prophesied at the invasion of Judah by Shishak (2 Ch 12 5-7). His message was to the effect that as the princes of Israel had humbled themselves, God's wrath against their idolatrous practices would not be poured out upon Jerus by the hand of Shishak (2 Ch 13 7). He is mentioned as the author of a history of Rehoboam (2 Ch 12 15). 

(2) Son of Shecaniah (1 Ch 3 22, ᾿Σαμιας, Samias, A, Σαμιας, Samaías, descendant of Zerubbabel. This is also the name of one of the men who helped to repair the wall (Neh 3 29, ᾿Σαμεια, Samet, A, Σαμαία, Samia, Neh 6 17-24 of 1 Ch 3)). 

(3) A simeonite (1 Ch 4 37, B, ᾿Σαμειον, Samiwn, A, ᾿Σαμιας, Samaías, identical, perhaps, with the Shimei of 1 Ch 4 26.27. 

(4) A Reubenite (1 Ch 5 4, B, ᾿Σαμειετ, Samet, A, Σειετ, Seiēt), called Shema in ver 8. 

(5) A Merarite Levite (1 Ch 9 14; Neh 11 15, ᾿Σαμαία, Samia, Samias; ver 11, B, ᾿Σαμαία, Samia, Σαμιας, Samaías, ver 11, B, ᾿Σαμαία, Samia, Σαμιας, Samaías, Samias, Samias, Samias; ver 11, B, ᾿Σαμαία, Samia, Σαμιας, Samaías, Samia...
SHEMRATOMITH, shē-mir'a-mOTH, shē-mir'-RA-moth; shem-in-rā-mōth (吸入, *shemirāmōth*); in 2 Ch 17:8, ḳ'tībīh ḳanīrīm; *Scheunemann, Semeiramoth*): The name of a Levitical family.

In 1 Ch 18:16, 19:16, 26:4, 26:15 Shemirath lists among the names of David's chieftains. In 2 Ch 17:8 the same name is given among the Levites delegated by Jehoshaphat to teach the Law in the cities of Judah. According to Schrader (KAT 2), 366 the name is to be identified with the Assyri Summaram, the latter occurring as a woman's name on the monuments, more esp. on the statues of Nebor from Nimrod. Another suggestion is that Shemirath was originally a place-name meaning "image of Shemiram" (= name of Ram or "the Exalted One").

HORACE J. WOLF

SHEMITES, shem'-i'tes. See SEMITES.

SHEMUHEL, shē-mú'-el, shem'-u-EL (吸入, *šemā'el*), "name of God" ([1 Ch 6:33 (18)]; RV Samuel, the prophet [see Samuel]; of Gray, HPN, 200, n. 3): (1) The Simeonite appointed to assist in the division of the land (Nu 34:20). The MT should be emended to ṣemā'el, to correspond with the form found in 1 6:2; 12:7; 36:41; 10:19. LXX has uniformly Ἀλαμεθί, Salameith.


SHEN, shēn (吸入, ḥa-shēn, "the tooth" or "peak"); τῆς φαλάδας, ἡς φαλάδας): A place named only in 1 S 7:12 to indicate the position of the stone set up by Samuel in connection with the victory over the Philis, "between Mizpah and Shen." LXX evidently read yāshān, "old." Probably we should here read υς'èshān, as in 2 Ch 13:19 (OHL, s.v.). Then it may be represented by *'Anti Sinia* to the N. of Beitha.

SHENAZAR, shē-nā'-zAR: AV = RV Shennazar (q.v.).

SHENAZAR, shē-nā'-zAR (吸入, *shen'azar*): A son of Jeconiah (Jehoiachin) and uncle of Zerubbabel (1 Ch 3:18, BA, *Sēnar, Sēnaer, Luc. *Sēnarap, Sēnaar, Vulg Sennaer, Sennaser*). It is highly probable that Sheshbazzar (Ezr 1 8:11), "the prince of Judah," and Shennazar are identical (so Meyer, Rothstein, etc.). The name is difficult; some suggest a corruption of ḳanīrīm, *shēkbal'azar*, and as equivalent to Sin-urus, *shin* [the moon-god] protected.6

SHENIR, shē-nir (吸入, s-'ir, rish'ir, *shnir*): Only found in Cant 4:8 (MT). See SENIR.

SHEOL, še-öl (吸入, *še-'ol*):

1. The Name
2. The Abode of the Dead
3. Post-canaical Period

This word is often trd in AV "grave" (e.g. Gen 37:35; 1 S 2:6; Job 7:9; 14:13; Ps 6:5; 49:14; Isa 14:11, etc.) or "hell" (e.g. Dt 32:22; Ps 9:17; 18:5; Isa 14:9; Am Name 9:2, etc.); in 3 places by "pit" (Nu 16:30-33; Job 17:16) it means really the unseen world, the state or abode of the dead, and is the equivalent of the Gr ἱδέας, by which word it is trd in LXX. The Eng. Revisers have acted somewhat inconsistently in leaving "grave" or "pit" in the historical books and putting "Sheol" in the margin, while substituting "Sheol" in the poetical writings, and putting "grave" in the margin ("hell") is retained in Isa 14:14. Cf their "Preface. The American Revisers more properly use "Sheol" throughout in the etymology of the Hebrew word, a derivation. A favorite derivation is from shādāl, "to ask" (cf Prov 1:12; 27:20; 30:15.16; Isa 5:14; Hab 2:5); others prefer the ḳādāl, "to be hollow." The Babylonians are said to have a similar word *Sutbu*, though this is questioned by some.

Into Sheol, when life is ended, the dead are gathered in their tribes and families. Hence the expression frequently occurring in the Dead (Ps 22; to go to one's fathers, etc) (Gen 15:17; 25:8.17; 49:33; Jer 32:18; 31:2; Dt 32:50; 34:5). It is figured as an underworld (Isa 44:23; Ezek 26:20, etc.), and is described by other terms, as "the pit" (Job 33:24; Ps 28:1; 30:3; Prov 1:12; Isa 38:16, etc), *Anaddon* (q.v.) or Destruction (Job 26:6; 28:22; Prov 15:11), the place of "silence" (Ps 94:17; 115:17), "the land of darkness and the shadow of death" (Job 10:21). It is, as the antithesis of the living condition, the synonym for everything that is gloomy, insubstantial, the abode of the shades, Job 26:5; Prov 2:18; 21:16; Isa 14:9; 26:14). It is a "land of forgetfulness," where God's "wonders" are unknown (Ps 88:10-12). There is no remembrance or praise of God (Ps 6:5; 88:12; 115:7-18, etc.). In its stillness, powerlessness, lack of knowledge and inactivity, it is a true abode of death (see DEATH); hence is regarded by the living with shrinking, horror and dismay (Ps 39:13; Isa 38:17-19), though to the weary and tired it may present the aspect of a welcome rest or sleep (Job 3:17-22; 14:12). The Gr idea of Hades was not dissimilar.

(1) Not a state of unconsciousness.—Yet it would be a mistake to infer, because of these strong and sometimes poetically heightened contrasts to the world of the living, that Sheol was conceived of as absolutely a place without consciousness, or some dim remembrance of the world above. This is not the case. Necromancy rested on the idea that there was some communication between the world above and the world below (Dt 18:11): a Samuel could be summoned from the dead (1 S 28:11-15); Sheol from beneath was stirred at the descent of the king of Babylon (Isa 14:9 ff). The state is rather that of abode; unconscious, semi-conscious, insubstantial (the abode of the shades), the abode of forgetfulness from which in a partial way the spirit might temporarily be aroused. Such conceptions, it need hardly be said, did not rest on revelation, but were rather the natural ideas formed of the future state, in contrast with life in the body, in the absence of revelation.

(2) Not removed from God's jurisdiction.—It would be yet more erroneous to speak with Dr. Charles (Eschatology, 35 ff) of Sheol as a region "quite independent of Yahweh, and outside the sphere of His rule." "Sheol is naked before God," says Job, "and Abaddon hath no covering" (36:6). "If I make my bed in Sheol," says the Psalmist, "behold thou art there" (Ps 139:8). The wrath of Jeh burns unto the lowest Sheol (Dt 32:22). As a rule there is little sense of moral distinctions in the OT representations of Sheol, yet possibly these are not altogether wanting (on the above and others points in the theology of Sheol, see Eschatology of the OT).

(3) Related to human mortality.—To apprehend fully the OT conception of Sheol one must view it in its relation to the idea of death as something unnatural and abnormal for man; a result of sin. The believer's hope for the future, so far as this had place, was not prolonged existence in Sheol, but deliverance from it and restoration to new life in
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God's presence (Job 14:13–15; 19:25–27; Ps 18:10.11); 17:15; 49:15; 73:24–26; see IMMORTALITY; ESCHATOLOGY of the OT; RESURRECTION).

Dr. Charles probably goes too far in thinking of Sheol in Ps 49 and 73 as "the future abode of the wicked only; heaven as that of the righteous" (op. cit., 74); but different destinies are clearly indicated.

There is no doubt, at all events, that in the post-canonical Jewish lit. (Apoc and apocalyptic) a very considerable development is manifest in the idea of Sheol. Distinction between good and bad in Israel is emphasized; Sheol becomes for certain classes an intermediate state between death and resurrection; for the wicked and for Gentiles it is nearly a synonym for Gehenna (hell). For the various views, with relevant lit. on the whole subject, see Eschatology of the NT; also Death; Hades; Hell, etc.

James Orr

Shephelah, sheáf ‘ā-‘ā (σεφήλα, σεφήλα, σφήλα, σφῆλα, σφῆλα, saphethah, "Jeh has judged"): (1) A son of David, by Abital (2 S 3: 4; 1 Ch 3: 9); (2) A Benjamite, father of Mesebhum, of Jerus (1 Ch 9: 8); (3) A Benjamite, who joined David at Ziklag (1 Ch 12: 5).

(4) A prince of the Simeonites in the time of David (1 Ch 27: 16).

(5) A son of King Jehoshaphat (2 Ch 21: 2).

(6) A family, 372 of whom returned with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2: 4; Neh 7: 9); 80 more males of this family, with their head, returned with Ezra (Ezr 8: 8).

(7) A servant of Solomon, 392 of whose descendants returned with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2: 57 f; Neh 7: 59 f); "Saphat" in 1 Esd 5: 9 and "Saphatthas" in 1 Esd 8: 34.

(8) A Perezite (Judahite), some of whose descendants dwelt at Jerus in the time of Nehemiah (Neh 11: 4).

(9) A son of Mattan, a contemporary of Jeremiah (Jer 38: 1).

James Orr

Shephelah, sheéph’á-lám (σεφήλαι, ho-šphéláh; σφήλα, σφήλα, σφῆλα, saphedh, saphelh, sapfelh, sapfelh), "lowland": The word denotes "lowland" and is variously 1. Name rendered in AV. It is "vale" in Dt and Refer- ences 1:7; Josh 10: 40; 1 K 10: 27; 2 Ch 15: 11; Jer 33: 13; "valley" in Josh 9: 11; 11: 12; 12: 8; 15: 35; Jer 5: 9; Jer 32: 44; "low plain" in 1 Ch 27: 28; 2 Ch 9: 27; "plain" in Jer 17: 26; Ob 19: 10; Zec 7: 7; and "low country" in 2 Ch 28: 18. RV renders uniformly "lowland." As the word always occurs with the definite art., indicating a distinct district, it might have been well to retain it without tr. The boundaries of the district are clearly marked and include much broken country; the hills being low compared with the mountains to the E., but much higher than the plain that runs to the shore. If a tr was to be made, perhaps "lowlands" would have been the best, as applied to the "Low-lands" of Scotland, "which likewise are not entirely plain, but have their groups and ranges of hills" (HGH, 203). In the wide sense the Shephelah included the territory originally given to the tribe of Dan, and also a considerable part of Western and Southwestern Judaea. By the early days the tribes of Dan and Simeon were practically absorbed by Judah, and hence we find in Josh 15 many cities in the Shephelah which belonged to that tribe (LB, 1: 211).

(1) The names of many ancient cities named in the Shephelah have been identified. They all lie within the strip of hill country that includes districts and mountains of Judah, terminating in the N. at the Valley of Ajalon. Once indeed the name appears to apply to the low hills N. of this (Josh 11: 16, "the mount of Israel and its Shephelah"). Every other reference applies only to the S.

Principal G. A. Smith has pointed out the difference between the districts to the N. and that to the S. of Ajalon (HGH, 203 f.). "North of Ajalon the low hills which run over into Sharon are separated by mountains behind them. You ascend to the latter from Sharon either by long sloping ridges, such as that which today carries the Jerus. road, or by a hill road from Jaffa to Nablus; or else you climb up terraces, such as the succession of terraces and ranges characterizing the plain, into which by which the country rises from Lydda to Bethel. That is, the low hills west of Samaria are (to use the Heb name, "eastern plains") separated by ranges or slopes of the hills, and are not part of a separate group. But S. of Ajalon the low hills do not so hang upon the Central Range, but are separated from the mountains of Judah by a series of valleys, both wide and narrow, which run all the way from Ajalon to near Hebron: and it is only when the low hills are flung off the Central Range into an independent group, separating Judaea from Philistia, that the name Shephelah seems to be applied to them."

(2) On the E. of the Shephelah, then, taking the name in this more limited sense, rises the steep wall of the mountain, into which access is gained only by narrow and difficult defiles. The hills of the Shephelah are from 500 to 800 ft. high, with nothing over 1,500. The formation is soft limestone. In the valleys and upland plains there is much excellent land which supports a fairly good population still. Wheat, barley and olives are the chief products. But western wine, produced in such regions, is a notable testimony to the culture of the vine in old times. The district is almost entirely dependent on the rain for its water-supply. This is collected in great cisterns, partly natural. The rocks are in many places honeycombed with caves.

The western boundary is not so definite as that on the E. Some have held that it included the Philis plain. This contention draws support from the mention of the Philis cities immediately after those of Judah, which are said to be in the Shephelah (Josh 15: 45 f); these verses can hardly be ruled out as of a later date). On the other hand the Philis are said to have invaded the cities of the Shephelah (2 Ch 28: 18), which implies that it was outside their country. In later times the Talm (Jerus Shiloh, 3: 2) distinguishes the Shephelah, the Shephelah, and the Plain. See, however, discussion in Buhl (GAP, 104 n.; and G. A. Smith, Expos, 1896, 404 f).

The Shephelah is crossed by five wide valleys which furnish easy passes from the plain. These are of importance chiefly because from each of them a way, crossing the "foss," enters one of the defiles by which alone armies could approach the uplands of Judaea. The hills of Judaea are much steeper on the east than on the west, where they fall away to Philistia in long-rolling hills, forming the Shephelah.

(3) The Five of them a way, crossing the "foss," enters one of the defiles by which alone armies could approach the uplands of Judaea. The hills of Judaea are much steeper on the east than on the west, where they fall away to Philistia in long-rolling hills, forming the Shephelah.

(1) The most noteworthy of these is the Vale of Ajalon. It winds its way first in a northeasterly direction, past the Beth-horons, then, turning to the S.E., it reaches
the plateau at el-Jib, the ancient Gibeon, fully 5 miles N.W. of Jerusalem. This is the eastern limit of all the avenues leading from the plain to the heights, and it is the one along which the routes of battle most frequently rolled from the days of Joshua (Josh 10:12) to those of the Maccabees (1 Macc 3:16 ff., etc.). It occupies also a prominent place in the records of the Crusades.

(2) Wādy es-Sūrār, the Valley of Sorek, crosses the Shephelah S. of Gezer, and pursues a tortuous course past Beth-shemesh and Kirjath-jearim to the plateau S.W. of Jerusalem. This is the line followed by the Jaffa-Jerusalem Railway.

(3) Wādy es-Sunt runs eastward from the N. of Tell el-'Afranj (Gatli) up the Vale of Elah to its confluence with Wādy es-Sur which comes in from the S. near Kirbet Shavech (Socoh); and from that point, as Wādy el-Jinjūn, pursues its way S. of Timnah to the uplands W. of Bethlehem.

(4) Wādy el-Afranj crosses the plain from Ashdod (Bethul), passes Beit Jibrin (Eleutheropolis), and winds up through the mountains toward Hebron.

(5) Wādy el-Hevy, from the sea about 7 miles N. of Gaza, runs eastward with many windings, passes to the N. of Lachish, and finds its way to the plateau some 6 miles S.W. of Hebron.

From the Shephelah thus opened the gateways by which Judaea and Jerusalem might be assailed: and the course of these avenues determined the course of much of the history. It is evident that the Shephelah lay open to attack from both sides, and for centuries it was the beatabile land between Israel and the Philistines. The ark for a time sojourned in this region (1 S 5:1 ff.). In this district is laid the scene of Samson’s exploits (Jgs 14–16). The scene of David’s memorable victory over the giant was in the Wādy es-Sunt, between Socoh and Azekah (1 S 17:1). David found refuge here in the cave of Adullam (1 S 22:1). For picturesque and vivid accounts of the Shephelah and of the part it played in history see Smith, HGL, 201 ff.; A. Henderson, Palestine, Its Historical Geography, 1894.

W. EWING

SHEPHERD, shep'èr (נָעַר, shepher, “beauty”): A mount near which the Israelites encamped (Nu 33:23). See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

SHEPHERD, shep'èrd (נָעַר, בָּיִחُ, נֵעַר, נָעַר; παπάς, ποιμήν, “a feeder”): The sheep owner frequently tends the flocks himself (Gen 4:4; 30:40; cf. Ezek 34:12), but more often he delegates the work to his children (Gen 29:9; 1 S 16:19; 17:15) or relatives (Gen 31:6). In such cases the sheep have good care because the keepers have a personal interest in the well-being of the animals, but when they are attended by a herding (1 S 17:20) the flocks may be neglected or abused (Isa 55:10 ff.; Ezek 34:8 ff.; Zec 11:17 ff.; Jn 10:12).

The chief care of the shepherd is to see that the sheep find plenty to eat and drink. The flocks are not fed in pens or folds, but, summer and winter, must depend upon foraging for their sustenance (Ps 23:2). In the winter of 1910–11 an unprecedented storm ravaged Northern Syria. It was accompanied by a snowfall of more than 3 ft., which covered the ground for weeks. During that time, hundreds of thousands of sheep and goats perished, not so much from the cold as from the fact that they could get no food. Goats hunt out the best feeding-

The shepherd frequently carries with him a pail from which the sheep can drink when the water is not accessible to them. On the mountain tops the melting snows supply the needed water. In other districts it is drawn from deep wells (Gen 29:2; Jn 4:6). The usual time for watering is at noon, at which time the flocks are led to the watering-places (Gen 29:2,3). After drinking, the animals lie down or huddle together in the shade of a rock while the shepherd sleeps. At the first sound of his call, which is usually a peculiar guttural sound, hard to imitate, the flock follow off to new
feeding-grounds. Even should two shepherds call their flocks at the same time and the sheep be intermingled, they never mistake their own master's voice (Jn 10:3-5).

The shepherd's equipment is a simple one. His chief garment is a cloak woven from wool or made from sheepskins. This is sleeveless, and so made that it hangs like a cloak on his shoulders. When he sleeps he curls up under it, head and all. During the summer a lighter, short-sleeved 'abu or coat is worn (Jb 9:25). In the autumn a 'shaf or cloak (see 'SHAPP'), and a characteristic attitude is to make a rest for his arms by placing his staff on his shoulders against the back of his neck. When an esp. productive spot is found, the shepherd may pass the time, while the sheep play and lie down on his pipe (Jgs 5:16). He sometimes carries a sling ( Hebrew , kela') of goat's hair (1 S 17:40). His chief belongings are kept in a skin pouch or bag ( Hebrew , k'lit) (1 S 17:40).

This bag is usually a whole tawed skin turned wrong side out, with the legs tied up and the neck forming the opening. He is usually aided in the keeping and the defending of the sheep by a dog (Job 30:1). In Syria the Khabur dogs make the best protectors of the sheep, as, unlike the cowardly city dogs, they are fearless and will drive away the wild beasts. The shepherd is often called upon to aid in defending the sheep (Gen 21:39; 1 S 17:54,65; 1sa 31:4; Jer 5:6; Am 3:12).

Figurative: The frequent use of the word 'shepherd' to indicate a spiritual overseer is familiar to Bible readers (Ps 23:1; 80:1; Eccl 12:11; Isa 40:4; 63:14; Jer 31:10; Ezk 34:23,37:24; Ju 21:15-17; Eph 4:11; 1 Pet 5:1-4). We still use the term "pastor," lit. "a shepherd." Leaders in temporal affairs were also called shepherds (Gen 47:17 m; Isa 44:28; 63:11). "Sheep without a shepherd" typified individuals or nations who (Jgs forgotten Jch (Nu 27:17; 1 K 22:17; 2 Ch 18:16; Ezk 34:5,8; Zec 10:2; Mt 9:36; Mk 6:34).

Jesus is spoken of as the good shepherd (Jn 10:14); chief shepherd (1 Pet 5:4); great shepherd (He 13:20); the one shepherd (Ju 19:16). "He will feed his flock like a shepherd, he will gather the lambs in his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and will gently lead those that have their young" (Isa 40:11) is a picture drawn from pasteur life over His church. A strong sympathy for helpless animals, though sometimes misdirected, is a marked characteristic of the people of Bible lands. The birth of offspring in a flock often occurs far off on the mountain side. The shepherd solicitously guards the mother during her helpless moments and picks up the lamb and carries it to the fold. For the few days, until it is able to walk, he may carry it in his arms or in the loose folds of his coat above his girdle. See also SHEEP.

JAMES A. PATON

SHEPHER, shef'eh, SHEPHER, sheh'e'fo ( Hebrew , sheph'lih; B, Zeb, Sefh, A, Zbph, Saph, Luc, Shephel, Sapheil [1 Ch 1:40]; or Shepho, shph'; A, Zeph, Sph, Luc, Zbph, Saph, Saphon [Gen 36:23]): A Horite chief.

SHEPHUPHAM, SHEPHUPHAN, sheh-fus'han fam or c'an ( Hebrew , shph‘olphim; B, Zbph, Saphan, Luc, Zeph, Saphan [Nu 26:39,43]); or Shephuphan, shph‘olphim; B, Zbph, Saphan, Shaphaphak, A, Zbph, Saph, Luc, Zeph, Shefphah [1 Ch 8:5], "a kind of serpent," Gray, HPN, 95: Eponym of a Benjamite family. The name occurs in Gen 46:21 as "Muppim" and in 1 Ch 7:12,15; 26:16 as "Shephupim." It is almost impossible to arrive at the original form; the gentle "Shuphamites" appears in Nu 26:39 (43).

SHERAH, sheh'ra. See SHERAH.

SHERD, sher'd. See POTSHERD.

SHEREBIAH, sher'e-b'yah ( Hebrew , shereb'yahh, "God has sent burning heat" [7]; the form is doubtful): A post-exilic priest and family. Shereibiah, who joined Ezra at the river Ahava (Ezr 8:18; LXX omits), and had charge, along with eleven others, of the silver and gold and vessels for the Temple (ver 24, BA, Zep, Zar, Luc, Za'phata, Sarbata). He aided in the exposition of the Law ( Neh 8:7 ), was among those who made public confession (9:4) and sealed the covenant (10:12 [13]). His name also appears in 12:24. In every passage listed above except 10:12 (13), BA read Za'phata, Sarbata, Luc, Za'phata, Sarbata. In 1 Esd 8:47 the name appears as "Asebehia"; RV "Asebelia"; in ver 54, "Esebria", RV "Esrebiens," and 1 Esd 13:48, "Sarbi." Many of the companion-names on the lists are plainly ethnic (Cheyne).

HORACE J. WOLF

SHERESH, sheh'resh ( Hebrew , sharesh; B, Zbpos, Sapos, A, Zepos, Sors, Luc, Zepos, Phares, Papos, Pharos): A Machirite name in a genealogy of Manasseh (1 Ch 7:16).

SHEREZER, sheh-re'zer (Zec 7:2 AV). See SHAREZER.

SHERGHAT, sheh'gar, sheh'gat, ASSHUR, ASSUR: The name of the first capital city of Assyria is known by the Arabs as Kala'at Sherghat, or the Fortress of Sherghat. Its ancient name was Assur or Assur (Gen 10:11 m). From it was derived the name of the country, Assyria, and of the people, Assyrians. The date of the founding of the city is not known. Apparently about 2000 BC a colony of Babylonians migrated northward along the Tigris River and settled up the right shore about halfway between the Upper and Lower Zab, or halfway between the modern cities of Mosul and Bagdad. Assur, the local deity of the place, became the national god of Assyria. It is uncertain whether the deity gave the name to the city, or the city to the deity, but probably an early shrine of Assur stood there, and the people, building their city about it, became known as the Assyrians. At first the city was a Bab dependency, governed by priests from Babylonia. In time, as the city acquired a political significance, the power of the priesthood declined; allegiance to Babylonia ceased, and the Assy empire came into existence. About 1200 BC the political power had so increased that a new capital, Nimrud (Calah) was built to the N. near the junction of the Upper Zab with the Tigris. In 722 BC the capital was transferred by Sargon to his new city, Dur-Sharrukin, and in 705 BC Sennacherib enlarged Nineveh, and it remained the capital city till the fall of the empire in 605 BC. Assur, however, as the seat of the national deity, never ceased to be the chief religious center.

The mounds of Assur are among the largest in Mesopotamia. They rise abruptly from the Tigris, which they follow for about half a mile, and extend a quarter of a mile inland. In the surrounding plain are other mounds, marking the sites of temples, and indicating that a part of the city was without the walls. At the northern end the mounds are surmounted by a high conical peak, which represents the tower or zigurrat of the temple of Assur.

Of the early excavators Layard and Rassam ex-
amined the ruins, but the fanaticism of the surrounding Arabs prevented extensive excavations. In 1904 Dr. W. Andrae, for the Deutsche Orientgesellschaft, began the systematic excavations which have been continued by Dr. P. Maresch for ten years. Discoveries of the greatest importance have been made. The city was found to have been surrounded on the land side by a double wall. The space between the walls, several rods in width, was occupied by houses, possibly the homes of the soldiers. The base of the outer wall was of stone; above it were mud bricks strengthened at intervals with courses of burned bricks. Along the outer upper edge was a parapet, protected by battlements. From the floor of the parapet small holes were bored vertically downward, so that the soldiers, without exposing themselves, might discharge their arrows at the enemy close to the base of the wall. Many of the holes are still visible. The wall was pierced with several gateways; the names “Gate of Assur,” “Gate of the Tigris,” “Gate of the Sun God” have survived. At the sides of the gateways were small chambers for the guards, and from them passageways led to the parapet above. The gates were reached by bridges which spanned the moat. Along the river side the city was protected by a high steep embankment, which was built partly of limestone, but chiefly of square bricks laid in bitumen.

The temple of Assur at the northern end of the city has been thoroughly excavated. With its outer and inner court and tower it conformed in its general plan to the older Bah temples. Several of the palaces of the early kings were discovered, but the best-preserved of the palaces was one which the excavators have called the residence of the mayor. It stood near the western edge of the city on the main street which ran from the western gate to the Tigris. It consisted of two courts surrounded by chambers. Grooves in the paved floor conducted fresh water to the kitchen, the baths and the chambers, and round tiles beneath the floor carried away the waste water to the arched city sewer and to the Tigris. To the rear of the mayor’s house was a crowded residential quarter. The streets were very narrow and winding. The houses were exceedingly small; in some of them one could not lie at full length upon the floor. Among their ruins appeared little but stone mortars and broken pottery and other essential household implements.

Near the southern end of the city a most remarkable discovery was made. About a hundred monuments, from 4 to 8 ft. high, were found standing erect. On the side of each one, near the top, was an inscription on several lines, dedicating the stone to some individual who had been of great service to the state. They were not tombstones; appar-

ently they had been erected during the lifetime of the people whom they honored. Of the greatest interest was one which bore the name of Samsuratmat or Semiramis, the once supposed mythical queen of Nineveh. Its tr reads: “The column of Sa-an-mu-ri-mat, the palace wife of Samsi-Adad, king of the world, king of Assyria, the mother of Adad-Nirari, king of the world, king of Assyria, the . . . of Shalmaneser, king of the four regions.” The inscription not only makes Semiramis a historical character, but places her among the foremost rulers of Assyria.

The tombs of the kings and nobles were found deep in the ruins in the very center of the city. They were rectangular structures of cut stone, covered above with a rounded arch of burned bricks. In some cases the massive stone doors still turned in their sockets. The roofs of many of them had fallen in; others, which were intact, were filled with dust. From the tombs a vast amount of silver, gold and copper jewelry and stone beads and ornaments were recovered.

One of the chief temples of the city stood at a short distance without the eastern wall. Nothing but its foundations remain. However, the temple was surrounded by a park, traces of which still exist. The soil of the surrounding plain is a hard clay, incapable of supporting vegetable life. Into the clay large holes, several feet in diameter, were dug and filled with loam. Long lines of the holes may still be traced, each marking the spot where a tree, probably the date palm, stood in the temple park. A modern cemetery on the summit of the main mound is still used by the neighboring Arabs, and therefore it will likely prevent the complete excavation of this oldest of the capital cities of Assyria. See further Assyria.

E. J. Banks

SHERIFF, sher’if (Aram. שריף, tıphayyê, “judicial,” “a lawyer,” “a sheriff” [Dn 3 29]): Probably a “lawyer” or “juriat” whose business it was to decide points of law. At best, however, the tr “sheriff” is but a conjecture.

SHESHACH, shēshak (תְּשֶׁשֶׁךְ, sheshakh, as if “humiliation”; cf תְּשָׁכָה, shakhakh, “to crouch”): The general explanation is that this is “a cypheform of ‘Babel’ Babylon” which is the word given as equivalent to “Sheshach” by the Tg (Jer 25 26; 51 41; LXX omits in both passages). By the device known as Atbas (אֲתָבָס), i.e. disguising a name by substituting the last letter of the alphabet for the first, the letter next to the last for the second, etc. תְּשֶׁשֶׁךְ is substituted for תבבל, bādoll. This theory has not failed of opposition. Delitzsch

Monuments in Assur Discovered by the Germans.
holds that “Sheshach” represents Shish-Ki of an old Bab regal register, which may have stood for a part of the city of Babylon. (For a refutation of this interpretation see Schrader, KAT, 415; 
COT, 11, 108.) Lauth, too, takes “Sheshach” to be a Hebrewization of Sikku, a Bab district. Winckler and Sayce read Gur-ussur. Finally, Cheyne and a number of critics hold that the word has crept into the text, being “a conceit of later editors.” See further Jeremiah, 6.

THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

SHESHAZZAR, shesh-baz’ar (מֹשֶׁשׁבַּזַּר, shēsh-ba-zar), or “בֶּשֶׁה בַזַּר, shēeshire-bazar). Sheshazzar is the Hebrew or Aramaic name of the Bab Shamsah-abu-usur, or Shamsush-ban-usur: “Oh Shamash, protect the father.” It is possible that the full name was Shamasah-ban-suri-Babil-usur, “Oh Shamash, protect the father (builder) of the seed of Babylon.” (See Zerubbabel, and compare the Bab names Ashur-ban-usur, Ban-siri, Nebi-ban-siri, Shamas-ban-apal, Shamas-apil-usur, Shamsah-ban-usur, and others in Tallequist’s Neubabylonischer Namenbuch, and the Aram. names on nos. 35, 44, 38, and 45 of Clay’s Aramäisches Dokumenten.) If this was the name of the king, there would be little doubt that Sheshazzar may have been the same person as Zerubbabel, since the former is called in Ex 5:14 the governor of Judah, and the latter is called by the same title in Hag 1:11; 2:21. More probable, however, that Sheshazzar and Zerubbabel were different persons, and that Sheshazzar was governor of Judah in the time of Cyrus and Zerubbabel in that of Darius. It is possible that Sheshazzar came to Jerusalem in the time of Cyrus and laid the foundations, and that Zerubbabel came later in the time of Darius Hystaspis and completed the building of the temple (cf Ex 2:65; 4:2; Hag 1:14).

According to Ex 1:8 Sheshazzar was the prince (Hamnas) of Judah into whose hands Cyrus put the vessels of the house of the Lord which Nebuchadnezzar had brought forth out of Jerusalem and had put in the house of his gods. It is further said in ver 11 that Sheshazzar brought these vessels with them of the captivity which he brought up from Babylon into Jerusalem. In Ex 5:14 it is said that these vessels had been delivered by Cyrus unto one whose name was Sheshazzar, whom he had made governor (pehed), and that Sheshazzar came and laid the foundations of the house of God which was in Jerusalem. See SANABBASSAR.

R. DICK WILSON

SHESHAI, shesh’i (שֵׁשָׁאֵי, shēshā’î), one of the sons of Anak, perhaps an old Hebronite clan name. (Sayce combines the name with Ṣuwa, יָשָׁא, the Egyptian name for the Syrian Bedouins.) The clan lived in Hebron at the time of the conquest and was expelled by Caleb (Nu 13:22, B, Ṣuwa, Ṣasa, Ά, Ṣuwa, Semei; Josh 15:14, B, Ṣuwa, Sasa, A, Ṣuwa, Sousai; Judges 1:10, B, Ṣuwa, Ṣasa, A, Gedhi, Gedhih).

SHESHA, shēsheh (שֶׁשֶׁה, šēsheh: Šēphān, Šēṭān): A Jerahmeelite whose daughter married his servant Jara (1 Ch 2:31.34.35). The genealogical list which follows embraces some very early names (cf Curtis, ICC, ed loc.).

SHEH. See Seth.

SHEETHAR, shēth’ār (שֶׁתְחָר, shēther; B and Luc., Ἀσσαρόνας, Ἀσσαρόνας, A, Ἀσσαρόν, Ἀσσαρόνας). One of the “seven princes” at the court of Ahaseurus (Est 1:14); these princes “sat first in the kingdom” and had the right of entrance to the king’s presence at any time, except when he was in the company of one of his wives. (According to Marquart, Fund., 69, Shethar comes from רְשָׁו, with which the Pers šīštāta, “joy,” is to be compared.) The word has never really been satisfactorily explained; it is presumably Pers.

SHE’THAR-BOZNAI, shē’thar-boz’ni, SHE’THAR-BOZNAI, shē’thar-boz’ni, -boz’ni, -boz’ni (םְתַח רְבֹנָי, šṭhar rō’nā, meaning uncertain): The name of a Pers (? official mentioned with Tattenai in connection with the correspondence with Darius relative to the rebuilding of the Temple (Ezr 5:3, 6; 6:12; B, Zabudavni, Satharsonu, A, Baradzi, Satharsonu, Satharsonu, Satharsonu). See further Zechariah, 6, 5, 2.

HORACE J. WOLF

SHETAH, shēt’ā (שְׇתַה, šēthāh). See § 2.

SHEVA, shēva (בְּשֶׁבָ, bē’seḇ; B, Σαῦο, Sāu; A, Σαῦο, Sāu, Luc., Σαῦ, Sāu): (1) A son of Caleb by his concubine Maacah (1 Ch 2:49). (2) See Shavah.

SHEV, ZEWAH, ZEWAH, shē-ā (שֵׁה, shēh); ZEWAH, shē-ā (שֵׁה, shēh); ZEWAH, shē-ā (שֵׁה, shēh); shē (שֶׁה, shēh; or שֶׁה, shēh; or שֶׁה, shēh), “Show” (so always ARV) is simply a modernized spelling of “shew” (so always in AV and generally in ERV), and it should be carefully noted that “shew” is never pronounced “shoo,” not even in the combination “showbread”; cf “saw.” In AV “saw” as a vb. is the tr of a very large number of terms in the original. This number is reduced considerably by RV (esp. in the NT), but most of these changes are to secure uniformity of rendition, rather than to correct obscurities. The proper sense of the vb., of course, is “to cause a person to see” (Gen 12:1, etc.) or “to cause a thing to be seen” (Dt 4:35; Jgs 2:22, etc.). “Seeing,” naturally, can be taken intellectually or morally (Jer 38:21; Ps 16:11, etc.), and can even be used for “hearing” (Isa 43:9, etc.; contrast RV 1:8-9, 27). Hence “saw” can be used as a general tr for the most various phrases, as “be shewed!” for γεματίζει, γεματίζει, “come to pass” (Acts 4:22, RV “the wrought!”); “saw forth themselves” for ὁράω, ὁράω, “be active” (Mt 14:2, RV “work”); “shew” for παρειδολογεῖται, παρειδολογεῖται, “do” (Acts 7:36, RV “having wrought!”); for παρειδολογεῖται, παρειδολογεῖται, “relate” (Lk 8:39, RV “declare”); for ὅρω, ὅρω, “make clear” (2 Pet 1:14, RV “signify”), etc. In Cant 2:9 Ave (ERV) “showing himself” and ARV (ERVm) “glanceth” both miss the poetry of the original: His eyes shine in the forehead (לָיָה, liyāh, “blossom,” “sparkle”).

AV’s uses of the noun “show” usually connote appearance in contrast to reality. So Lk 20:47, “for a show” (ὑποδοθέα, ὑποδοθέα, “apparent cause,” RV “pretense”); Col 2:23, “show of wisdom” (so RV, μισθός, “worthless product”); Gal 6:12, “make a fair show” (so RV, εἰσπράξεσθαι, εἰσπράξεσθαι, “have a fair face”); Ps 39:6, “vain show” (so AV דֶּעָב, dē’āb, “image,” RVm “shadow”). However, in 2 Cor 13:1 (ἐφαντάζω, ἔφαντάζω, “spectacle” [so RV]) and in Col 2:15 (δεικνυόμαι, δεικνυόμαι, “to display” “shew” = “spectacle.”
In Isa 3 9 “the shew of their countenance” is a bad term for “their respect of persons” (so RVm for ἐκκαθάρασθε πρὸς ἐμοί). The “shewing” of the Baptist (Mt 1 20 AV; Lk 1 79 AV; Nu 4 7 IV) is of course his appearing to begin his ministry.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

SHEWBREAD, shîb’rē, THE, (םִּבְרֵד), lehem ha-pa’alim, “bread of the presence”; ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων, ἡ πρόθεσις τὸν ἱερόν [He 9 2]; ARV shewbread. 1. The Term See Nu 15:4. The marginal reading of Ex 25 30; 33 13, RV “Presence-bread,” exactly gives the meaning of the Heb. In 2 Ch 2 4 it is spoken of as “the continual shewbread,” because it was to be before Jeh “always” (Ex 25 30).

Later Judaism has much to say as to the number and size of the loaves, more properly thin cakes, which bore this name, together with the ritualistic legislation required was that, once in every week, there should be twelve cakes of unleavened bread, each containing about four-fifths of a peck of fine flour, placed in two piles upon a pure table with frankincense beside each pile and changed every Sabbath day (Lev 24:3–5). From the description of the table upon which the flat cakes were to lie (Ex 25 23–30; 37 10–16), it held a series of golden vessels comprising dishes, spoons, flagons and bowls. As it is unlikely that empty cups were set before Jeh—they being described as “the vessels which were upon the table”—we may conclude that the table held presentation offerings of “grain and wine and oil,” the three chief products of the land (Dt 7 13). The “dishes” were probably the salvers on which the thin cakes were piled, six on each. The “dishes” would contain wine, and the bowls (made with spouts, “to pour withal”), the oil, while the “spoons” held the frankincense, which was burned as a memorial, “even an offering made by fire unto Jeh.” The cakes themselves were eaten by the priests on every Sabbath day, as being among the “most holy” sacrifices. Each of the synagogists refers to the incident of David and his companions having eaten of the shewbread (καὶ ἔφαγον τὰς πρόθεσιν) as told in 1 S 21 4–6 (Mt 12:11; Mk 2:26; Lk 6 4).

At such times as the removal of the tabernacle took place, the separate appointments of the table of incense were not parted from it, but were carried with it—dishes, Journeyings spoons, bowls, and cups (Nu 4 7). These, like other furniture, were borne by the Kohathite Levites, but a few articles of lighter weight were in the personal care of the high priest. These comprised the oil for the candlestick, the sweet incense, the holy oil of consecration, and the meal-offering and the continual burnt-offering (Nu 4 7 8–16). Small quantities of these alone would be borne from place to place, such as would be needed with the least delay to refurbish the vessels of the sanctuary on every re erection of the tent of meeting.

With this view of the nature, we have a natural and adequate sense of the meanings and importance of the shewbread, in the economy of the temple ritual and service. It was a continual reminder to the worshippers of the truth that man does not live by bread alone, emphasized by the fact that these most holy offerings were afterward eaten. It was the OT version of the prayer, “Give us this day our daily bread”; and in the fact that the holy table was never for a moment left without some loaves lying on it, we have the symbol of man’s continu- ing and unbroken dependence upon God. Even during the travels of the table of shewbread with the tabernacle, the “continual shewbread” was required to be in its place thereon (Nu 4 7).

It has been usual to say that “frankincense in golden urns stood beside the twelve loaves” (EB, IV, col. 4212); but this is a mere repetition of a Jewish legend, as spoons were the recognized holders of the frankincense (cf. burnt-offering of Nu 7 14). Such spoons formed a part of the equipment of the shewbread table, and on the removal of the week-old cakes the spoons were carried forth and the frankincense in them burned on the great altar on the Sabbath day. If this were done while the grain and wine and oil were being consumed, it would derive additional significance, as betokening the gratitude andadoration of the representative recipients of the bounties of Nature, just as the daily burning of incense in the holy place betokened the worship and adoration of the praying multitudes without the temple (Lk 1 10). See SHEWBREAD, Table of.

W. SHAW CALDECOTT

SHEWBREAD, TABLE OF, (םִּבְרֵד), shūbdān [Ex 25 25–30, etc]; ἡ πρόθεσις καὶ ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων, ἡ πρόθεσις καὶ ἡ πρόθεσις τὸν ἱερόν [He 9 2]; For construction, see TABERNACLE; TEMPLE. A rude representation of the table is given on the Arch of Titus in Rome. The bas-relief was measured by Professor Boni in 1905, and the height and width of the represented tables were found to be 48 cms., or nearly 19 in. The table represented is, of course, that of Herod’s temple, taken at the fall of Jerusalem in 70 AD. See the author’s art. “The Temple Spoils” in PEFS, 1906, 306 ff.

The table of shewbread is to be distinguished from the altar of incense. It has become the fashion of the newer criticism to deny the existence of the altar of incense in preexilic times, and to explain the allusion to it in 1 K 6 20 as the table of shewbread (so in Ezk 41 22). The other references (1 K 6 22; 7 48; 9 25) are dismissed as interpolations. The procedure is radically vicious. The table of shewbread is not an “altar,” though the altar is once spoken of as a “table” (Ezk 41 22). There was only one altar of incense (1 K 6 20), but in 2 Ch 4 8 ten tables of shewbread. See SHEWBREAD.

W. SHAW CALDECOTT

SHIBAH, shīb’a (םִּבְרֵד), shib’ith, “seven”; ἡ ἀρτοφέρησις, ἡ ἀρτοφέρησις [He 9 2]; shibbōleth, “test of speech” applied by the men of Gilead to the Ephraimites, who wished to cross the Jordan, after defeat. If they pronounced the word shibbōleth, their dialectic variety of speech betrayed them (Jgs 12 6). The word probably has the sound of “stream” or “flood” (cf Ps 69 2).

SHIBMAH, shīb’ma (םִּבְרֵד), shibmāh). See Sibmah.

SHICRON, shīk’rōn (םִּבְרֵד), shikkōrōn). See Shikkeron.

SHIELD, shēl. See ARMOR, IV, 1.

SHIGGAION, shi-gā’yon, shi-gō’n (םִּבְרֵד), shig-gāyōn): Occurs in the title of Ps 7, and in the pl., in the verse introducing Habakkuk’s prayer (Hab 3 1). Derived from a vb. meaning “to wander,” it is generally taken to mean a dishyramb, or rhapsody.
This is not supported by the Gr VSS, but they are evidently quite at a loss. See Psalms, Book of.

SHIHON, shih’hon (שִׁוהָן, shi’m). See Shion.

SHIHOR, shih’hor (שִׁהוֹר, shih’hor), also written without "r" in Heb and incorrectly "Sihor" in Eng. A stream of water mentioned in connection with Egypt. Joshua 13:3 speaks of the "Sihor, which is before Egypt," a stream which commentators have thought to be "the brook of Egypt," the stream which separated Egypt from Pals, now called Wady el-Arish. Jeremiah 2:18 AV says, "Do you take the safety of Egypt, to drink the waters of Sihor?" Commentators have thought Shihor in this case to be a name for the Nile. Both interpretations cannot be correct. Whatever the name S. means, at least it did not denote a movable river. It must be the same stream in both these passages, and no identification of the stream can be correct that does not satisfy both of them. Professor Naville has recently shown conclusively (Proc. Soc. Bib. Arch., January, 1913) that neither interpretation is strictly correct, and has made clear the Bib. references to S. In the northeasternmost province of ancient Egypt, Khentahi ("Fronting on the East"), was a canal, a fresh-water stream drawn off from the Nile, called in the neighbors' language "the Hapyor Canal" (the -t- is an Egypt fem. ending). There have been many changes in the branches and canals from the Nile in the Delta, and this one with many others has been lost altogether; but there is a tradition among the Bedouin of Wady el-Arish, or this day that once a branch of the Nile came over to that point. This Shi-h-Hor, "Stream of Horus," makes perfectly clear and harmonious the different references of Scripture to S. It was "before Egypt," as Josh describes it, and it was the first sweet water of Egypt which the traveler from Pals in those days was able to obtain, as the words of Jeremiah indicate. "To drink the waters of S." meant to reach the supply of the fresh water of the Nile at the edge of the desert. The two other references to S. (1 Ch 13:5; Is 23:3) are perfectly satisfied by this identification. The "seed of S." (Isa 23:3 AV) would be grains from Egypt by way of the Sihor.

M. G. KYLE

SHIHOR-LIBNATH, shih’hor-lib’nat (שִׁהוֹר לִבְנָת, shih’hor-lib’nat). A place named on the boundary of Asher (Josh 19:26). It seems to mark with Carmel the western limit, and may have been on the S. of that mountain. Pesh, Syr, and Ono. take this as two distinct names attaching to cities in this region. So far, however, no trace of either name has been found in the course of very careful exploration. More probably Shihor was the name of a river, "Libnath" distinguishing it from the Nile, which was called Shihor of Egypt. It may have been called Shihor because, like the Nile, it contained crocodiles. The boundary of Asher included Dor (Tantanah), so the river may be sought S. of that town. Crocodiles are said still to be found in the Kishon; but this river runs N. of Carmel. The Crocodedon of Ploemcy (V. xxv.5; xvi.2) and Piny (v.19), which the latter makes the southern boundary of Phoenix, may possibly be Nahr ez-Zerka, which enters the sea about 5 miles S. of Tantur. Here also it is said the crocodile is sometimes seen. Perhaps therefore we may identify this stream with Shihor-libnath.

W. EWING

SHIKKERON, shik’ker-on (שִׁקְקְרֶן, shik’ker’en). AV Shicoron: A place mentioned in Josh 15:11 as being on the northern border of Judah, between Ekron and Beer-sheba, and beyond, toward the sea. The site is unknown, but Rev. C. Hauer (PEFS, 1907, 259) suggests Tell es-Sellaha, N.W. of Akir, remarking that if this were the site the boundary would follow a natural course over the mountain to Beer-sheba.

SHILHI, shil’hi (שִׁלחִי, shilhi). Father of Jehovah's mother (1 K 22:42=2 Ch 20:31; BA in 2 Ch, Zeal, Solel, B in 1 K, Zeal, Semeri, A in 1 K, Zal, Shilh, Solel, Luke, etc., in both, Zal, Shile, Semei). C. H. W. Charnie (EB, art. "Shilhi") ventures the supposition that "Shilhi" is a misreading for "Shihim" (Josh 15:32), and is therefore the name of a place rather than that of a person; he holds it to be the name of the birthplace of Azubah, the king's mother.

SHILHIM, shil’him (שִׁלחִים, shilhim) [Josh 15:32]: See Sharaaim. (2) Possibly Azubah the mother of Jehovah, who is called "the daughter of Shilhi" (1 K 22:42; 2 Ch 20:31), was a native of Shilhim.

SHILLEM, shil’em, SHILLEMITEs, shil’em-its (שִׁלֶלֶם, shil’em, shi-lem’it, ka-shilemt): Shilleh is found in Gen 46:24, a son of Naphtali; Shillems, his descendants, are mentioned in Nu 26:49; Shallum (q.v.) is found in 1 Ch 7:13.


SHILOH, shil’oh (שִׂלוֹה, shiloh): The prophecy in Gen 49:10, "The scepter shall not depart from Judah; ... until Shiloh come," etc., has been the subject of very diverse interpretations. RV gives as alternative renderings, "Till he come to Shiloh having the obedience of the peoples' Or, acc. to Syr, 'Till he come whose it is, etc." (1) From the earliest times the passage has been regarded as Messianic, but the rendering in the text, which takes "Shiloh" as a proper name, bearing a meaning such as "peaceful" (of Isa 9:6, "Prince of Peace"), labors under the difficulty that Shiloh is not found elsewhere as a personal name in the OT, nor is it easy to extract from it the meaning desired. Further, the word was not personally applied to the Messiah in any of the ancient VSS, which rather assume a different reading (see below). Apart from a purely fanciful passage in the Talm (cf Driver, Gen, 413), this application does not occur earlier than the version of Seba Münster in the 16th cent. (1584).

(2) The rendering, "Till he come to Shiloh," where Shiloh is taken as the name of a place, not a person, is plausible, but is felt to yield no suitable sense in the context. It is, therefore, now also set aside by most recent scholars. (3) The 3rd rendering, which regards Shiloh as representing the Heb shiloh - (sheloth) = Sheloh, from כָּעָשֶׁר (k’as’er), "a shivah, "whose [it is]," has in its favor the fact that this is evidently the reading presupposed in the LXX, the Pesh, and the Jewish Tgs, and seems to be alluded to in Ecc 21:27, "until he come whose right it is." In this view the passage has still a Messianic reference, though critics argue that it must then be regarded as late in origin. Other interpretations need not detain us. See for details the full discussion in Driver's "Ezekiel's Christology," 1:42 ff, ET, the comms. of Delitzsch, Driver, and Skinner, Gen (esp. Excursus II in Driver), and the arts. in the various Bible dict.; see also Prophecy.

James Orr

SHILOH (the most usual form is שִׂלֹה, shiloh, but it appears סָלֹה, shilo, and סָלָה as
THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

SHILONITE, shil'lo-nit (שִׁלֹנִית, shilón; [2 Ch 9 29], [םילה, shilón [10 15; Neh 11 8, 5]; Σιλωνίτης, Silōnītēs, Silōnītēs]; This denotes an inhabitant of Shiloh, and applies (1) to Ahijah the prophet (1 K 11 29, etc); and (2) to a family of the children of Judah, who, after the exile, made their home in Jerus (1 Ch 9 5; Neh 11 5, AV "Shiloni").

SHILSHAH, shil'sháh (שִׁלְשָׁה, shilsháh); BA, Sa-lúvá, Salesid, Luc., Selémán, Selemán: An Asherite (1 Ch 7 37).

SHIMEA, shim'e-a (שִׁמֵּא, shim'ā); See Sham- ma and Shammah.

(1) Brother of David (see Shammah).
(2) Son of David (1 Ch 3 5, B, Sowár, Sóman; but in 2 S 5 14; 1 Ch 14 4, "Shammua").
(3) A Merarite Levite (1 Ch 6 30, B, Sópa, Sómeá, A, Saúd, Samod, Luc., Saúd, Samad).
(4) A Gershonite Levite (1 Ch 6 30 [24], Sóuád, Samod).

SHIMEAH, shim'e-a (שִׁמֵּא, shim'ā; B, Saúd, Saúd, Samod, Luc., Saúd, Samad): A descendant of Jehiel, the "father" of Gibeon (1 Ch 8 32); in 1 Ch 9 38 he is called "Shimeah" (B, Saúd, Samad, A, Saúd, Samad; see JQR, XI, 110-13, §§10-12).

SHIMEAM, shim'e-am. See Shimeah.

SHIMEATHITES, shim'bath-its (שִׁמֵּא, shimm'āth), or גַּל, shimm'āth; LXX in 2 K, "Tómos, Tomonath, B in 2 Ch, Saúd, Samod, A, Saúd, Samad, Luc., Saúd, Samad): Father of Jozacar (2 K 21 22), one of the murderers of Joash, king of Judah. According to 2 Ch 24 26 Shimeam is an Ammonites and the mother, not the father, of Jozacar. Many textual emendations have been suggested (many HDB, art. "Shimeath"), but they are unnecessary, as the Chronicler's revised version of the incident in K was a deliberate one. The Chronicler was a sturdy opponent of intermarriage, and in the story of the assassination of King Joash he saw an opportunity to strike a blow against the hated practices. In the original account, the two conspirators are given as "Jozakar the son of גַּל [shimm'āth], and Jehozabad the son of יָוֶן [shemen]." The two names are both masc.; but the final א of the former looked to the Chronicler like the fem. ending and offered him his opportunity. In his account, the one of the two murderers (dastardly villains, even though the king had merited death) was "the son of גַּל [shimm'āth], the Ammonite," and the other was "the son of יָוֶן [shimm'ath], the Moabite" (cf Torrey, Ezra Studies, 212).
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SHIMEATHITES, shim'bath-its (שִׁמֵּא, shimm'āth); BA, Saúd, Samod, Samathim, Luc., Saúd, Samathim: A sub-division of the tribe of Caleb (1 Ch 2 55). In the three families mentioned in this passage Jerome saw three distinct classes of religious functionaries: Vulg concutes atque resonantes et in tabernaculis commorantes. The Tg has a similar explanation, except that the "Suceathytes" are those "covered" with a spirit of prophecy. Beissner (Handbuch zum AT) accepts Jerome's explanation, except that he regards the first class as gate-keepers (Aram, דָּמָּה, t̄irāh, a technical term for sacred music-making, גַּל, shimm'āth, the Halachah or sacred tradition. Buhl (HWB) de-
rives Shimeathites and Simeathites from unknown places. Keil interprets as descendants from the unknown Shemeth (cf Curtis, ICC). The passage is hopelessly obscure. Horace A. Wolf

SHIMEI, shim'ē (םִימֵא, shim'ē), possibly "hear me [El]", or "(Jah)"; שֵׁמֵי, Semei, Seme, Sime, Shim; Shim'on; Sime, Sime'on; Simeathites, Shim'ites. A frequent occurrence throughout the OT records, sometimes varying slightly in form in EV. AV has "Shimi" in Ex 6 17; "Shimhi" in 1 Ch 8 21; "Shimeah" in 2 S 21 21. RV has "Shimeites" in Zec 12 13, where AV has "Shimeathites". Shimi in Ex 6 13 has "Shema" in 1 Ch 13 21 for the "Shime" of ver 21. In all others of the many occurrences in AV and RV the form is "Shimei."

(1) A family name among the Levites before and after the exile, at least five of whom bore it: (a) Son of Gerahon and grandson of Levi (Ex 6 17; Nu 3 18; 1 Ch 6 17; 23 7.10). The text of 1 Ch 6 and 23 is corrupt, making difficult the tracing of the various genealogies and the identification of the several Shimees. Evidently that of 23 7 is more for one of the four sons of Ladan or Libni, whose names are given in the preceding verse. (b) An ancestor of Asaph the musician (1 Ch 6 42), possibly the same as (a) above, Jahath the son of Sh. (of 23 10) being by a copyist's error transposed to 23 7. (c) The father of the Merarite branch of the Levites (1 Ch 6 29). (d) One of the 288 trained singers in the service of the sanctuary under Asaph (1 Ch 25 17). (e) One of the Levites who helped to cleanse the Temple in Hezekiah's reformation (2 Ch 29 14). He was a descendant of Heman the musician. Hezekiah afterward appointed him with Conaniah to have chief oversight of "the oblations and the tithes and the dedicated things" which were brought into the chambers of Jeh's house prepared for them (2 Ch 31 11.12). (f) A Levite who under Ezra put away his foreign wife (Ezr 10 23), "Semeic" in 1 Esd 9 23.

(2) The best-known Bible character of this name is the Benjamite, of the family of Saul (2 S 16 5-12; 19 16-20; 1 K 2 8.9.36-46), who met David at Bahurim as he was fleeing from Absalom, and in bitter and cowardly fashion cursed and attacked the hard-pressed king. Apparently David's flight to the wilds led through a narrow ravine, on one side of which, a king in his rage climbed up the ridge above, stood Shimeath and in safety as he cast stones at David and his men, cursing as he threw (2 S 16 5.6). His hatred of David who had displaced his royal kinsman Saul had smouldered long in his mean heart; and now the flame bursts out, as the aged and apparently helpless king flees before his own son. S. seizes the long-coveted opportunity to pour out the acid hate of his heart. But when David's faithful companion would have the ravine to make quick work of S., the noble king forbade him with the remarkable words: "Behold, my son, who came forth from my bowels, seeketh my life: how much more may this Benjamite now do it? let him alone, and let him curse; for Jeh hath hidden him. It may be that Jeh ... will require me good for his cursing" (2 S 16 11.12). After Absalom's overthrow, as the king was returning victorious and vindicated, S. met him at the Jordan with most abject confession and with vows of allegiance (2 S 19 16-23).

The king spared his life; but shortly before his death charged his son Solomon to see that due punishment should come to Shime for his sins: "Thou shalt bring his bones down from his sepulcher to the land of Ab, to the land of his fathers" (1 K 2 8-9). When he came to the throne Solomon summoned Shimeathite and Shimeathite who fled in Jerus., as he desired that he be come and from which he must not go out on pain of death (1 K 2 36-38). Feeding secure after some years, Shimei left his home in Jerus to recapture some escaped slaves (vs 39-41), and in consequence he was promptly dispatched by that gruesome avenger of blood, the royal executioner, "Be stoned to death", "fell upon him," as he had upon Adonijah and Joab, "so that he died" (ver 40).

(3) Another Benjamite, mentioned with Rei as an officer in the king's bodyguard, who was faithful to David in the rebellion of Adonijah (1 K 4 5). Jos reads Rei as a common noun, describing S. as "the friend of David." He is to be identified with the son of Elah (1 K 4 18), whom Solomon, probably because of his fidelity, named as one of the 12 chief commissary officers appointed over all Israel, "who provided victuals for the king and his household."

(4) A man of some prominence in the tribe of Benjamin (1 Ch 8 2), whose home was in Ajalon, where he was a "head of fathers' houses" (ver 13), but his descendants lived in Jerus. (ver 28). In AV he is called "Shimhi"; in ver 13 he is called "Shema."

(5) Another Benjamite, an ancestor of Mordecai (Est 2 5), "Semeias" in AD 41 2. (6) A brother of David (2 S 21 21; AV "Shimeah"); in 1 S 18 9 he is called "Shammah"; cf "Shimeathite; Shim'ma."

(7) A man of Judah, called "the Ramathite," who was "over the vineyard" in David's reign (1 Ch 27 27).

(8) A Simeonite living in the time of David (1 Ch 4 26.27), whose chief claim to distinction was that he was father of 10 sons and 6 daughters. The descendants of such a numerous progeny, not being able to maintain themselves in their ancestral home in Beer-sheba, in the days of Hezekiah fell upon Gerar, and dispossessed "the sons of Ham" (ver 20 LXX), and upon Mt. Seir, driving out the Amalekites (43).

(9) A man of Reuben, son of Gog (1 Ch 5 4).

(10) (11) Two men of "Israel," i.e., not priests or Levites, one of the sons of Hasenuah (Est 10 33), the other "of the sons of Bani" (10 35), who put away their foreign wives at Ezra's command. In 1 Esd called respectively "Seme" (9 35) and "Semeath" (9 34).

(12) A brother of Zerubbabel (1 Ch 3 19).

The Shimeathites were descendants of Shimei, grandson of Levi; cf (1) (a) above (Nu 3 21; Zec 12 13).

Edward Mack

SHIMEON, shim'ōn (םֵימֵון, shim'ōn; else where "Simeon"): One of the sons of Harim who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10 31; BA, Zechar, Semach, Luc, Zechar, Semach; Simeath = 1 Esd 9 32, "Simon Chosamuss").

SHIMHI, shim'hī. See SHIMEI.

SHIMI, shim'i, sh'īm, SHIMITES, sh'mîts. See SHIMEI.

SHIMMA, shim'a. See SHAMMAR.

SHIMON, shim'ōn (םים, shim'ōn; B, Simeon, Sem'mih, A, Zechar, Sem'meth, Luc, Simeath, Sam't): A name in the Judahite genealogy (1 Ch 4 20).

SHIRMATH, shir'math (םימה, shir'math; Simeath; Semar'ath, Samar'ath): The last of nine sons of Shime of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Ch 8 21).

SHIRMI, shir'mi (שימר, shir'mi; various forms in LXX): There are four Hebrews mentioned in the Bible who bear this name:

(1) A Simeonite, a son of Shemaiah and father of Jediah, a chief of his tribe (1 Ch 4 37).

(2) The father of Jediael, a bodyguard of King David (1 Ch 1 45).

(3) A son of Hoshah, a Levite. He was appointed by David to be doorkeeper in the house of the Lord. He was made chief of the tribe, although not the firstborn of his family (1 Ch 26 10).
(4) One of the sons of Elizaphan, a Levite. He assisted in purifying the temple in the time of Hezekiah (2 Ch 29:13).

S. L. UMBACH

SHIMRITH, shim'riθ (םירית, shimrith, "guard," fem.): A Moabitess, the mother of Jehozabad, one of those that conspired against King Joash (2 Ch 24:26). Elsewhere (2 K 12:21) Jehozabad is described as the son of Shomer (q.v.), the same name without the fem. ending.

SHIMRON, shim'ron (םירון, shimron), "watch"): The 4th son of Issacchar (Gen 46:13; Nu 26:24; 1 Ch 7:1), and ancestor of the Shimronites (Nu 26:24).

SHIMRON-MERON, shim'ron-mə'ron (םירתון, shimron mariθ; שים, Shimón . . . מירון, Shimón . . .Mariθ, Shimón . . . Mārōn; שים, Shimôn . . . Ma'rōn . . . Phasgi . . . Marōn): A royal city of the Canaanites, the king of which was slain by Joshua (12:20). Here the name is followed by that of Adashaph, which also follows the name of Shimron in 11:1. This suggests that the two are in reality one, and that Shimron-meron may only be the full name. A royal Can. city, Samimuruna, is mentioned in the inscriptions of Senacherib, Esarhaddon and Assur-bani-pal, which with Schrader (KAT, 163) would identify with this, and thinks it may now be represented by es-Semearīyeh. See Shimron.

W. EWING

SHIMSHAI, shîm'shî, shîm'shâ'î (שימשאי, shimshai): B, Šamōd, Sumōd, Smōd, A, Šamūd, Sumōd, and other forms): A town whose king was tributary to Jabin king of Hazor, and who joined in the attempt to resist the invasion under Joshua (Josh 11:1). It was in the territory allotted to Zebulun (19:15). No sure identification is possible. Other Eq. and Talm both omit the r from the name; and Neubauer would identify it with Simonías (Vita, 24), the Simonia of the Talm, which is now represented by Semmānīyeh, a village about 3 miles W. of Nazareth, on the edge of the plain (Geog. du Talm). Be'īl Lāmīn, named by Jos along with it, is a short distance to the N.W. Es-Semearīyeh, about 3 miles N. of Acre, has also been suggested; but it is perhaps too far to the W.

W. EWING

SHINAR, shîn'ær (שִׁנָּר, shin'ar; סנהר, Senhâr; Senhâr): 1. Identification
2. Possible Babylonian Form of the Name
3. The Semitic Origin of Shinar
4. The Syriac Sen'ar
5. ThePrimitive Tongue of Shinar
6. Comparison with the Semitic Idiom
7. The Testimony of the Sculptures, etc., to the Races
8. The Successors Probably in Shinar before the Semites
9. The States of Shinar
Sippa; Kēs; Babylon; Nippur; Adab, Šuruppak; Umma; Erech, Lagash, Larsa; Ur; Eridu; the Land of the Sea, Ninlî, Iškî, or Karkar; Upē or Upiā (Opsi); Other Well-known Cities
10. Shinar and Its Climate
11. Sculpture in Shinar
12. The First Nation to Use Writing in Western Asia
13. The System Employed, with an Example

The name given, in the earliest Heb records, to Babylonia, later called Bablu, or the land of Bablu (בבל, 'ereq babel). In Gen 10:10

1. Identity
2. Possible Babylonian Form of the Name
3. Sumerian Equivalents

The principal difficulty lies in 2. Possible the fact that what might be regarded Babylonian as the non-dialectical form Šinār Form (which would alone furnish a satisfactory basis of comparison, if not found, and would, if existent, apply to the southern portion of Babylonia. The northern tract was called Akkad, after the name of its capital city (see ACCAN). The Gr form Šēn(n)āwr shows that, at the time the LXX tr was made, there was no tradition that the 'qēn was guttural, as the supposed Bab forms would lead us to expect. As the Bib. form Šinār indicates the whole of Babylonia, it corresponds with the native (Sumerian) Šingu-Ura, rendered "Sumer and Akkad," from which, by changing K into Š and Š into S (found in Sumerian), Šinār may have been derived, but this explanation is not free from difficulties.

This twofold designation, Šingu-Ura, is that which is commonly used in the inscriptions of the earlier kings, though it cannot, then have indicated always the whole country, but only such parts of it as acknowledged their overlordship. Later Equivalents er on the corresponding term seems to have been Kūnū ("the territory of the Akkadians") to all appearance a term introduced by the Kassite rulers). Nabonassar and his successors seem to have-contented themselves with the title "king of Babylon," rule in the city implying also the dominion over the whole

SHINAB, shîn'âb (שִׁנַּב, shinâb), Sum.  nâb, shinâr, سَنَب, Sennâr; Senndâr): King of Admah (q.v.). He is mentioned with Shemeber, king of Zeboiim; he was attacked by Chedorlaomer and his allies (Gen 14:2). The reading is very uncertain. If the incident narrated is founded on fact, Shinab may be identical with Sanib, an Ammonite king in the time of Tiglath-pileser III (so Fr. Delitzsch, Wo lag der Paradies 254); or the name may be equated by the Assyrian Shennazzar (cf. She'nnazzar), and Shemba, with the Assyrian Shams-abbâl (Sayce, Epexege. T. VII, 463). Jewish exegesis gives a sinister explanation of all four names (ver 2). The Mishr. (Br. Rab. 42) explains Shinab as שִׁנֶב כְּבָּד, shônâb kâbâd, "one who draws money [wherever he can]." It is of interest to note that the names fall into two alliterative pairs and that each king's name contains exactly as many letters as his city. On the whole, however, the list leaves an impression of artificiality; as the names are not repeated in ver 8, it is highly probable that they are later additions to the text.
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country. Often, however, the equivalent term for Babylonia is Ešu, probably an abbreviation of Šedu, and here standing for the land belonging to that sacred city—"the good city," a type of Paradise, Babylonia being, in fact, situated upon the Edinu, or "plain" (see Eden).

All these comparisons tend to show that the Bab equivalent of Shinar is not any of the above, and as yet has not, in fact, been found. This is also implied by the fact, that Sen'ar was used in Syr for the country around Bagdad, and annually included may be supposed) the plain upon which the ruins of Babylon stand. Sen'ar was therefore in all probability an ancient Bab designation of the tract, now lost, but regarded by the Hebrews as synonymous with Babylon.

From the inscriptions it would seem that the primitive language of Shinar was not Semitic, but the agglutinative idiom now named

5. Primitive Sumerian—a tongue long regarded as Tongue of Turanian, and having, it is thought, Turanian Chinese affinities, is, the "language" of Turkish an-ma'ak (a-ana), "mother," Turkish ana; abba, 'old man,' Turkish baba, "father"; bâh, "house," Turkish ev, etc. The Chinese affinities seem less close, but the following may be quoted: ak(y), "father." Chinese ye (Amoy iâ); ge, "night," Chinese ye; gu, "to speak," Chinese yâ; shu, "hand," Chinese shêu; kin, "business," Chinese kâng, "work"; etc. Chinese and Turkish, however, have had time to pass through many changes since Sumerian was current in Shinar. Many words of the Sumerian language were borrowed by the Sem Babylonians, and a few (like kâkel, "temple," Sem bâgal, "great house") entered the other Sem languages.

Häfley's contention that Sumerian is simply "an idiom" for the expression of Sem Bab, seems to be untenable, as they differ not only in words, but also in grammar; moreover, Sumerian had a dialect, called by the natives "woman's tongue." For the rest, the principal differences between Sumerian and Sem Bab are:

(1) a different opposition of nouns instead of prepositions;
(2) verbs with long strings of particles and affixes to denote persons and regiments, instead of a prefix and a suffix;
(3) compound words, both nouns and verbs, are common instead of being exceedingly rare; Sumerian seems to have borrowed several words from Sem Bab.

Not only the language, but also the sculptures which they have left, point to the probability that the earlier inhabitants of Shinar belonged to a different race from the Sem. The Semites of Babylonia, Sculptures, etc.

7. Testimony of the later The Semites of Babylonia, etc.

8. Sumerians Probably Preceded Semites in Shinar

9. State of Shinar (1) Sippar or Sippar-Auru (Ya' rura), possibly including Accad (Gen 10 10), some distance S.W. of Bagdad. It is the modern 'Abu-kabbah, "father of grain." Though it seems to have fallen early under the dominion of the Semites, it was at first Sumerian, as its native name, Zimhir, and the ideographic writing thereof show. According to Berossus, who calls it Panta-Pantilón, one of its earliest kings was Amelon or Amilarius, who reigned 13 sær, or 45,800 years. Later on came Evedereshesh (Nusku), the native Eunu-dur-an-ki, renowned as a priest favored by the gods. His descendants, if of pure race, inherited the divine grace which he enjoyed. It is said to have been in Sippara (Sippar) that Ut-napisim, the Bab Noah, buried the records before entering the ark.

(2) About 18 miles N. of Babylon lay Kîš, now Ohtime—a foundation which seems to have preceded Babylon as the capital of Shinar. Its early name, Assur-Bau, is said to have been the wife of a wine-merchant and to have reigned 100 years.

(3) Babylon, for which see BABEL; BABYLON. As one of its early kings, Berosus mentions Alorus, "the shepherd of the people," as having reigned for 10 sær, or 36,000 years. The state of Babylon probably included Cuthah (Tel Ibrahim), which once had kings of its own, and possessed a special legend of the Creation. Belonging to Babylon, also, was the renowned city Borsippa, now Birs, or the Birs Nimroud, the traditional site of the Tower of Babel (see BABEL, TOWER OF).

(4) Some distance S.E. of Babylon lay Nippur or Niffer, now Niffer (Noufar), identified by the rabbis with the 'Calneh' of Gen 10 9. It was a place of considerable importance from the beginning of the worship of Enlil and Ninlil, later, also, of their son Ninip and his spouse (see Calneh). The American excavations on this site have thrown a flood of light upon almost every branch of Assyriological research.

(5) Adab, now called Bismaya, the city of Mah, the goddess of reproduction. One of the earliest rulers of Adab was seemingly called Lugal-dalu, of whom a fine statue, discovered by the American explorers, exists. It was apparently renowned as a necropolis.

(6) S. and a little W. of Adab was Šurrupak, now Fara. This was the birthplace of the Bab Noah, Ut-napisim, son of Opames (Unbaru-Talu), a Chaldæan of Lachish. The coming of the Flood was revealed to Ut-napisim here.

(7) Practically E. of Fara lay Umma or Giših (or Gišuh), now Jochha. This city was apparently of considerable importance, and the traditional site of Lugalzaggis.

(8) S. of Fara lay Unuga, Sem Uruk, the Bib. Erech (q.v.), now Warka. Its most celebrated king, after Gilgamesh, was Lugal-aggisi, one of the opponents of the rulers of Lagāš.

(9) Some distance E. of Warka was the territory of Lagāš, now Tel-fah—"a little state, rather in-
accessible, but of considerable importance to the antiquarian, which is a testimonial to the advance in civilization which it had made. Its kings and viceroys were among the most renowned, though apparently unknown outside their own domains. The most celebrated were the reformer Ur-Nina-gina and viceroy Gudea, to whom many erections in the city were due. (See Gudea’s remarkable statue in the Louvre.)

(10) Somewhat to the S.E. of Waraka lay Larsa, the “Ellasar” of Gen 14 1 (q.v.). This center of learning maintained its independence even after the other states had been absorbed by Amurru and his dynasty into the Bab empire.

(11) To the S.E. of Waraka and Senaga lies the site of the ancient Ur of the Chaldees (q.v.). This was given in 15; Henry said (p. 43, 200, and in whose time the Musurus Oannes, or Annedotus, arose out of the Pers Gulf. In Sumerian the word for “king” is usually a type of the tree of life songs. The later kings of Babylon sometimes bore the title “king of Eridu,” as though rulers of the domain of Paradise.

(13) The Land of the Sea (that bordering on the Pers Gulf), in which, seemingly, the Chaldeans afterward settled, seems to have played an important part in the early history of Shinar. Berosus speaks of its king Ammenon, who reigned 12 sari, or 43,200 years, and in whose time the Musurus Oannes, or Annedotus, arose out of the Pers Gulf. In Sumerian the word for “king” is usually a type of the tree of life songs.

(14) Of the Ur lay Eridu, or, in full, Gubern, “the good city,” wherein, apparently, lay the earthly Paradise. This is identified with the present Abu-shahrein, and was the seat of Ea or Enki, god of the sea and of fertilizing streams. According to the tradition, it was there that the “dark vine grew,” a type seemingly of the tree of life songs. The later kings of Babylon sometimes bore the title “king of Eridu,” as though rulers of the domain of Paradise.

(15) Upû or Upia, the Gr Opis, apparently obtained renown at a very early date, its kings being given in the great chronological list before those of Kish.

(16) Other well-known cities, possibly state-capitals, were Larak, Gr Laranne; Amarda, one of the centers of the worship of Nergal; Aminana, a province E. of the present Bagdad; Dilmu, now Nuru, Ennigi, and Kabara, seemingly centers of the worship of Hadad; Tilman, at the head of the Pers Gulf, and including the island of Bahrein; the province of Saba; Sebe or Bagdadu, possibly the modern Bagdad; and several others.

Whether the country was in the same seemingly unscarred-for state, as anciently as at present is unknown; but one cannot help admiring the courage of the original immigrants into such a district, for example, as that of Lagash. This, which belongs to the land of Shinar, is thus described:

10. Shinar and Its Climate

The southern region, is very inaccessible on account of the watercourses and marshes. Like the whole of Shinar in general, it is more or less dried up in summer, and unhealthy for Europeans. The alterations in the waterways, owing to changes in the irrigation-dams, must then, as now, have hindered communication. Sharp cold, with frost, succeeds the heat of summer, and from time to time sand-storms sweep across the plain. Notwithstanding the destruction sometimes wrought, the floods were always welcomed in consequence of the fruitfulness which followed, and which was such as to make Babylonia one of the most fertile tracts known.

The reference to the Sumerian sculptures in (7) above will have shown that the inhabitants of the Shinar peninsula seem to have had a certain order and of some antiquity, even at the time when it first presents itself to our notice. It is true that many specimens are crude and uncurious, but this is probably due to the sculptors having been, often enough, the slaves of their material. Their stones were frequently more or less pebble-shaped, and they had neither the skill nor the tools to reduce them to better proportions—moreover, reduction of bulk would have meant a diminution of their importance. The broad, squat figures which they produced, however, gave them bad models for their bas-reliefs, and it was long ere this defect was removed, notwithstanding the superintendents of the old lists were produced by their seal-engravers during and after the 4th millennium BC.

But in all probability special renown will always be attached to the non-Semitic inhabitants of Shinar as the inventors, or at least the

12. First to earliest users known to us, of the cuneiform script, is that known as the Sumerian type. This, as we may see, was employed in Western Asia that the system which they introduced was cumbersome and imperfect, but they knew of nothing simpler, and modern Chaldeans, with which their script has been compared, is far less practical. Briefly, the system may be described as syllabic for the prefixes and suffixes, and ideographical for the roots. To show this the following transcribed example will probably suffice:

E nu-DU URU nu-DIM. A house was not built, a city was not constructed;

URU nu-DIM ADAM nu-mn-MA. A city was not constructed, a community had not formed;

ABZU nu-DU GURDUUGA nu-DIM. The abyss was not built, Eridu was not constructed;

AZAGA DINGIRena KI-DURA-bi nu-DIM. The holy gods of the gods, its seat was not constructed;

SU-nUNIN KUBURAGA ABBAGA. The whole of the lands was sea.

The nominal and verbal roots of the above extract from the bilingual account of the Creation are in capitals, and the pronominal prefixes and suffixes, with a couple of lengthening and prefixing of the nouns, are used. Such form and pronunciation of the nouns, in small letters. This will not only give an idea of the poetical form of the Sumerian legend of the Creation by Merodach and Arru, but also show how short and concise, as a language, was the speech of Shinar, before Sem supremacy.

11. Sculpture in Shinar

SHINE, shin: The Heb words ‘āhāl, ‘ōr, hādāl, zāhar, zāur, yāḇāh, nāḇāth, ‘ēḇshath and kārān are all derivations of the root shin: “shine.” All indicate either the direct or indirect diffusion of beams of light. In a direct and literal sense the word “shine” is used of the heavenly bodies, or of candles, and fire (Job 18 5; 26 5 AV; 29 3; 31 20; 2 K 3 22). In a figurative sense it is used of reflected light which increases in any sense (Ex 34 29 f.35; Isa 60 1; Ezk 43 2; Dn 12 3). God as the sun of righteousness is thus depicted in Ps 50 2. The NT words aistropiō, apraxo, lumnō and phainō are all the same. Thus literally it is said of the lighting that it shines (Mt 24 27; Lk 21 24; 1 Th 5 23). It is also applied to the life of faith or to men prominent in the kingdom of God (Mt 5 16; Jn 8 35; 2 Cor 4 6; Phil 2 15; 2 Pet 1 19); to the glory of God (Lk 2 9); to angelic appearances (Lk 24 4; Acts 12 7); or to Christ as He appeared to John on Patmos (Rev 1 10).

T. G. PINTER

SHINE, shin: The Heb words ‘āhāl, ‘ōr, hādāl, zāhar, zāur, yāḇāh, nāḇāth, ‘ēḇshath and kārān are all derivations of the root shin: “shine.” All indicate either the direct or indirect diffusion of beams of light. In a direct and literal sense the word “shine” is used of the heavenly bodies, or of candles, and fire (Job 18 5; 26 5 AV; 29 3; 31 20; 2 K 3 22). In a figurative sense it is used of reflected light which increases in any sense (Ex 34 29 f.35; Isa 60 1; Ezk 43 2; Dn 12 3). God as the sun of righteousness is thus depicted in Ps 50 2. The NT words aistropiō, apraxo, lumnō and phainō are all the same. Thus literally it is said of the lighting that it shines (Mt 24 27; Lk 21 24; 1 Th 5 23). It is also applied to the life of faith or to men prominent in the kingdom of God (Mt 5 16; Jn 8 35; 2 Cor 4 6; Phil 2 15; 2 Pet 1 19); to the glory of God (Lk 2 9); to angelic appearances (Lk 24 4; Acts 12 7); or to Christ as He appeared to John on Patmos (Rev 1 10).

H. E. DOSEK
The Hebrews and the Sea.—The Hebrews were a pastoral and agricultural people, and had no inducements to follow a seafaring life. They were possessed of a considerable seaboards along the Mediterranean, but the charm of their coast gave little encouragement to navigation. The coast of the land of Israel from Carmel southward had no bays and no estuaries or river-mouths to offer shelter from storm or to be havens of ships. Solomon landed his timber and other materials for the Temple at Joppa, and tradition has handed down what is called “Solomon’s Harbor” there. The builders of the second temple also got timber from Lebanon and conveyed it to Joppa. It was Simon Maccabaeus, however, who built its harbor, and the harbor at Joppa was “the first and only harbor of the Jews” (G. A. Smith, HIGHL, 136). Caesarea in NT times was a place of shipping and possessed a harbor which Jos declared to be greater than the Piraeus, but it was Herodian and more Gr and Rom than Jewish. It was mostly inhabited by Greeks (Jos. B. I, 111, ix, 1). Now Caesarea has disappeared; and Joppa has only an open roadstead where vessels lie without shelter, and receive and discharge cargo and passengers by means of boats pulling between the pier and the shore. It was in other directions that Israel made acquaintance with the activities of the sea. Of internal navigation, beyond the fishing-boats on the Sea of Galilee which belong exclusively to the NT, the ferry boat on the Jordan (2 S 19, 18, 19; 1 K 19, 4) and ship are recognized, and even that is not perfectly clear (Rv “convoy,” but “a ford” is doubtless meant). It is from Tyre and Egypt and even Assyria and Babylonia, rather than from their own waters, that the Hebrew prophets and psalmists drew their pictures of seafaring life.

II. Ships in the OT and Apoc.—(1) In early times. —In the early books of the OT there are references connecting certain of the tribes, and the northern tribes, with the activities of the sea. (Gen 49 13; Dt 33 19); and in Deborah’s Song, which is acknowledged to be a very early fragment of Thoth. In Joshua, a “valley with a river” (Gen 49 13; Dt 33 19). The Oracle of Balaam (Nu 24 24) looks forward to a day when a fleet from Kittim should take the sea for the destruction of Assyria. “Ships of Kittim” are mentioned in Dnl (11 30). Kittim is referred to in the three greater Prophets (Isa 23 112; Jer 2 10; Ezek 27 6). The land of Kittim is Cyprus, and in the references in Isaiah it is associated with Tyre and the ships of Tarshish.

(2) During the monarchies.—It is not till the time of the monarchy that the Hebrews begin to figure as a commercial people. Already in the time of David commercial relations had been established between Israel and Tyre (2 Sm 5 11). The friendly cooperation was continued by Solomon, who acquired himself a fleet of cedar and the fir at Hiram’s command on Lebanon, but also of the skilled service of Hiram’s men to bring the timber from the mountains to the sea. Hiram also undertook to make the cedar and the fir into rafts (1 K 5 9, 13). The boats “floats” AV, “floats” RV) to go by sea and to deliver them to Solomon’s men.
at the place appointed, which the Chronicler tells us was Joppa. From this cooperation in the building of the Temple there grew up a larger connection in the pursuit of sea-borne commerce. It was at Ezion-geber near to Elath on the Red Sea, in the land of Edom which David had conquered, that Solomon had his fleet, "a hang-dry of ships" (1 K 9 26-28). Hiram joined Solomon in these enterprises which had their center on the Red Sea, and thus the Phoenicians had water communication with the coasts of Arabia and Africa, and even of India. The partnership existed for the commerce of the West. "For the king [Solomon] had at sea a navy of Tarshish with the navy of Hiram: once every three years came the navy of Tarshish, bringing gold, and silver, and ivory, and apes, and peacocks" (1 K 10 22).

Tarshish is the name of the Phoen colony on the river Tartessus, called also Baetis, the modern Guadalquivir. It was the farthest limit of the western world as known to the Hebrews. They had commerce with it with Tarsum of Cilicia, but they are not convincing. It is conceived of in Heb. lit. as remote (Isa 60 19; Jon 3; 4 2), as rich (Ps 72 10; Jer 16 9), as powerful in commerce (Ezk 27 13). Ships of Tarshish were no doubt ships actually built for the Tarshish trade (2 Ch 20 36f; Jon 1 3), but the expression became a general designation for large sea-going vessels to any quarter. Ships of Tarshish made a deep impression upon the imagination of the Heb people. The Psalmist takes it as a proof of the power of Jehovah that He breaks the ships of Tarshish with an east wind (Ps 48 7). Isaiah includes them among the vessels he hears living in the farthest region of power and glory which the terror of the Lord would certainly overtake (Isa 2 16). Ezekiel regards them as the carries that bore the merchandise of the mistress of the seas (27 25). It is in ships of Tarshish that the prophet of the Return sees the exiles home in crowds to Jerusalem as their natural home (Isa 60 9).

From Solomon's time onward the kings of Judah retained their hold upon Eloth (1 K 22 48f; 2 Ch 20 35-37) till it was seized by the Syrians in the days of Ahaz (2 K 16 6).

(3) In later times. - As Solomon had the cooperation of Hiram in securing materials and craftsmen for the building of the first Temple, so Joshua and Zerubbabel by the favor of Cyrus obtained timber from Lebanon, and masons and carpenters from Sidon and Tyre for the building of the second. After, cedar trees were brought from Lebanon by sea to Joppa, and thence conveyed to Jerusalem (Ezr 3 7).

From Joppa Jonah fled to avoid compliance with God's command to preach repentance there (Jon 1 1f). He found a ship bound for Tarshish as far toward the W. as Nainveh to the E. The fare (pakhakh) paid by a passenger is a monopoly charge, in which he stowed himself away (pakhakh), the crew (malakhiy), the captain or shipmaster (raash ha-kibkele), the storm, the angry sea, the terrified mariners and their cry to their gods, and the casting of Jonah overboard to appease the raging waters - all make a lifelike picture.

It was in the time of Simon, the last survivor of the Maccabean brothers, that Joppa became a seaport with a harbor for shipping. "Amid all his glory he took Joppa for a haven, and made it an entrance for the isles of the sea" (1 Mac 14 3). When Simon reared his monument over the sepulcher of his father and brothers, and at Modin, he set up seven pyramids with pillars, upon which were carved figures of ships to be "seen of all that sail on the sea" (1 Mac 13 29). About this period we hear of ships in naval warfare. When Antiochus IV Epiphanes planned his expedition against Egypt, he had with other armaments "a great navy," presumably ships of war (1 Mac 1 17); and at a later time Antiochus VII speaks expressly of "ships of war" (1 Mac 15 3).

(1) Egypt. - The Egyptians, like other nations of antiquity, had a great horror of the open sea, although they were expert enough in their own navigation. As the neighboring Pharaoh-necho built up a powerful navy to serve him both in commerce and in war. See PHARAOH-NECHO.

Of explicit references to Egypt ships in the OT there are but few. Isaiah speaks of vessels of papyrus upon the waters" of the Upper Nile, on board of which are the messengers of Cush or Ethiopia returning to tell the tidings of the overthrow of Assyria to the inhabitants of those remote lands (18 2 AV has "balsashes" instead of "papyrus"). Ezekiel also, foretelling the overthrow of Egypt, speaks of messengers traveling with the news on swift Nile boats to strike terror into the hearts of the "curious Ethiopians" (30 9). When Jeh compares his days to "the swift ships" ("the ships of reed" RVm), the allusion is most likely to Egypt's, these being skiffs with a wooden keel and the rest of buoys, sufficient to carry one person, or at most two, and light, to travel swiftly (9 20).

(2) Assyria and Babylonia. - The Assyrians and Babylonians were mainly an inland people, but their rivers gave them considerable scope for navigation. The Assyrian monuments contain representations of naval engagements and of operations on the seacoast. When Isaiah pictures Jeh as a better defender of Judah than the rivers and streams, and compares himself to them in which he stowed himself away (pakhakh), the crew (malakhiy), the captain or shipmaster (raash ha-kibkele), the storm, the angry sea, the terrified mariners and their cry to their gods, and the casting of Jonah overboard to appease the raging waters - all make a lifelike picture.

There are mentions in the Assyrian annals of "seamen" being driven to ship as refugees by war, and coming into the sea "in the days of Sennacherib" (18 2), to which the prophet refers (21 3). Speaking of Jeh's wonders to be performed toward His people after Babylon had been overthrown, the prophet declares: "Thus saith Jeh, your Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel: For your sake I have sent to Babylon, and I will bring down all of them as fugitives, even the Chaldeans, in the ships of their rejoicing" (43 14). In this case, however, the ships are not passenger ships, but more probably merchant ships, or ships for pleasure, sailing in the Euphrates.

(3) Phoenicia. - It was from the Phoenicians that the Mediterranean people learned seamanship and skill in navigation. It is strange, therefore, that in his dirge over the downfall of the mistress of the sea, Ezekiel should represent Tyre as a gallant ship, well built, well furnished, and well manned, broken by the seas in the depths of the waters, fallen into the heart of the seas in the day of her ruin. Ezekiel's description (ch 27, with Davidson's notes) brings together more of the features of the ship of antiquity than any other that has come down to us. Her builders have made her perfect in beauty with planks of fir or cypress, most of cedar, cars of the oak of Bashan, benches or deck of ivory inlaid with boxwood, sail of fine linen with brodered work from Egypt, and an awning of blue and purple
from the coasts of Eliahah (possibly Sicily). She is named with oarsmen of Sidon and Arvad, pilots of the wise men of Tyre, calkers from Gebal to stop up the cracks and seams in her timbers, mariners and men of war from other lands who enhanced her beauty by hanging up the shield and helmet with figs. She is fitted with the most varied cargo, the produce of the lands around, her customers, or as they are called, her traffickers, being Tarshish in the far W., Sheba and Arabia in the S., Haran and Asshur in the E., Javan which is Greece, and Tarshish, which is Spain, in the W.

One or two of the particulars of this description may be commented upon. (a) As regards rigging, the Phoenician ships of the time of Ezekiel, as seen in Assyrian representations, had one mast with one yard and carried a square sail. Egyptian ships on the Red Sea about the time of the Exodus, from relics of the XIXth Dynasty, had one mast and two yards, and carried also one large square sail. The masts and yards were made of fir or of pine, and the sails of linen, but the fiber of macephorus was employed as well as flax in the manufacture of sail-cloth. The sail had also to serve "for an ensign" (Ezek. Ekk. 77). The flag proper," says Davidson (ad loc.), "seems not to have been used in ancient navigation; its purpose was to indicate as for example in the battle Actium the ship of Antony was distinguished by its purple sail.

(b) As regards the crew, in the two-hanked Phoenician ship the rowers of the first bank work their oars over the gunwale, while those of the second banks lower down, so that each may have free play for his oar. The calkers were those who filled up seams or cracks in the planking and covered them with tar and wax, after the manner of the instruction given to Noah regarding the Ark. "Then shalt thou set pitch within and without with pitch" (Gen 6 14).

(c) As regards cargo, it is to be noted that "the persons of men, that is, slaves, formed an article of merchandise in which Javan, Tubal, and Meshech, countries to the N., traded with Tyre.

Of general references to shipping and seafaring life there are comparatively few in the OT. In his great series of Nature-pictures in 3. General Ps 104, the Psalmist finds a place for References the sea and ships (vs 25 ff), and in Ps 107 there is a picture of the storm overtaking them that go down to the sea in ships, and of the deliverance that comes to them when God "bringeth them into their desired haven" (vs 23 ff). In the Book of Prov the ideal woman who brings her food from far is like "the merchant ships" (31 14). In the same book the drunkard, because of his unnatural insensibility to danger, is likened to a man "that lieth down in the midst of the sea, or as he that lieth upon the top of a mast" (33 34); and among the inscrutable things of the world the writer includes "the way of a ship in the midst of the sea" (30 19). In Wisd, human life is described "as a ship passing through the billoowy water, whereof, when it is gone by, there is no trace to be found, neither pathway of its keel in the billoows" (5 10). The same book notes it as a striking example of the case of a divine and beneficent Providence that "men intrust their lives to a little piece of wood, and passing through the surge on a raft are brought safe to land" (14 1 5). The Jews like the Egyptians and the Assyrians had a natural shrinking from the sea, and the Ecclesiasticus interprets their feeling when he says: "They that sail on the sea tell of the danger thereof; and when we hear it with our ears, we marvel" (43 24).

III. Ships in the NT. - It is the fishing-boats of the Sea of Galilee which exclusively occupy attention in the Gospels. In the time of Our Lord's ministry in Galilee the shores of the Sea were densely peopled, and there must have been many boats engaged in the fishing industry. Bethsaida at the northern end of the Lake and Tarichaeas at the southern end were great centers of the trade. The boats were probably of a size and built similar to the few employed on the Lake today, which are between 20 and 30 ft. in length and 7 ft. in breadth. The word "launch," of putting a boat or a ship into the sea, has disappeared from RV, except in Lk 8 22, where it is more appropriate to an inland lake. They were propelled by oars, but no doubt also made use of the sail when the wind was favorable (Lk 8 23), though the pictures which we have in the Gospels are mostly of the boatmen toiling in rowing in the teeth of a gale (Mk 6 48), and struggling with the threatening waves (Mt 14 24). In the boat on which Jesus and the disciples were crossing the Lake after the feeding of the 5,000, Jesus was in the stern "asleep on the cushion" (Mk 4 38, AV "a pillow"; Gr proskephtasian, "headrest"). More than once Jesus made special use of a boat. As He was by the seashore a great concourse of people from all parts made it desirable that "a small boat" (ploiarion) should be in attendance off the shore to receive Him in case of need, though He does not seem to have required it (Mk 3 9). On another occasion, when the crowds were still greater, He went into a boat and sat "in the sea with the multitude on the sloping beach before Him (Mk 4 1; Lk 5 3). This boat is said in St. Luke's narrative to have been Simon's, and it seems from references to it as "the boat" on other occasions to have been generally at the disposal of Jesus. It is St. Paul's voyages which yield us the knowledge that we possess from Bib. sources of ships in NT times. They are recorded for us in the Acts by St. Luke, who, as Sir William Ramsay puts it, had the true Apostles' feeling for the sea (St. Paul the Traveller, 21). In St. Luke's writings there are many nautical terms, peculiar to him, used with great exactitude and precision.

When St. Paul was at Malta and was proceeding to Rome in charge of Julius, the centurion, along with other prisoners, a ship of Adramytium, a coasting vessel, carried the party from Caesarea along the Syrian coast, northward of Cyprus, past Cilicia and Pamphylia, to Myra of Lycia. There the centurion found a ship of Alexandria sailing for Italy, one of the great corn fleet carrying grain from Egypt for the multitudes of Rome. (After the capture of Jerusalem by Titus returned to Italy in such a vessel, touching at Rhegium and landing at Puteoli.) The size of the vessel is indicated by the fact that there were 276 persons on board, crew and passengers all told (Acts 27 37). St. Luke has made no note of the name of this or of the previous vessels in which St. Paul had voyaged. Of the presumably larger vessel, also an Alexandrian corn ship bound for Rome, which had wintered in Melita, and which afterward took on board the shipwrecked party

Roman Ship from Tomb at Pompeii.
(Acts 28:11), "the sign! (παράσημον, parásēmon) is given, and she is called "The Twin Brothers." The expression shows that it was in painting or relief; a figurehead, with the Twin Brothers represented, would be given by τέμνων, epítemn. The cargo (φορτίον, phortion, Acts 27:20, AV and RV "lading") in this case was wheat (27:38), but another word is used, γάνος, gánmos, by St. Luke of a ship's load of wheat (Acts 21:36; cf. Rev 18:11 ff.).

Of those engaged in handling the ship we find (ver 11) the master (κυρίερην, kuríēren), the owner (παλαιός, παλαϊός, although this expression seems not quite consistent with the ownership of a cargo ship, cf. the commercial service, and Ramsay's distinction between the words, meaning the former "sailing-master" and the latter "captain," may be better), the sailors (vers 30, who treacherously sought to lower the ship's boat on the pretence of laying out anchors from the "foreship" or prow, and to get away from the doomed vessel).

Of operations belonging to the navigation of the vessel in the storm there were (1) the taking on board of the ship's boat and securing it with ropes (ver 16, in which operation St. Luke seems to have taken part; cf. ver 32), (2) the undergirding of the ship (ver 17, using helps, that is taking making use of certain means of relief, adopting the eldritch, only resorted to in extremities, of passing cables under the keel of the ship to keep the hull together (ver 19, taking soundings (ver 28), (5) letting go four anchors from the stern (ver 29, stern-anchoring being very unusual, but a necessity in the circumstances), (7) further lightening the ship by throwing the wheat into the sea (ver 28), (8) cutting the anchor cables, unlashing the rudders, hoisting up the foresail to the wind, and holding straight for the beach (ver 40).

Of the parts of the ship's equipment there are mentioned "the sounding lead" (βολίτ, bolús, though it is the vb. which is here used), "the anchors" (ἐξωρία, ἐξωρια, of which every ship carried several, and which at successive periods have been made of stone, iron, lead and perhaps other metals, each having two flukes and being held by a cable or a chain), "the rudders" (παράθων, pàrathōn, of which every ship had two for steering, which in this case had been lifted out of the water and secured by "bands" to the side of the ship and unlashed when the critical moment came), "the foresail" (στόμια, στόμιa), not the mainail, but the small sail at the bow of the vessel which at the right moment was hoisted to the wind to run her ashore), and "the boat" (σκάπη, skápē, which had been in tow in the wake of the vessel, according to custom still prevalent in those "coasting-vessels being sometimes bcalmed, when the crew got into the small boat and take the ship in tow, using the oars to get her round a promontory or into a position more favorable for the wind)." The season for navigation in those seas in ancient times was from April to October. During the winter the vessels were laid up, or remained in the shelter of some suitable haven. The reason for this was not simply the tempestuous character of the weather, but the obscurity of the heavens which prevented observations being taken for the steering of the ship (Acts 27:20).

In 2 Cor 11:25 St. Paul mentions among sufferings he had endured for Christ's sake that thrice he had suffered shipwreck, and that he had been "a night and a day in the deep," implying that he had been in danger of his life clinging to a spar, or borne upon the vessel's constructed raft. It may be a reminiscence of the sea when St. Paul in the very earliest of his Epistles (1 Thess 2:19), speaking of the coming of the Lord, says, "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout! (ἐφ ορθέων, εἰκωθείς, with a voice, and a trumpet, as the angel of the covenant, hēlēw, giving the time to the rowers on board the ship. Although ἀνάρρυτος, ἀνάρρυτας, was "an underrover," and ἀνάρρυτος, ἀνάρρυτας, "the crew of a ship," as contrasted with κυρίερην, kuríēren, "the sailing-master," the derived meaning of "serving," or "officer," has lost in the NT all trace of its origin (Mt 5:25; Lk 1:2 and many passages; of σέβαλεν, sēbālein, and σεβάλειν, sēbālein, where the idea of "furling" or "shifting a sail" is entirely lost: 1 Cor 7:29; 2 Cor 8:20).

Figurative: In the hope of the godly is figured as "an anchor, sure and steadfast, entering into that which is within the veil" (6:19, esp. with Ebrard's note in Oxford, etc. ad loc. in St. James, showing how a simple thing, that is, the anchor and ship, adorns the hearth, which is the ship, and the anchor the ship). The anchor, as the steersman wills, is a "keeper of the door." In Rev there is a representation of the fall of Babylon in the New Jerusalem reminiscence of Judges "Jeho's in Egypt." In Egypt, in what lamentations arises from the merchants of the earth who can no more buy her varied merchandise (τον γάνον, τον γάνον, "cargo" RV) and shipmasters and passengers and seafaring people look in terror and stand upon the smoke of her burning (Rev 18:13-16).

LITERATURE—The usual books on Gr and Rom antiquities furnish descriptions and illustrations, Works on the monuments like Layard, Niniveh. 379 ff.; Maspero, Ancient Egypt and Assyria; Ball, Light from the East, and Reissner, Cairo Museum Catalogue, "Models of Ships and Boats," 1903, contain descriptions and figured representations which are instructive. On shipping and navigation in classical antiquity Smith of Jordanhill. Voyages and Shipwreck of St. Paul, is still the standard authority.

T. NICOL

SHISHIA, shiš'ha (σίσια, shishā): One of Solomon's officers of state (1 K 4:3).

SHISHAK, shiš'ak (σισακ, shišak [1 K 14:25]; Σωφρατός, Sowfratós): Sheshonk or Sheshonq I, who is called on his monuments the "conqueror of Gebal" (1 K 15:19). He is the founder of the XXIIId Dynasty, was 952-930 BC in all probability of Libyan origin. It is possible that his claim to the throne was that of the sword, but it is more likely that he acquired it by marriage with a princess of the dynasty preceding. On the death of Pasekbanhu II, the last of the kings of the XXIst Dynasty, 952 BC, Shishak ascended the throne, with an efficient army and a well-equipped treasury at his command. He was a warlike prince and cherished dreams of Asiatic dominion. He had not long been seated on the throne when Jeroboam the son of Nebat, of the tribe of Ephraim, whom Solomon had promoted but whom Rehoboam had cast aside, had called on the court of Shishak (1 K 11:26 ff.).

2. Patron of Erez. Shishak had cast aside Jeroboam from the displeasure of his sovereign to the court of Shishak (1 K 11:26 ff.).

There Jeroboam remained till the death of Solomon, when he returned to Canaan, and, on Rehoboam's retiring, and an unsatisfactory answer to the people's demands for relief from their burdens, headed the revolt of the Ten Tribes, over whom he was chosen king with his capital at Shechem (1 K 12:25 ff.). Whether there was not in the XXIst Dynasty some kind of suzerainty of Egypt over Fal, when Solomon married Pharaoh's daughter and received with her Gezer as a dowry, seems not to be clearly established.
It is, however, natural that Jeroboam's patron in the day of adversity should take sides with him against Rehoboam, now that the kingdom was divided. Active support of Jeroboam would be in the line of his dreams of an eastern empire.

So it came to pass that in the 5th year of Rehoboam, Shishak came up against Jerus with 1,200 chariots, and 60,000 horsemen, and people without number out of Egypt, the Libyans, Sukkites, and Ethiopians, and took the fenced cities of Judah, and came to Jerusalem. At the preaching of the prophet

**3. Syrian Campaign**

Shemaijah, Rehoboam, and his people repeat, and Jerus was saved from destruction, though not from plunder nor from servitude, for he became Shishak's servant. (2 Ch 12 8). Shishak took away the treasures of the house of the Lord and the treasures of the king's house, carrying off among the most precious of the spoils all the shields of gold which Solomon had made (1 K 14 25 ff; 2 Ch 12 1–9). From the Scripture narrative it does not appear that there was any occupation of Pal by the Egypt forces on this occasion.

There is, however, a remarkable contemporary record of the campaign engraved on the south wall of the Temple of Amon at Karnak by Shishak himself. Not only is the expedition recorded, but there is a list of districts and towns of Pal granted to his victories by Amon-Ra and the goddess of Thebes engraved there. A number of towns mentioned in the Book of Jos have been identified, and among the names of the list are Rabbath, Taannach, Gibeon, Mahanaim, Beth-horon and other towns both of Israel and Judah. That names of places in the Northern Kingdom are mentioned in the list does not imply that Shishak had directed his armies against Jeroboam and plundered his territories. It was the custom in antiquity for a victorious monarch to include among conquered cities any place that paid tribute or was under suspicion, whether captured in war or not; and it was sufficient reason for Shishak to include these Israelite places that Jeroboam, as soon probably, had invited him to come to his aid. Among the names in the list was "Jud-ha-malek"—Yehudah, the kingdom of Judah, which was at first believed to be the name of the king of Judah, with a flourish which passed for Rehoboam. Being, however, a place-name, it is now recognized to be the town Yehudah, belonging to the king. On the death of Shishak his successor assumed a nominal suzerainty over the land of Canaan.
SHOBAB, shō'bab (םֹבָב, shōḇāḇ; סֹבָב, Sōḇāḇ): (1) One of the sons of David (2 S 5 14; 1 Ch 3 5; 14 4). (2) A son of Caleb (1 Ch 2 18).

SHOBACH, shō'bak (םֹבָך, shōḇāḵ; סֹבָך, Sōḇāḵ; Sōḇāḵ, Sōḇāḵ): Captain of the Syrian host (2 S 10 16 18); but “Shochach” (םֹבָך, shōḇāḵ) in 1 Ch 19 16 18.

SHOBAL, shō’bal (םֹבַל, shōḇāl; סֹבַל, Sōḇāl, Sōḇāl; Sōḇāl, Sōḇāl): The head of one of the families which returned from the Bab captivity (Ezr 2 42; Neh 7 45).

SHOBAL, shō’bal (םֹבַל, shōḇāl; סֹבַל, Sōḇāl, Sōḇāl): One of those who sealed the covenant under Nehemiah after the Bab captivity (Neh 10 24).

SHOBI, shō’bi (םֹבִי, shoḇī; Osēbē, Osēbē): One of those who remained faithful to David during the rebellion of Absalom (2 S 17 27).

SHOCHOH, shō’kō (םֹכֹה, shoḵōh; ב, Sōḵō; Sōḵō, Sōḵō; Sōḵō, Sōḵō): This in 1 S 17 1 AV is a variant of Sōcoh (q.v.).

SHOES, sho’ēs, SHOE-LATCHET, sho’ēlach-ēt (שֹׁלֶחֶט, ‘šōlēḵēt, ‘šōlēḵēt), na’al, lit. “that which is fastened,” with denominative vb. šēmāl, “to provide with

27): The na’al was a simple piece of leather tied on the foot with the šēmāl, so easy of construction that its low cost was proverbial (Am 2 6; 8 6; Sir 46 19; cf Gen 14 23), and to be without it was a sign of extreme poverty (2 Ch 23 15; Isa 20 2). Women, however, might have ornamental sandals (Cant 1 17; 2 Ch 18 9, 10), and Ezekiel names “sealskin” (16 10) as a particularly luxurious material, but the omission of sandals from the list of Isa 3 18 23 shows that they were not commonly made articles of great expense. The hupōdēma was likewise properly a sandal, but the word was also used to denote a shoe that covered the foot. The contrast between hupōdēma in Mt 10 10 and sandalōn in Mk 6 9 seems to show that this meaning is not unknown in the NT, the “shoe” being regarded as an article of luxury (cf Lk 15 22). But in Mt 3 11 and 5, only the sandal can be meant.

Sandals were not worn indoors, so that putting them on was a sign of readiness for activity (Ex 12 11; Acts 12 8; Eph 6 15), the more wealthy having them brought (Mt 3 11) and fastened (Mk 1 7 and 18) by slaves. When one entered a house they were removed; all the more, naturally, on entering a sanctuary (Ex 3 5; Josh 15 18; Jer 7 33). Mourners, however, did not wear them even out of doors, as a sign of grief (Ezk 24 17 23), perhaps for the same reason that other duties of the toilet were neglected (2 S 12 20, etc.). A single long journey out of a pair of sandals (Josh 7 15; 9 15), and the preservation of the “latchet of their shoes” from being broken (Isa 5 27) would require almost miraculous help.

Ruth 4 7 states as a “custom in former times in Israel,” that when any bargain was closed, “a man drew off his shoe, and gave it to his neighbor.” This was of course simply a special form of earnest-money, used in all transactions. In Dt 25 9 it the custom appears in a different light. If a man refused to perform his duty to his deceased brother’s wife, the seller of the land were to remove his shoe and disarm him publicly. “And his name shall be called in Israel, The house of him that hath his shoe loosed.” The removal of the shoe is apparently connected with the rite in Ruth 4 7 as a remanuence of the man’s privilege. But the general custom seems to have become obsolete, for the removal of the shoe is now a reproach.

The meaning of Ps 60 8 108 9, “Upon [m unto]” Edom will I cast my shoe,” is uncertain. דָּעַל, ‘al, may mean either “upon” or “unto.” If the former, some otherwise unsubstantiated custom of asserting ownership of the land may be meant. If the latter, this meaning is “Edom I will treat as a slave,” to whom the shoe is cast on entering a house.

BurtON Scott Easton

SHOHAM, shō’ham (שֹׁהָם, shōhām, “onyx”; B, Ṣōḏām, Ṣōḏām; Ṣōḏām, Ṣōḏām): One of the sons of Merari (1 Ch 24 27).

SHOMER, shōmēr (שֹׁמְר, shōmēr): (1) The father of one of the conspirators who killed Joash (2 K 12 21). See Shimeath.

(2) One of the sons of Heber of the tribe of Asher (1 Ch 7 32). See Shimer.

SHOPACH, shō’fak. See Shorach.

SHOPHAN, shō’fān (שֹׁפָן, shōphān). See Atroph-Shophan.

SHORE, shōr: (1) רֹאשׁ, ṭōšh, always of the Mediterranean, variously transl. as, “beach,” “shore,” “seashore,” “coast,” “sea-coast,” “sea-shore” (Gen 19 13; Dt 1 7; Josh 9 1; Jgs 5 17; Jer 47 7; Ezek 25 16). (2) רְפָּף, ṣāḇāph, lit. “lip,” “lip’” of Arab. ạ̀bà, shafad, “lip’” of the sand upon the seashore, a figure of multitude (Gen 23 17; Ex 14 30; Josh 11 4; Jgs 7 12; 1 S 13 5; 1 K 4 29); the shore of the Red Sea or Gulf of ’Ahabah.
by Ezion-geber (1 K 9 26; 2 Ch 8 17), the brink of the River Nile (Gen 41 13 17); the edge (AV “brink”) of the valley of Arnon (Dt 2 36). (3) ἐμφύεσθαι, kōpōth, lit. “end,” “extremity,” the uttermost part (AV “shore”) of the Salt Sea (Josh 15 2); ἐμφύεσθαι, ἐχθαρβήσαι, “the end of the earth” (Ps 46 9; cf. Arab. ḏhāl-rāb, “the uttermost parts of the earth.”) (4) kēlōs, Ūkēlōs, lit. “height” as the upper part is by the sea shore” (He 11 12). (5) aigavlōs, aigalōs, the beach (AV “shore”) of the Sea of Galilee (Mt 13 2. 48; Jn 21 4); of the Mediterranean (Acts 21 5; 27 39. 40). (6) ἀσσον παρελθόντα τῷ Κρήτῃ, ἄσσον παρελθόντοι τῷ Κρήτῃ, doubtful reading, “sailed along Crete, close in shore” (AV “sailed, won by Crete”) (Acts 27 13). See COAST; HAVEN; SAND.

ALFRED ELY DAY

SHORTEN, shōr-tən: The Heb word shārēr and the Gr kolōdōl lit. indicate abbreviation of time or space (Ps 89 45; Prov 10 27; Ezk 43 5); figuratively they point to limitation of power or of suffering (Nu 11 23; Isa 50 2; 59 1; Mt 24 22; Mk 13 20).

SHOSHANNIM EDUTH, shō-shan-im ʾe-dūth. See Song; Psalms.

SHOULDER, shōldér (םְשֵׁלד, ʾskhem, ʾšē, kāthēp, נְשֵׁלד, נְשׁוֹד, נְשַׁד, אֵשׁוֹד; ʾšōs, ʾšōs; ʾbēshōk, ʾbēshōw, ʾbēshōw, ʾbēchōn; ʾšōkāni, ʾšōkāni, ʾšōkāni, ᾿kāhēph): The shoulder of the body is used as the head of the altar on which heavy loads are carried (Gen 21 14; 24 15.45; Ex 12 34; Josh 4 5; Jgs 9 48). King Saul's impressive personality is thus described: "There was not among the children of Israel a goodlier person than he: from his shoulders and upward he was higher than any of the people" (1 S 9 2; 10 23). To carry loads on the shoulder or to have "a staff on the shoulder" is expressive of subjection and servitude, yea, of oppression and cruel punishment, and the removal of such burdens or of the rod of the oppressor connotes delivery and freedom ( Isa 9 4; 14 25).

Figuratively: The shoulders also bear responsibility and power. Thus it is said of King Messiah, "He shall take upon his shoulders... the key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder; and he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open" (22 22). Job declares that he will refute all accusations of unlawful conduct made against him, in the words: "Oh that I had the indictment which mine adversary hath written! Surely I would carry it upon my shoulder." (Job 31 35, 36.

The Heb word kāthēp comes very close in meaning to the above, though it is occasionally used in the sense of arm- and shoulder-piece of a garment. It is used to describe the part of the body accustomed to carry loads. On it the Levites carried the implements of the sanctuary (Nu 7 9; 1 Ch 15 15; 2 Ch 35 3). Oriental mothers and fathers carried their children on the shoulder astride (Isa 49 22; cf 60 4); thus also the Holy Land folk carried their babies (Ezk 12 1; 12).

The loaded shoulder is likely to be "worn" or chafed under the burden (29 18). In the two passages of the NT in which we find the Gr equivalent of shoulder (ὅμος, fairly common in Apoc.), it corresponds most closely with this use (Mt 23 4; Lk 15 5). Of the shoulders of animals the word kāthēp is used in Ezk 34 21 (of sheep, where, however, men are intended) and in Isa 30 6 (of asses).

Stubborn opposition and unwillingness is expressed by "withdrew the shoulder" (Neh 9 29), or "pulled away the shoulder" (Zec 7 11), where the meaning of "shoulder" is this: they gave "turned the shoulder," a stubborn shoulder." Contrast "how the shoulder," i.e. "submit" (Bar 2 21). Of "stiffnecked"; see NECK. Somewhat difficult for the understanding of Occidentals is the poetical passage in the blessing of David to his son Solomon (1 K 4 21). The belief of Jeh shall dwell in safety by him; he covereth him all the day long, and he dwelleth between his shoulders" (Dt 33 12). The "shoulders" refer here to the mountain saddles and proclivities of the territory of Benjamin between which Jesus, the beloved of Jeh, which belonged to Judah, lay nestling close upon the confines of the neighboring tribe, or even built in part on ground belonging to Benjamin.

Much less frequently than the above-mentioned words, we find ἐρν, ἐρνα, which is used of the "bald shoulder of the ram" which was a wave offering at the consecration of a Nazirite (Nu 6 19) and of one of the priests' portions in the sacrifice (Dt 18 3); in Sir 7 31 this portion is called brachion, properly "arm," but both AV and RV translate "shoulder." In the OT no and heave offerings see SACRIFICE. AV frequently translates Heb ᾿adak, lit. "leg," "thigh" (q.v.) by shoulder, which RV occasionally retains (e.g. Neh 6 20).

H. L. E. LUBRINGER

SHOULDER-BLADE, shōldér-blād (םְשֵׁלד, ʾšīkmānāh): "Then let my shoulder [kāthēph] fall from the shoulder-blade [šīkmānāh], and mine arm [z’ro'] be broken from the bone [kānekān]" (Job 31 32). The Heb word is the fem. form of šīkmēn (see SHOULDER). It is found only in this passage.

SHOULDER-PIECE, shōldér-pīs (םֵעֲצָת, ʾkāhēph): The word designates the two straps or pieces of cloth which passed from the back of the ephod (see EPHOD) of the high priest over the shoulder and were fastened at the front. These shoulder-pieces seem to have been made of a precious texture of linen (or byssos) with threads of gold, blue, purple and scarlet, to which two onyx (or beryl) stones were attached bearing the names of six tribes of Israel each. These are called the "stones of memorial" (Ex 39 18). Each of these stones was fastened the plaited or woven bands ("wreathed chains") from which, by means of two golden rings, the breastplate was suspended. It is by no means clear from the descriptions (Ex 28 7.12-25; 39 4.7.18.20) how we have to imagine the form and attachment of these shoulder-pieces. It has been thought that the ephod might be of Egypt origin, which is not very probable, though V. Ancessi, Annales de philosophie chrétienne, 1872, 45 ff, reproduces some representations from the great work of Lepsius, Denkmäler, where costly royal garments have two shoulder straps, like the ephod. Usually Egyptian garments have no shoulder strap, or at most one.

H. L. E. LUBRINGER

SHOVEL, shōv’l: (1) ʾṣōqō, ṭūrab, is a wooden shovel used on the threshing floor for winnowing the grain (Isa 30 24). (2) ᾿γαθ, ᾿γαθ, is used in various passages to indicate some instrument employed to carry away ashes from the altar ( Ex 27 3; 38 3; Nu 14; 1 K 7 40.45; 2 K 25 16; 2 Ch 4 11.16; Jer 52 15). It was very likely a small shovel or those used in connection with modern fireplaces for cleaning away the ashes of (Heb ᾿adāh, "to sweep away") or for carrying live coals to start a new fire. (3) ᾿γαθ, ᾿yādēth (Dt 23 13 RVm).

JAMES A. PATCH

SHOW, shō. See Savor.
SHOWBREAD, shōb'red. See Shewbread.

SHOWBREAD, TABLE OF. See Shewbread, Table of.

SHOWER, shō'ər. (1) הַשָּׁוָר, ṣḥāḇḥām, a pl. form apparently denoting gentle rain, usually used figuratively, as in Dt 32:2; Ps 72:6; Mic 5:7. (2) סְבֹּר, geshem, used of gentle rain in Job 37:6: “shower of rain,” AV “small rain”; used of the flood in Gen 7:12. Figuratively, of blessing, “showers of blessing” (Ex 34:26): of destruction: “There shall be an overflowing shower in mine anger, and great hailstones in wrath to consume it” (Ezk 13:13). (3) רֹב, zeren, usually storm or tempest (cf Isa 4:28; 26:2): “They are wet with the showers of the mountain” (Job 24:8). (4) נְדוֹס, ṣmārōn (Lk 12:54). Rain is unknown in Pal in the long summer of 5 or 6 months. A few showers usually fall in September, succeeded by fine weather for some weeks before the beginning of the heavy and long-continued winter rains.

ALFRED ELY DAY

SHRINE, shrin (rōaṣ, nādē): In Acts 19:24 small models of temples for Diana.

SHROUD, shroud (םֹר, holēs, “bough”): Winding-sheet for the dead. See BURLA. Used also in AV, ERS Exk 31:3 in the rare old sense of “shelter,” “covering.” ARV has “a forest-like shade” (םֹר, ḫōresh, “wood,” “wooded height”) (Isa 17,9, etc.). Cf Milton, Comus, 147.


SHUA, SHUAH, šō'ā: (1) (םוֹר, šō'ā), “prosperity”: A Canaanite whose daughter Judah took to wife (Gen 38:2.12; 1 Ch 2:3; see BATH-SHA).

(2) (םוֹר, šādāʾ, “prosperity”): Daughter of Heber, an Asherite (1 Ch 7:32).

(3) (םוֹר, šāb, “depression”): A son of Keturah by Abraham (Gen 25:2; 1 Ch 1:32), and his posterity. See BILDAD.

(4) A brother of Caleb (1 Ch 4:11). See SHUHAH.

SHUAL, shō'āl (םוֹר, šādāl): An Asherite (1 Ch 7:36).

SHUAL, LAND OF (םוֹר, šphēl, “ereq šhāl; Ḥ šaal, hē Sāqēl): From their encampment at Michmash the Philis sent out marauding bands, one going westward toward Beth-horon, another eastward, “the way of the border that looketh down upon the valley of Zeboim.” The pass to the S. was held against them by Israel. The third party therefore went northward, turning “unto the way that leadeth to Ophrah, unto the land of Shual” (1 S 13:17). Ophrah is probably identical with et-Tanibeh, a village which lies some 5 miles E. of Beitin (Bethel). It is in this district therefore that the land of Shual must be sought, but no definite identification is possible.

W. Ewing

SHUBAEL, shō'ba-el, shō'ba-el (םוֹר, šabādel): (1) A Levite, son of Amran (1 Ch 24:20); one of the leaders of song in the temple (1 Ch 25:20). See SHERUEL; Gray, T.P.N. 190.

(2) A son of Hemam (1 Ch 25:4). See SHERUEL.

SHUHAB, shō'ha (םוֹר, šahāb, “depression”): A brother of Caleb (1 Ch 4:11).

SHUHAM, shō'ham (םוֹר, šāḥām): Son of Dan, ancestor of the Shubamites (Nu 26:42f). In Gen 46:23 called “Hushim.”

SHUHTE, shō'ht (םוֹר, šāḥāt): Cognomen of Bildad, one of Job’s friends (Job 2:11; 8:1, 18:1; 25:1, 42:9). The place referred to cannot be definitely located. See BILDAD; SHUH.

SHULAMMITE, shō'lä-mit (Cant 6:13, AV “Shulamite”). See SHUNAMMITE.

SHUMATHITES, shō'math-its (םוֹר, шуматі, shumātī): One of the families of Kirath-jeearim (1 Ch 2:53).

SHUNAMMITE, shō'na-mit (םוֹר, шумаміт, šhumamīt, šhamamīt, šhunamīt; B, Šumamīt, Šumamīt, A, Šoumamīt, Šoumamīl): Applied to natives of Shunem.

(1) Abishag, who was brought to minister to the aged king David, love for whom led Adonijah to his doom (1 K 1:315; 2 17, etc.).

(2) The woman, name unknown, whose son Elisha raised from the dead (2 K 12, etc). Later when apparently she had become a widow, after seven years’ absence on account of famine, in the land of the Philis, she returned to find her property in the hands of others. Elisha’s intervention secured its restoration (8:1-6).

(3) The Shulamite (Cant 6:13). In this name there is the exchange of ṭ for ṣ which is common.

W. Ewing

SHUNEM, shō'nom (םוֹר, шнен, šānem; B, Šonav, Šounān, A, Šoumav, Šoudnā): A town in the territory of Issachar named with Jezreel and Chesolith (Josh 19:18). Before the battle of Gilboa the Philis pitched their camp here. They and the army of Saul, stationed on Gilboa, were in full view of each other (1 S 28:4). It was the scene of the touching story recorded in 2 K 4:8-37, in which the prophet Elisha raises to life the son of his Shunamite benefactress. Onom describes it as a village called Sulem, 5 Roman miles S. of Mt. Tabor. This points to the modern Safaim, a village surrounded by cactus hedges and orchards on the lower south-western slope of Jebel ed-Duby ("Hill of Moreh"). It commands an uninterrupted view across the plain of Esdraelon to Mt. Carmel, which is about 15 miles distant. It also looks out across the valley of Jezreel to the slopes of Gilboa on the S. It therefore meets satisfactorily the conditions of Josh and 1 S. A question has, however, been raised as to its identity with the Shunem of 2 K 4. Elisha’s home was in Samaria. Apparently Carmel was one of his favorite haunts. If he passed Shunem “continually” (ver 9), going to and coming from the mountain, it involved a very long detour if this were the village visited. It would seem more natural to identify the Shunem of Elisha with the Samim of Onom, which is said to be in the territory of Sebaste (Samaria), in the region of Akkrabatta, or perhaps with Sulem, fully a mile N. of Taanach, as nearer the line of travel between Samaria and Carmel.

There is, however, nothing to show that Elisha’s visits to Shunem were paid on his journeys between Samaria and Carmel. It may have been his custom to visit certain cities on circuit, on business calling for his personal attention, e.g. in connection with the “schools of the prophets” materials do not exist on which any certain conclusion can rest. Both Suleam and Safaim are on the edge of the splendid grain fields of Esdraelon (2 K 4:18).

W. Ewing
SHUNI, sbe'òl(h), SHUNITES, sbe'òlnits (šùnî, šùnît): One of the sons of Gad and his descendants (Gen 46:16; Nu 26:15).

SHUPHAM, sīòfam, SHUPHAMITES, sīòf-' fam-īts. See SHEEPHUPHAM.

SHUPPIM, sīòp'm (šùpš, shuppim): (1) One of the descendants of Benjamin (1 Ch 7 12.15). (2) One of the porters in the temple (1 Ch 26:16). See MUPPIN; SHEEPHUPHAM.

SHUR, šūr, šbôr (šùr, šâr; Šîbû, Šôr): The name of a desert E. of the Gulf of Suez. The word means a “wall,” and may probably refer to the mountain wall of the Tib plateau as visible from the shore plains. In Gen 16:7 Hagar at Kadesh (‘āín ḳādēš) (see ver 14) is said to have been “in the way to Shur.” Abraham also lived “between Kadesh and Shur” (Gen 20:1). The position of Shur is defined (Gen 25:18) as being “opposite Egypt on the south to Assur.” After crossing the Red Sea (Ex 15:4) the Hebrews entered the desert of Shur (ver 22), which extended southward a distance of three days’ journey. It is again noticed (1 S 17:5 7) as being opposite Egypt, and (28:7) as near Egypt. The place thus no longer occupies the same site, for on the E. of the Red Sea, and of the Bitter Lakes.

Bruesch, however, proposed to regard Shur (“the wall”) as equivalent to the Egyptian sêdîw (“wall”), the name of a fortification of some kind apparently near Aswan (2), probably covering the incursion to Egypt on the road from Pelusium to Zosam. The extent of this “wall” is unknown, but Bruesch connects it with the wall mentioned by Diodorus Siculus (1.4) who wrote about 8 B.C., and who attributed it to Sesostris II. He identifies the “east side of Egypt against the irrigations of the Syrians and Arabs” with a wall drawn from Pelusium through the deserts as far as to Heliopolis, for a space of 1,500 furigens.” Heliopolis lies 90 miles (not 185) S.W. of Pelusium; this wall, if it existed at all, would have run on the edge of the desert which extends N. of Ḥady (Transvaal from Kantoeh to Tilk-eh-Chir; but this then on the borders of Goshen, is evidently much too far W. to have any connection with the desert of Shur E. of the Gulf of Suez. See Budge, Hist. Egypt, 90; Bruesch, Egypt under the Pharaohs, abridged edition, 320.

C. R. Conder, Shushan (šùnî, šbôr; Šôr, Šîbû; Šùnî, Šùnî); This city, the Šān or Šabon of the Babylonians, and the native

1. Position, (Elamite) Šāban, is the modern Shush Etyymology (Sus) in Southwestern Persia, a series and Forms of ruins-mounds on the banks of the of its Name river Karkha. The ancient etymology of the city (Arabic illi and “of horses”) are probably worthless, as an etymology in the language of the place would rather be expected; the name therefore connect the name withšāna, meaning “farther,” and pointing to some much more distant city. It is frequently mentioned in the Bab inscriptions of the 3rd millennium BC, and is expressed by the characters for the goddess Sitar and for “oeder,” implying that it was regarded as the place of the “divine grove” (see 3, below). In later days, the Assyrians substituted for the second character, that having the value of šès, possibly indicating its pronunciation. Radau (Early Bab History, 236) identifies Shushan (Susa) with the Sāša of the Bab king Kuri-galzu (11th cent. BC, if the first of the name), who dedicates to the Bab goddess Ninlil an inscription of a certain Stele, who had at an earlier date, dedicated it to Sitar for the life of the Bab king Dungi (c 2500 BC).

The surface still covered with ruins is about 2,000 hectares (1,940 acres), though this is but a fraction compared with the ancient extent of the city, which is estimated to have been between 12,000 and 15,000 hectares (29,640–37,000 acres). Though considerable, the extent of Susa was small compared with Nineveh and Babylon.

2. The Ruins The ruins are divided by the French explorers into four tracts: (1) The mound of the Archemenian period (5th cent. BC), c 1,476 by 820 ft., dominating the plain (height c 124 ft.). (2) The Royal City on the E. of the Citadel, composed of two parts: the Apadana (N.E.), and a nearly triangular tract extending to the E. and the S. This contains the remains of the palace of Darius and his successors, and occupies rather more than 123 acres. The palace proper and the throne-room were separated from the rest of the official buildings. (3) The City, occupied by artisans, merchants, etc. (4) The district on the right bank, similarly inhabited. This area was extended into all the lower plain, between the Shaur and the Kerkha. Besides these, there were many isolated ruins, and the suburbs contained a number of villages and separate constructions.

Most of the constructions at Susa are of the Peri period. In the northern corner of the Royal City, a part of the Apadana, the only great monument of which remains were found on the level. The principal portion is a half-baked column hall called the “sala” or the “sala of the Apadana,” which was destroyed by fire in the time of Artaxerses I. The columns apparently had capitals of the style common in Persia—the foot parts of two bulls kneeling back to back. In the Citadel a palace built by Xerxes seems to have existed, the base of one of his columns having been found there. Bricks bearing the inscriptions of early Elamite kings, and the foundations of the later buildings, show the antiquity of the original part of this palace. According to the explorers, this was the portion of the city reserved for the temples.

The number of important antiquities found on the site is considerable. Among the finds may be mentioned the triumphal stele of Naram-Sin, 3rd millennium BC; the statuettes of the Bab king Disovered Dungi (c 2360 BC); the reliefs and inscriptions of the Elamite king Bag-Shia-Sinak (c 2340 BC); the obelisk inscribed with the laws of Hammurabi of Babylon; the bronze bas-relief of the Elamite king Sutruk-Nahhunte (c 1120 BC), who carried off from Babylon the stele of Naram-Sin and Hammurabi above mentioned, together with a considerable number of other Babylonic inscriptions—most precious archaeological find.

Shushan passed through many serious crises, one of the severest being its capture and destruction by the armies of the Assyrian king Assurbanipal about 610 BC. According to Assurbanipal’s account, the ziggiurat or temple-tower of Susa was built of enamelled bricks imitating lapis-lazuli, and was adorned with pinnacles of bright bronze. The god of the city was Shusinak, who dwelt in a secret place, and none ever saw the form of his divinity. Lagamaru (Lammaru) and five other of the city’s deities were adored with incense by kings, and their images, with those of 12 more (worshipped by the people), were carried off as spoil to Assyria. Winged bulls and genius adored Susa’s temples, and figures of wild bulls protected the entrances to their shrines. Other noteworthy things were the sacred groves into which no stranger was allowed to enter, and the burial-places of the Elamite kings. After recovering from the blow inflicted by the Assyrians, Shushan ultimately regained its old importance, and, as the summer residence of the Pers kings, became
the home of Abasurus and Queen Esther (Neh 1 1; Est 1 25; 2 3; 3 15; 9 11 ff; Dan 8 2; cf. Est 11 3).


T. G. PINCHES

SHUSHAN EDUTH, shō’shan ʾduth. See Song; Psalms.

SHUSHANCHITES, shō-shan’kitis (עְשֹׁנַחְיָתִים, šāhan’khay’tīm) [Aram.]; B, Σουσαναχαῖοι, Sousanachaios; AV Susanchites): Colonists in Samaria whose original home was in Shushan (Ezr 4 9).

SHUTHALHITES, shō-th’thal’hits, shō’th’hal’hits. See Shuthelah.

SHUTHelah, shō-th’elho, shō’shē-lo, SHUTHELAhIs, shō-th’ē-lo-th’shē-lo, shō-th’ē-lo-hits (שֻׁתָלְהִי, shuthalthi): A son of Ephraim (Nu 26 35 36; cf 1 Ch 7 20 21), and his descendants. See Genealogy.

SHUTTEL, shut’el. See Weaving.

SIA, s’a, SIAHA, s’a-ha (סיָה, sī’ha): One of the remnant which returned from captivity (Neh 7 47; Est 2 44).

SIBBECAI, SIBBECHAI, sib’e-kī, sib’e-kā’ī (סיבכָאֵי, sibbhēkah’i): One of the valiant men in David’s army (2 S 21 18; 1 Ch 11 20; 20 4 11).


SIBMAH, sib’ma. See Serah.

SIBRAIM, sib’ri’m, sib’ra-im (סִיבּראִים, sibbrayim; B, Σεβράμ, Sèbrdm, A, Σεφράμ, Sephrdm): A place named as on the boundary of Pal in Ezekiel’s ideal delineation, “between the border of Damascus and the border of Hamath.” (Ezk 47 16). It may possibly he represented by the modern Khiher Sanbariyeh on the west bank of Nahr el-Hosbāy in about 3 miles S.E. of “Abil.

SIBYLLINE ORACLES, sib’il-in, -in or’a-k’l’s. See Apocalyptic Literature, B, V.

SICARI, si’kā-ri’. See Assassins.


SICK, sik. SICKNESS, sik’nes (ﬠֶשַּה, ḥālah; Gen 48 1; etc, ḥēl [Dt 28 61, etc], נָשָה, nasha‘a’ [Dt 29 21, etc], נָמשָה, moshāh [Ex 23 25, etc], דָּעָה, dauaḥ [Lev 16 33, etc, דִּשַּׁך, dishaḥ]. ḥālah [2 S 12 15, etc]; ḥāloth, asthenē [Mt 10 8, etc; cf. Macc 9 22], κακῶς ἰχθύων, kokōs ochōn [Lk 7 2], κακῶς ἵχοντας, kokōn echonitas [Mt 4 24, etc.], ἄρρωστος, ἄρρηστος [Sir 7 33; Mt 14 12], ἀμφότερα, orkhōtēn [Sir 10 10, etc], with various cognates, κακῶς, ἀχάριον [Jas 5 15]; Λατ. morbus [2 Esd 8 31]: Compared with the number of deaths recorded in the historical books of the Bible the instances in which diseases are mentioned are few. “Sick” and “sickness” (including “disease,” etc) are the trs of 6 Heb and 9 Gr words and occur 56 t in the OT and 57 t in the NT. The number of references in the latter is significant as showing how much the healing of the sick was characteristic of the Lord’s ministry. The diseases specified are varied. Of infantile sickness there is an instance in Bath-sheba’s child (2 S 12 15), whose disease is termed ṭan’ash, not improbably trismus nascentium, a common disease in Palestine. In Psalms there are recorded the unspecified sickness of Abijah (1 K 14 1), of the widow’s son at Zarephath (1 K 17 17), the sunstroke of the Shunammite’s son (2 K 4 19), the epileptic boy (Mt 17 15), sharia’s daughter (Mt 9 18), and the widow’s son (Jn 4 46). At the other extreme of life Jacob’s death was preceded by sickness (Gen 48 1). Sickness resulted from accident (Ahaziah, 2 K 1 2), wounds (Joram, 2 K 8 29), from the violence of passion (Ammon, 2 S 13 2), or mental emotion (Dol 8 27); see also in this connection Cant 2 5; 5 8. Sickness the result of drunkenness is mentioned (Hos 7 5), and as a consequence of famine (Jer 14 18) or violence (Mic 6 13). Đakos or periodic sickness is referred to (Lev 15 33; 20 18), and an extreme case is that of Lk 8 43.

In some examples the nature of the disease is specified, as a’sa’s disease in his feet (1 K 15 23), for which he sought the aid of physicians in vain (2 Ch 16 12). Hezekiah and Job suffered from sore boils, and the same disease (leprosy) attacks (2 Ch 21 19), as did Antiochus Epiphanes (2 Macc 9 5). Probably the sudden and fatal disease of Herod was similar, as in both cases there is reference to the presence of worms (cf. Acts 12 23 and 2 Macc 9 9). The disease of Publius’ father was also dysentery (Acts 28 8). Other diseases specified are paralysis (Mt 8 6; 9 2), and fever (Mt 8 14). Not improbably the sudden illness of the young Egyptian at Ziklag (1 S 30 11), and the illness of Ben-hadad which weakened him so that he could not resist the violence of Hazael, were also the common Pal fever (2 K 8 15) of whose symptoms and effects there is a graphic description in Ps 38. Unspecified fatal illnesses were those of Elisha (2 K 13 14), Lazarus (Jn 11 1), Tabitha (Acts 9 37). In the language of the Bible, leprous is spoken as of a defilement to be cleansed, rather than as a disease to be cured.

The proverb concerning the sick quoted by the Lord at Capernaum (Mk 6 10) has come down to us in several forms in apocryphal and rabbinical writings (Babda’ Kammad 26 13; Sanhedrāt 176), but is nowhere so terse as in the form in which He expresses it. The Lord performed His healing of the sick to the word or thought, and one of the most emphatic charges which He gave to His disciples when sending them out was to heal the sick. One of the methods used by them, the anointing with oil, is mentioned in Mk 6 13 and enjoined by James (5 15). In later times the anointing which was at first used as a remedial agent became a ceremonial in preparation for death, one of the seven sacraments of the Rom church (Aquinas, Summa Theologiae suppl. ad P III. 29).

The duty of visiting the sick is referred to in Ezk 34 4 16. and by the Lord in the description of the Judgment scene (Mt 25 36 43). It is implicit in some of the rabbinical tractates. “He that visits the sick lengthens his life, he who refrains shortens it,” says Rabbi Ishahan in N’drārīm 29. In Shulhan ‘Arakh, Yoreh De’ēth there is a chapter devoted to this duty, which is regarded as incumbent on the Jew, even though the sick person be a Gentile (Gitra 61a). The church’s duty to the sick, so long neglected, has now, within the last 70 years, been recognized in the mission field, and has proved, in heathen lands, to be the most important of all pioneer aggressive methods.

While we find that the apostles freely exercised their gifts of healing, it is noteworthy that we read
of the sickness of two of St. Paul's companions, Epaphroditus (Phil 2:26) and Trophimus (2 Tim 4:20), for whose recovery he seems to have used no other means than prayer. See also Disease.

ALEX. MACALISTER

SICKLE, sik'1 (סֵכֶל, ἱρματισ), hermitish [Dt 16:19; 23:25], sickle, maggâl; cf Arab. minjâl [Jer 50:16; Joel 3:13]; ἱματων, ἱματων [Mt 4:29; Rev 14:14–19]: Although the ancients pulled much of their grain by hand, we know that they also used sickles. The form of this instrument varied, as is evidenced by the Egypt sculptures. The earliest sickle was probably of wood, shaped like the modern scythe, although much smaller, with the cutting edge made of sharp flats set into the wood. Sickle blades were found at Tel el-Hesi. Crescent-shaped iron sickles were found in the same mound. In Pal and Syria the sickle varies in size. It is usually made wholly of iron or steel and shaped much like the instrument used in western lands. The smaller-sized sickles are used both for pruning and for reaping.

JAMES A. PATCH

SIKONY, sîkî-on (Σικόνιον, Sikón, Σικόνιον, Sukô-n, Σικόν, Sukôn): Mentioned in 1 Mac 16:25 in the list of countries and cities to which Lucas the Babylonian sent his friend and companion to Chedorlaomer (burned in 139 BC) wrote, asking them to be friendly to the Jews. The Jewish dispersion had already taken place, and Jews were living in most of the seaports and cities of Asia Minor, Greece and Egypt (cf Str Pls C.14:37 and Plao). Sicyon was situated 18 miles W. of Corinth on the south side of the Gulf of Corinth. Its antiquity and ancient importance are seen by its coins still extant, dating from the 5th cent. Though not as important as Corinth in its sea trade, the burning of that city in 143 BC, and the favor shown to Sicyon by the Roman authorities in adding to its territory and assigning to it the direction of the Isthmian games, increased its wealth and influence for a time.

S. F. HUNTER

SIDDIM, sid'dim, VALE OF (םיד理論, ים, ʾemek ha-siddim; LXX ἡ φάραγγὶς [or κόλας] ἡ ἀλκος, ἡ φάραγγς [κόλας] ἡ καλύτερη): The place mentioned in Gen 14:3–8 as being the scene of encounter between Chedorlaomer and his allies with the kings of Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboim and Zoar. In Gen 19 it is identified with the Salt Sea, and in ver 10 it is said to have been full of slime pits (“bitumen”).

According to the traditional view, the Vale of Siddim was at the southern end of the Dead Sea. But in recent years a number of eminent authorities have maintained that it was at the northern end of the Dead Sea, in the vicinity of Jericho. Their argument has mainly been based on incidental references in the scene (Gen 13:1–13) describing the parting of Lot and Abram, and in the account of Moses' vision from Pisgah (Dt 34:3).

In the account of Abram and Lot, it is said that from Bethel to the plain of the Jordan, that it was well watered everywhere, before Jehovah destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah. The word here in the plain means “circle,” and well describes the view which one has of the plain about Jericho as Bethel as he looks down the valley past Arah. But it seems to go beyond the point to assume that the Vale of Siddim was within that circle of the plain as Gen 13:13 itself simply that Lot dwelt “in the cities of the plain, and went out from his tent as far as Sodom.” In the vision of Moses, likewise, we have a very general and convenient description in which it is said that he was shown “the plain of the valley of Jehoshaphat, the reed-tracks, unto the utmost Swift, which, as we learn from Gen 19:22, was not far from the Vale of Siddim. It is true that from the traditional site of Pisgah Lot the original ancestor of the couch, nor the district, has been pushed to the main part of the depression by the Jordan, and various smaller streams descending from the highlands on either side. In

The tendency at the present time is to return to the traditional view that the Vale of Siddim was at the south end of the Dead Sea. The people by the fact that Jebel Uдум, the salt mountain at the southwestern corner of the Dead Sea, still bears the name of Sodom, Uдум being simply another form of the word Soum, still stronger argument, however, is drawn from the general topographical and geological conditions. In the first place, Zoar, to which Lot is said to have fled, was not far away. The most natural site for it is near the mouth of the Wady Kerak, which comes down from Meab into the southern end of the Dead Sea, and the city was ever afterward spoken of as a Moabite city, which would not have been the case if it had been at the north end of the sea. It is notable in Josh 13:15–21, where the cities given to Reuben are enumerated, that, though the slopes of Pisgah are mentioned, Zoar is not mentioned.

In Gen 14, where the battle between Amraphel and his allies with Sodom and the other cities of the plain is described, the south end of the Dead Sea comes in later to the end of their conquest, and special mention is made of the salt and bitumen pits which occurred in the valley, and evidently played an important part in the outcome of the battle.

At the south end of the Dead Sea there is an extensive cirque or plain which is better supplied with water for irrigation than is the region about Jericho, and which, on the supposition of slight topographical changes, may have been frequently in ancient times; while there are many indications of such fertility in the ruins that have been described by travelers about the mouth of the Kerak and other localities nearby. The description, therefore, of the fertility of the region in the Vale of Siddim may well have applied to this region at the time of Lot's entrance into it.

There are very persistent traditions that great topographical changes took place around the south end of the Dead Sea in connection with the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, while the opinion has been universally prevalent among the earlier historical writers that the site of Sodom and Gomorrah is beneath the waters of the Dead Sea.

Geological investigations, so far from disproving these traditions, render them altogether possible and credible. There is a remarkable contrast between the northern and southern ends of the Dead Sea and of the south end. Near the north end the depth descends to 1,300 ft., whereas for many miles out from the south end it is very shallow, so that at low water a ford exists, and is occasionally used, from the north end of the salt mountain across to el-Lisân.

The precipitous salt cliffs of Jebel Uдум which border the southwest corner of the Dead Sea would indicate that, in comparatively recent times, there had been an abrupt subsidence of a good many feet in the bottom of the Dead Sea at the date of Abraham.

Such subsidences of limited areas and in connection with earthquakes are by no means uncommon. In 1819 an area of 2,000 sq. miles about the delta of the Indus River sank beneath the level of the sea, so that the tops of the houses were barely seen above the water. A smaller area in the delta of the Suez Delta sank during the last century beneath the waters of Lake Baikal. Professor K. S. Tarl of Cornell University has recently described the effects of the partial subsidence of Alaska, in which there was a change of level of 47 ft.

More probably (see ABRAHAM; DEAD SEA) there has been a rise in the waters of the Dead Sea since Abraham's time, caused by the encroachment upon the original area of the sea that has not been spoken of. But we are by no means sure that the traditional site of Pisgah and the tent of Lot is not to be supported. To the extent that the import of this land-grown to be restricted to the points which are actually within range of vision.
The equilibrium between precipitation and evaporation could have been maintained only by a rise in the water causing it to spread over the shallow shelf at the south end, thus covering a large part of the Vale of Sidon with the shoal water now found between el-Lisân and Jebel Ushûn.

George Frederick Wright

**SIDE, aît-dé (Ṣūth, Sîd):** An ancient town of Pamphylia, occupying a triangular promontory on the coast. It was one of the towns to which a letter favorable to the Jews was sent by the Roman consul Lucius (1 Macc 15:23). The town seems to have been of considerable antiquity, for it had existed long before it fell into the possession of Alexander the Great, and for a time it was the metropolis of Pamphylia. Off the coast the fleet of Antiochus was defeated by the Rhodians. During the 1st century. Side was noted as one of the chief ports of pirates who disposed of much of their booty there. The ruins of the city, which are now very extensive, bear the name Zeki Adale, but among them there are no occupied houses. The two harbours protected by a sea wall may still be traced, but they are now filled with sand. The wall on the land side of the city was provided with a gate which was protected with round towers; the walls themselves are still in good preservation. Within these walls the most important of the remains are three theaters leading from the city gate to the harbors. Without the walls, the street leading to the city gate is lined with tombs, and among the shambles of the neighboring fields are traces of many buildings and of an aqueduct.

**E. J. Banks**

**SIDES, sîd (ṣīd, yarkhâh, "thigh," "flank"):** RV substitutes "innermost parts" for AV "sides" in Jon 1:5; cf 1 S 24:3.

**SIDON, sîdôn (ṣîthôn):** The eldest son of Canaan (Gen 10:15).

**SIDON, sîdôn (ṣîthôn, Szādāv, Sîdôn; AV Sidon and Zidon; RV SİDON only):** One of the oldest Phoenician cities, situated on a narrow plain between the range of Lebanon and the sea, in lat. 33° 34' nearly. The plain is well watered and convenient for habitation. The city has spread from a little N. of Sarepta to the Bestrenus (Nahr el-Auly). The ancient city was situated near the northern end of the plain, surrounded with a strong wall. It possessed two harbors, the northern one about 500 yds. long by 200 wide, well protected by little islets and a breakwater. There are about 600 by 400 yds., surrounded on three sides by land, but open to the W., and thus exposed in bad weather. The date of the founding of the city is unknown, but we find it mentioned in the Am Tabs. 14, 15, and in Gen 10:19 it is the chief city of the Canaanites, and Joshua (Josh 11:8) calls it Great S. It led all the Phoenician cities in its early development of maritime affairs, its sailors being the first to launch out into the open sea out of sight of land and to sail by night, guiding themselves by the stars. They were the first to come into contact with the Greeks and we find the mention of them several times in Homer, while other Phoenician towns are not noticed. S. became early distinguished for its manufactures and the skill of its artisans, such as beautiful metal-work in silver and bronze and textile fabrics embroidered and dyed with the famous purple dye which became known as Tyrian, but which was earlier produced at S. Notices of these choice articles are found in Homer, both in the Iliad and the Odyssey. S. had a monarchical form of government, as did all the Phoenician towns, but it also held a sort of hegemony over those to the S. as far as the limit of Phoenicia. It likewise made claims to the lands of Sidon with the shoal water now found between el-Lisân and Jebel Ushûn.

The attempt was not renewed, but many colonies were established over-sea. Citium, in Cyprus, was one of the earliest.

(1) The independence of S. was lost when the kings of the XVIIIth and XIXth Dynasties of Egypt added Pal and Syria to their dominions (1580-1250 BC). The kings of S. were allowed to remain on the throne as long as they paid tribute, and perhaps still exercised authority over the towns that had before been subject to them. When the power of Egypt declined under Amenhotep IV (1375-1358), the king of S. seems to have thrown off the yoke, as appears from the Am Tabs. Ribaddi of Gebal writes to the king of Egypt that Zimri, king of S., had joined the enemy, but Zimri, himself claims, in the letters he wrote, to be loyal, declaring that the town belonging to him had been taken by those who had fled from the Hittites (Tab. 147). During the 12th century, the city was eventually made independent of Egypt, and she retained the hegemony of the southern towns and perhaps added Dor, claimed by the Philistines, to her dominion. This may have been the reason for the war that took place about the middle of the 12th century BC, in which the Phœnicians took and plundered S., whose inhabitants fled to Tyre and gave the latter a great impetus. S., however, recovered from the disaster and became powerful again. The Book of Jgs claims that Israel was an inland colony by S. (10:12), but it is probable S. stands here for Phœnicia in general, as being the chief town.

(2) S. submitted to the Assyrians as did the Phœnican cities generally, but revolted against Senacherib and again under Esarhaddon. The latter destroyed a large part of the city and carried off most of the inhabitants, replacing them by captives from Babylon and Elam, and renamed it Ir-Esar-haddon ("City of Esar-haddun"). The settlers readily mingled with the Phœnicians, and the city continued to be a Phœnician city even after S. was captured by the Persians, who made it into a Persian colony.

The latter destroyed a large part of the city and carried off most of the inhabitants, replacing them by captives from Babylon and Elam, and renamed it Ir-Esar-haddon ("City of Esar-haddun"). The settlers readily mingled with the Phœnicians, and the city continued to be a Phœnician city even after S. was captured by the Persians, who made it into a Persian colony.
azar, he is probably Strato I who reigned about 374–363 BC, and hence his grandfather, Esmaunazar I, must have reigned in 400 BC or earlier. Strato II was on the throne when Alexander took possession of Phoenicia and made no resistance to him, and even aided him in the siege of Tyre, which shows that S.

had recovered after the terrible disaster it suffered in the time of Ochus. It perhaps looked upon the advance of Alexander with content as its avenger. The devastation of Tyre increased the importance of S., and after the death of Alexander it became attached to the kingdom of the Ptolemies and remained so until the victory of Antiochus III over Seleucus (198 BC), when it passed to the Seleucids and from them to the Romans, who granted it a degree of autonomy with native magistrates and a council, and it was allowed to coin money in bronze.

S. comes into view several times in the NT; first when Christ passed into the borders of Tyre and S. and healed the daughter of the Syro-

3. NT

phoenician woman (Mk 7 24–30; also mentioned when Herod Agrippa I received a delegation from Tyre and S. at Caesarea (Acts 12 20), where it appears to have been outside his jurisdiction. St. Paul, on his way to Rome, was permitted to visit some friends at S. (Acts 27 3). See also Mt 11 21 f and Mk 3 8.

It was noted for its school of philosophy under Augustus and Tiberius, its inhabitants being largely Greek; and when Berytos was destroyed by an earthquake in 551, its great law school was removed to S. It was not of great importance during the Crusades, being far surpassed by Acre, and in modern times it is a small town of some 15,000.

LITERATURE.—See PHOENICIA.

SIDONIANS, sī-do'nī-ans: Natives or inhabitants of Sidon (Dt 3 9; Josh 13 4 6; Jgs 3 3; 1 K 5 6).

SIEGE, sēj (נַעַג, māgōr; [Dt 28 52 53; 1 K 15 27; 2 K 25 2; Isa 29 3; Ezk 4 2]; “to besiege,” “to suffer siege,” māgōr bô’ [Dt 20 19; 2 K 24 10; 25 2]):

1. In Early Hebrew History
2. In the Monarchy
3. Preliminaries to Siege
4. Siege Operations: Attack
   (1) Line of Circumvallation
   (2) Mound, or Earthworks
   (4) Batterings, Rams
   (5) Storming of Walls and Rushing of Breach
5. Siege Operations: Defence
6. Raising of Siege
7. Horrors of Siege and Capture
8. Siege in the NT

LITERATURE

In early Heb history, siege operations are not described and can have been little known. Although the Israelites had acquired a certain degree of military discipline in the wilderness, when they entered Canaan they had no experience of the operations of a siege and were without the engines of war necessary for the purpose. Jericho, with its strongly fortified wall, was indeed formally invested—it “was straitly shut up because of the children of Israel: none went out, and none came in” (Josh 6 1)—but it fell into their hands without a siege. Other cities seem to have yielded after pitched battles, or to have been taken by assault.

Many of the Canaanite fortresses, like Gezer (2 S 5 25; Josh 16 10), Taanach and Megiddo (Jgs 1 27), remained unreduced. Jerus was captured by the men of Judah (Jgs 1 8), but the fort of Jebus remained unconquered till the time of David (2 S 5 6).

In the days of the monarchy more is heard of siege operations. At the siege of Rabbath-Ammon Joab seems to have deprived the city of its water-supply and, captured it (2 S 11 1; 12 27). At Abel of Beth-maccah siege operations are described in which Joab distinguished himself (2 S 20 15). David and Solomon, and, after the disruption of the kingdom, Rehoboam and Jeroboam built fortresses which are long become the scene of siege operations. The war between Assyria and Israel in the days of Nadab, Baasha, and Elah was, for the most part, a war of sieges. It was while besieging Gibbethon that Nadah, the son of Jeroboam, was slain by Baasha (1 K 15 27), and 27 years after, while they were still investing the same place, the soldiery chose their commander Omri to be king over Israel (1 K 16 16). From the Egyptians, the Syrians, the Assyrians, and the Chaldaeans, with whom they came into relations in later times as allies or as enemies, the people of the Southern and of the Northern Kingdoms learned much regarding the art, both of attack and of defence of fortified places.

It was an instruction of the Deuteronomistic Law that before it was invested for a long siege, it should be summoned to capitulate. 3. Pre-

(Dt 20 10; cf 2 S 20 18; 2 K 18 liminaries 17 ff). If the offer of peace be to Siege declined, then the siege is to be proceeded with, and if the city be captured, all the male population is to be put to death, and the women and children reserved as a prey for the captors. To this humane reservation the cities of the Canaanites were to be an exception: their inhabitants were to be wholly exterminated (Dt 20 16–18).

The same law prescribed that there should be no unnecessary destruction of fruit trees in the prosecution of a long siege. Trees not yielding fruit for human subsistence might be cut down: “And thou shalt build bulwarks [māgōr, “siege works”] against the city that maketh war with thee, until it fall” (Dt 20 19 20). This instruction to have regard to the fruit trees around a hostile city seems to have been more honored in the breach than in the observance, even in Israel. When the allied kings of Israel, Judah, and Edom were invading Moab and had instruction to “smite every fortified city,” the prophet Elisha bade them also “fell every good tree, and stop all fountains of water, and mar every good piece of hand of stones” (2 K 3 19 25). When the assault of Jerus by the Chaldaeans was imminent, Jeh commanded them to stand down only “until the king’s [Aramean] war be over; and the Arabian warfare, we are told, the destruction of the enemy’s palm groves was a favorite exploit (Robertson Smith, OTT, 369). And the Assyrians when they captured a city had no compunction in destroying its plantations (inscription of Shalmanasar II on Black Obelisk).

From passages in the Prophets, upon which much light has been thrown by the ancient monuments of Assyria and Chaldaea, we gain a very clear idea of the siege works directed against a city by Assyry or Chaldaean invaders. The siege of Lachish (2 K 18 13 14; Isa 36 1; Jer 34 1) is the subject of a series of magnificent reliefs from the mound of Koyunjik (Layard, Monuments of Nineveh, II, plates 20, 21, 22). The downfall of Nineveh as predicted in Nahumi’s prophecy lets
us see the siege operations proceeding with striking realism (see Der Untergang Ninive's by A. Jeremias and Colonel Billerbeck). Nowhere, however, are the incidents of a siege—the gathering of hostile forces, the slaughter of peaceful inhabitants, the straits endured by the besieged, the raising of siege works, the setting of engines of war against the walls, the demolition of the towers, the breach in the principal wall, the rush of men and the clatter of horses' hoofs through the streets, the slaughter, the pilage, the destruction of walls and houses—more fully and faithfully recorded than by Ezekiel when predicting the capture of Tyre by Nebuchadrezzar (Ezk 26:7–12). The siege of Tyre lasted 13 years, and Ezekiel tells how every head was made bald and every shoulder torn by the hard service of the besiegers (Ezk 29:18). There were various ways in which an invading army might deal with a fortified city so as to secure its possession. Terms might be offered to secure a capitulation (1 K 20:1 ff; 2 K 18:14 ff). An attempt might be made to reduce the city by starvation (2 K 6:24 ff; 2 K 17:5 ff). The city might be invested and captured by assault and storm, as Lachish was by Sennacherib (2 K 18:13; 19:9; see Layard, op. cit., II, plates 20–24). The chief operations of the besiegers were as follows: (1) There was the investment of the city by the besieging army. It was sometimes necessary to establish a fortified camp, like that of Sennacherib at Lachish to guard against sorties by the defenders. Of the siege of Jerus we read that Nebuchadrezzar came, "he and all his army" down on Jerus, and "he camped against it" (Jer 52:4; cf 2 K 25:1). From the commencement of the siege, slingers and archers were posted where they could keep the defenders engaged; and it is to this that reference is made when Jeremiah says they "came and took the archers against Babylon, all them that bend the bow; encamp against her round about; let none thereof escape" (Jer 50:29).

(2) There was next the drawing of a line of circumvallation (därakh) with entrenchments round about the walls. These forts were towered manned by archers, or they were used as stations from which to discharge missiles (Jer 62:4; Ezk 17:17). In this connection the word "munitio" in AV and ERV (see Ezk 11:1) disappears in ARV and is replaced by "fortress."

(3) Following upon this was the mound (qāḏlāh), or earthworks, built up to the height of the walls, so as to command the streets of the city, and strike terror into the besieged. The mound, now the height above the ground, was largely manned by men who were able to batter the lower and weaker part of the city wall (2 S 20:15; Isa 37:33; Jer 6:6; Ezk 4:2; Dn 11:15; Lam 4:18). If, however, the town, or fortress, was built upon an eminence, an inclined plane reaching to the height of the eminence might be formed of earth or stones, or trees, and the besiegers would be able to bring their engines to the foot of the walls. This road was even covered with bricks, forming a kind of paved way, up which the ponderous machines could be drawn without difficulty. To such roads there are references in Scripture (Job 19:12; Isa 29:3, "siege works"); cf Layard, Nineveh and Its Remains, II, 366 f). In the case of Tyre this mound, or way of approach, was a dam thrown across the narrow strait to obtain access to the walls (Ezk 26:8). It was, often, too, there was a trench, sometimes filled with water, at the foot of the wall, which had to be dealt with previous to an assault.

(4) The earthworks having been thrown up, and approaches to the walls secured, it was possible to set and to work the batters (bāṭirām) which were used to be employed in breaching the walls (Ezk 4:2), or in bursting open the gates (Ezk 21:22). The battering-rams were of different kinds. On metal forming its head, they can hardly fail to make an impression, and gradually, by the constantly repeated shocks, a breach is opened and the besiegers are able to rush in and bear down the defenders. It is to the shelter furnished by these towers that the prophet Nahum refers (2:5) when he says, "The mantlet is prepared," and that Isaiah points when he declares that the king of Assyria "shall not come unto this city, nor shall shoot an arrow there, neither shall be come before it with shield (māḏāṅ), nor cast up a mound against it" (Isa 37:33). Ezekiel has the same figure when, describing the siege of Tyre by Nebuchadrezzar, he declares that he shall "cast up a mound" against her, and "raise up the buckler," the buckler (gīwāḵ) being like the Rom testudo, or roof of shields, under cover of which the besiegers carried on operations (Ezk 26:6; Colonel Billerbeck [op. cit., 178] is doubtful whether this device was known to the Assyrians). Under the shelter of their movable towers the besiegers could push forward mines, an operation known as part of siegecraft from a high antiquity (see 2 S 20:15, where ARV and ERV give "undermined" as an alternative to "battered"; tunneling was known in antiquity, as the Sibon tunnel shows).

(5) The culminating operation would be the storming of the walls, the rushing of the breach. Scaling-ladders were employed to cross the encircling trench or ditch (Prov 21:22); and Joel in his powerful description of the army of locusts which had devastated the land says that they "climb the wall like men of war" (Joel 2:7). Attempts were made to set fire to the gates and to break them open with axes (Job 9:7; 2:3; Ezk 26:9). Jeremiah tells of the breach that was made in the city when Jerus was captured (Jer 39:2). The breaches in the wall of Samaria are referred to by Amos (4:3), who pictures the women rushing forth headlong like a herd of kine with hooks and fishhooks in their nostrils.

While the besiegers employed this variety of means of attack, the besieged were equally ingenious and active in maintaining the defence.

5. Siege Operations. All sorts of obstructions were placed in the way of the besieging army. The defence of the walls

Defence

Springs and cisterns likely to afford supplies of water to the invaders were carefully covered up, or drained off into the city. Where possible, trenches were filled with water to

Battering-Ram.
make them impasseable. As the siege-works of the enemy approached the main wall, it was usual to build inner fortifications, and for this purpose houses were pulled down to provide the needed space and also to supply building materials (Isa 22 10). Slingers placed upon the walls hurled stones upon the advancing enemy, and archers from loopholes and protected battlements discharged arrows against the warriors in their movable towers.

Sorties were made to damage the siege-works of the enemy and to prevent the battering-rams from being placed in position. To counteract the assaults of the battering-rams, sacks of chalk were let down in front of the position where the engine operated—a contrivance counted again by pales with osythes upon which cut off the sacks (Jos, BJ, III, 79, 20). So, too, the defenders, by dropping a doubled chain or rope from the battlements, caught the ram and broke the force of its blows. Attempts were made to destroy the ram also by fire. In the great bas-relief of the siege of Lachish an inhabitant is seen hurling a lighted torch from the wall; and it was a common device to pour boiling water or oil from the wall upon the assailants. Missiles, too, were thrown with deadly effect from the battlements by the defenders, and it was by a piece of a millstone thrown by a woman that Abimelech met his death at Thebez (Jgs 9 53).

While Uzziah of Judah furnished his soldiers with shields and spears and helmets and coats of mail and bows and slingers, he also "made in Jerusalem engines, invented by skilful men, to be on the towers and upon the battlements, wherewith to shoot arrows and great stones" (2 Ch 26 15). The Jews had, for the defense of Jerusalem against the army of Titus, engines which they had taken from the Twelfth Legion at Beth-horon which seem to have had a range of 1,200 ft. Many ingenious devices are described by Jos as employed by himself when conducting the defence of Jotapata in Galilee against Vespasian and the forces of Rome (BJ, III, vii).

When Nahash king of the Ammonites laid siege to Jabesh-gilead in the opening days of the reign of Saul, the terms of peace offered to 6. Raising the inhabitants were so humiliating of the Siege and cruel that they sought a respite of seven days and appealed to Saul in their distress. When the newly chosen king heard of their desperate condition he assembled a great army, scattered the Ammonites, and raised the siege of Jabesh-gilead, thus earning the lasting gratitude of the inhabitants (I S 11; cf I S 31 12, 13). When Zelekiah of Judah found himself besieged in Jerusalem by the Chaldaeans under Nebuzaradan, he sent intelligence to Pharaoh Hophra who crossed the frontier with his army to attack the Chaldaeans and obliged them to desist from the siege. The Chaldaeans withdrew for the moment from the walls of Jerusalem and offered battle to Pharaoh Hophra and his host, but the courage of the Egyptians failed him and he retired in haste without encountering the Chaldaeans in a pitched battle. The siege was prosecuted to the bitter end, and Jerusalem was captured and completely overrun (2 K 25 1; Jer 37 3-10; Ezek 17 17).

In the ancient law of Israel "siege" is classed with drought and pestilence and exile as punishments with which Jehovah would visit His people 7. Horrors of Siege. Of the horrors there described they had seen and again described. At the siege of Samaria by Ben-hadad II, so terrible were the straits to which the besieged were reduced that they cooked and ate their own children (2 K 6 28). In the siege of Jerusalem by the Chaldaeans, which ended in the overthrow of the city and the destruction of the Temple, the sufferings of the inhabitants from hunger and disease were incredible (2 K 25 3; Jer 32 24; Lam 2 20; 4 8-10). The horrors of siege have, perhaps, reached their climax in the account given by Jos of the tragedy of Masada. To escape capture by the Romans, ten men were chosen by lot from among the occupants of the fortress, 960 in number, including combatants and non-combatants, men, women and children, to slay the rest. From these ten one was similarly chosen to slay the survivors, and he, having accomplished his awful task, ran his sword into his own body (Jos, BJ, VII, ix, 1). While all the inhabitants of a city under siege suffered the famine of bread and the thirst for water, the combatants ran the risk of impalement and other forms of torture to which prisoners in Assyria and Chaldaea and Rome were subjected.

The horrors attending the siege of a city were only surpassed by the barbarities perpetrated at its capture. The emptying of a city by its capture is likened to the hurling of a stone from a sling (Jer 10 17, 18). Deportation of the whole of the inhabitants often followed (2 K 17 6; 24 14). Not only were the inhabitants of the captured city deported, but their gods were carried off with them and the idols broken in pieces. This is predicted or recorded of Babylon (Isa 21 9; 46 1; Jer 50 2), of Egypt (Jer 43 12), of Samaria (Hos 10 6). Indiscriminate slaughter followed the entrance of the assaulting, and the city was usually given over to the flames (Jer 39 8, 9; Lam 4 18). "Cities without number," says Shalmaneser II in one of his inscriptions, "I wrecked, razed, burned with fire." Houses were destroyed and women dishonored (Zeal 14 2). When Darius took Babylon, he impaled three thousand prisoners (Herod, iii.159). The Scythians scalped and flayed their enemies and used their skins for horse trappings (ib, iv.64). The Assyrian sculptures show prisoners subjected to horrible torments, or carried away into slavery. The captured Zelekiah had his eyes put out after he

Catapult for Hurling Missiles.
had seen his own sons cruelly put to death (2 K 25 7). It is only employing the imagery familiar to Assyrian warfare when Isaiah represents Jeh as saying: "Therefore will I put my hook in thy nose, and my bridle into thy lips, and I will turn thee back by the way by which thou camest" (Isa 37 29). Anticipating the savage barbarities that would follow the capture of Samaria by the Assyrians, Hosca foresees the infants being dashed to pieces and the women with child being ripped open (2 Ki 19 36; 2 Ch 32 24). The prophet Nahum predicting the overthrow of Nineveh recalls how at the capture of N-unam (Egypt Thebes) by the Assy conqueror, Ashurbanipal, "her young children also were dashed in pieces at the head of all the streets; and they cast lots for her honorable men, and all her great men were bound in chains" (Nah 3 10).

The only explicit reference to siege operations in the NT is Our Lord's prediction of the complete destruction of Jerusalem when He wept over it: "...and shall dash thee to the ground, and thy children within thee, and shall not leave in thee one stone upon another" (Lk 19 44). The order and particulars of the siege are in accordance with the accounts of siege operations in the OT. How completely the prediction was fulfilled we see from Jl 3 1-9.

Figurative: In St. Paul's Epp. there are figures taken from siege operations. In 2 Cor 10 4 we have the "casting down of strongholds," where the Gr word κατακαίην, κατακαίησαν, from κατακαίνω, κατακαίων, is the regular word used in LXX in the reduction of a fortress (Prov 21 22; Lam 2 2; 1 Mac 5 65). In Eph 6 16 there is allusion to siege-works, for the subtle temptations of Satan are set forth as the flaming darts hurled by the besiegers of a fortress which the Christian soldier is to quench with the shield of faith.

LITERATURE—Nowack, Hebräische Archäologie, 71; Benzmüller, "Kriegswesen" in Herzog; Billerbeck and A. Jeremias, Der Untergang Ninives; Bieberle, Der Festungsbau im alten Orient.

T. NICOL

SIEVE, sīv, SIFT. See AGRICULTURE; THRASHING.

SIGLOS, sig'los. See SIGLOΣ, SIGLOΣ: A Peru silver coin, twenty of which went to the gold Daric (q.v.).

SIGN, sīn (סינ, "a sign," "mark," יד, שקר, מופת, "wonder"); σημεῖον, σημελον, "a sign," "signal," "mark": A mark by which persons or things are distinguished and made known. In Scripture used generally of an address to the senses to attest the existence of supersensible and therefore Divine power. Thus the plagues of Egypt were "signs" of Divine displeasure against the Egyptians (Ex 4 8 ff; Josh 24 17; and often); and the miracles of Jesus were "signs" to attest His unique relationship with God (Mt 12 38; Jn 2 18; Acts 2 22). Naturally, therefore, both in the OT and the NT, "signs" are assimilated to the miraculous, and prevalently associated with immediate Divine intervention. The popular belief in this communication between the visible and the invisible worlds has always been, and is now, widespread. So-called "natural" explanations, however ingenious or cogent, fail with the great majority of people to explain anything. Wesley and Spurgeon were as firm believers in the validity of such methods of intercourse between man and God as were Moses and Gideon, Peter and John.

The faith that walks by signs is not by any means to be lightly esteemed. It has been allied with the highest nobility of character and with the most signal achievement. Moses accepted the leadership of his people in response to a succession of signs: e.g. the burning bush, the rod which became a serpent, the leprous hand, etc (Ex 3 and 4); so, too, did Gideon, who was not above making proof of God in the sign of the fleece of wool (Jgs 6 36-40). In the training of the Twelve, Jesus did not disdain the use of signs (Lk 5 11, and often); and the visions by which Peter and Paul were led to the evangelization of the Gentiles were interpreted by them as signs of the Divine purpose (Acts 10 and 16).

The sacramental use of the sign dates from the earliest period, and the character of the sign is as diverse as the occasion. The rainbow furnishes a radiant suggestion of God's overarching love and assurance that the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy the earth (Gen 9 13; cf 4 15); the Feast of Unleavened Bread is a reminder of God's cure in bringing His people out of bondage (Ex 13 3); the Sabbath is an oft-recurring proclamation of God's gracious thought for the well-being of man (Ex 31 13; Ezk 20 12); the brazen serpent, an early foreshadowing of the cross, perpetuates the imperishable promise of forgiveness and redemption (Nu 21 9); circumcision is made the seal of the special covenant under which Israel became a people set apart (Gen 17 11); baptism, the Christian equivalent of circumcision, becomes the sign and seal of the dedicated life and the mark of those avowedly seeking to share in the blessedness of the Kingdom of God (Lk 3 12-14; Acts 2 41, and often); bread and wine, a symbol of the spiritual manna by which soul and body are preserved unto everlasting life, is the hallowed memorial of the Lord's death until His coming again (Lk 22 14-20; 1 Cor 11 23-28). Most common of all were the local altars and mounds consecrated in simple and sincere fashion to a belief in God's ruling and overruling providence (Josh 4 1-10).

Signs were offered in proof of the Divine commission of prophet (Isa 20 3) and apostle (2 Cor 12 12), and of the Messiah Himself (Jn 20 30; Acts 2 22); and they were submitted in demonstration of the Divine character of their message (2 K 20 9; Jn 20 26, Acts 38 1). And in bap-

tism the child to be born of a young woman (Isa 7 10-16; of Lk 2 12) is to certify the prophet's pledge of a deliverer for a captive people. See IMMANUEL.

With increase of faith the necessity for signs will gradually decrease. Jesus hints at this (Jn 4 48), as does also Paul (1 Cor 1 22). Nevertheless "signs" in the sense of displays of miraculous powers, are to accompany the faith of believers (Mk 16 17 5), use in and forthwith characterize the dispensation of the Holy Spirit, and mark the consummation of the ages (Rev 15 1). See also MIRACLE.


CHARLES M. STUART

SIGNET, sig'net. See SEAL.

SIGNS, NUMERICAL, nɪt-mer'i-kal. See NUMBER.

SIGNS OF THE HEAVENS. See AstronomY, 1 4.
SIHON, sī' hon (מִשְׁפֹּת, sīhōn): King of the Amorites, who vainly opposed Israel on their journey from Egypt to J P al, and who is frequently mentioned in the historical books and in the Ps be cause of his prominence and as a warning for those who oppose God. For defeat by Jeh and Eth. Hebrew people (Num 21, and often; Deut 4: 31; Josh 20: 10; Judges 11: 19. 20: 21; 1 Kgs 19; Neh 9: 22; Ps 135: 11; 136: 19; Jer 48: 45).

SIHOR, sī'h o r. See Shihor.

SIHOR-LIBNATH, sī'h o'-r lib'纳 th. See Shihor-Libnath.

SILAS, sī'lass (Σίλας, Silas, probably contraction for Σίλανως, Silanous; the Heb equivalents suggested are שִׁלֶּהַ, silēh, "Tertius," or שִׁלֹא, silōă, "asked" [Zahn]). The Silas of Acts is generally identified with the Silvanus of the Eph. His identification with Titus has also been suggested, based on 2 Cor 1: 19: 8: 23, but this is very improbable (cf Knowling, Expositor's Gr Text, II, 326). Silas, who was probably a Levite (cf Acts 6: 37), accompanied Paul during the greater part of his 2d missionary journey (Acts 15-18). At the meeting of the Christian community under James at Jeru, which decided that circumcision should not be obligatory in the case of Gentile believers, Silas and Judas were appointed along with Paul and Barnabas to convey to the churches in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia the epistle informing them of this decision. As "leading men among the brethren" at Jeru, and therefore more officially representative of the Jeru church than Paul and Barnabas, Silas and Judas were further commissioned to confirm the contents of the letter by "word of mouth." On arrival at Antioch, the ep. was delivered, and Judas and Silas, "being themselves also prophets, exhorted the brethren with many words, and confirmed them." Their mission being thus completed, the four were "dispersed in peace from the brethren unto those that had sent them" (Acts 15: 42), "unto the antiochian churches." (.5) (Acts 15: 22-25).

Different readings now render the immediate moves of Silas somewhat obscure; ver 33 would imply that he returned to Jeru. But some texts proceed in ver 34 in the line of his"appointing Silas to abide therestill," and others add "and Judas alone proceeded." Or, the first half is accepted by 35. The principal texts however reject the whole verse and are followed in this by RV. It is held by some that he remained in Antioch till chosen by Paul (ver 40). Others maintain that he returned to Jeru where John Mark then was (cf Acts 13: 13); and that either during the interval of "some days" (Acts 15: 36), when the events described in Gal 2: 11-12 (Wend), he returned to Antioch along with Peter, or that he and John Mark were summoned thither by Paul and Barnabas, subsequent to their departure. However, see Knowling, Expositor's Gr Text, II, 330, 332-35.)

Upon Barnabas' separation from Paul, Silas was chosen by Paul in his place, and the two missionaries, "after being commended by the brethren [at Antioch] to the grace of the Lord," proceeded on their journey (Acts 15: 37-39). Travelling through Asia, Syria, Cilicia, Galatia, Phrygia and Mysia, where they delivered the decree of the Jeru council and strengthened the churches, and were joined by Timothy, they eventually reached Troas (Acts 16: 14-16). Their indications are that at this city Luke also became one of their party (cf also the apocryphal "Acts of St. Paul," where this is definitely stated; Budge, Contendings of the Apostles, II, 544). Upon the call of the Macedonian, the missionary band set sail for Greece, and after touching at Samothrace, they landed at Neapolis (Acts 16: 9-11). At Philippi, Lydia, a seller of purple, was converted, and with her they made her abode; but the exorcism of an evil spirit from a sorceress brought upon Silas and Paul the enmity of her masters, whose source of gain was thereby being charged before the magistrates with causing a breach of the peace and preaching false doctrine, their garments were rent off them and they were scourged and imprisoned. In no way dismayed, they prayed and sang hymns to God, and an earthquake in the middle of the night secured them a miraculous release. The magistrates, on learning that the two prisoners whom they had so maltreated were Rom citizens, came in person and besought them to depart out of the city (Acts 16: 12-19). After a short visit to the house of Lydia, where they held an interview with the brethren, they departed for Thessalonica, leaving Luke behind (cf Knowling, op. cit., 354-55). There they made many converts, esp. among the Greeks, but upon the house of Jason, their host, being attacked by hostile Jews, they were compelled to escape by night to Berea (16: 40—17: 10). There they received a better hearing from the Jews, but the enmity of the Thessalonian Jews still pursued them, and Paul was conducted for safety to Akiem (Iam 17: 13), and that they were overtaken by his two followers (18: 5). Knowling (op. cit., 363-64) suggests that they may have actually met at Athens, and that Timothy was then sent to Thessalonica (cf 1 Thess 3: 12), and Silas to Philippi (cf Phil 4: 13). By the time they came together again at Corinth. The arrival of Silas and Timothy at that city is probably referred to in 2 Cor 11: 9. It is implied in Acts 18: 18 that Silas did not leave Corinth at the same time as Paul, but no further definite reference is made to him in the narrative of the 2d missionary journey.

Assuming his identity with Silvanus, he is mentioned along with Paul and Timothy in 2 Cor 1: 19 as having preached Christ among the Corinthians (cf Acts 18: 5). In 1 Thessalonians, he is one of the same three send greetings to the church at Thessalonica (cf Acts 17: 1—9). In 1 Pet 5: 12 he is mentioned as a "faithful brother" and the bearer of that letter to the churches of the Dispersion (cf Acts 16: 40). But this latter text assigns He to the authorship of Silas is untenable.

C. M. KERR

SILENCE, sī' lens: Five Heb roots, with various derivatives, and two Gr words are thus tr. The word is used lit. for dumbness, interrupted speech, as in Lam 2: 10; Ps 32: 3; Ecc 3: 7; Am 5: 13; Acts 16: 12; 1 Cor 14: 28; 1 Tim 2: 11,12 AV (ARV "quietness"); Rev 8: 1, or figuratively of the unanswerers of the believer (Ps 33: 1; 30: 22; Jer 8: 14); of awe in the presence of the Divine majesty (Isa 41: 1; Zec 2: 13), or of death (1 S 2: 9; Ps 94: 17; 116: 17).

later used of cotton and silk): The only undoubted reference to silk in the Bible is the passage cited from Rev, where it is mentioned among the merchandise of Babylon. Sērōkon, "silk," is from Sř, the Gr name of China, when Chinese silk was first obtained. The equivalent Lat sericum occurs frequently in classical authors, and is found in the Vulg (Est 8 15) for būç, "fine linen." For būç, bassus, and sshēh EV has nearly always "fine linen," but for sshēh in Prov 31 22, AV has "silk," and in Gen 41 42 and Ex 25 4, AV's has "silk" and RV's has "cotton." See LINEN; FINE.

There can be little doubt of the correctness of EV "silk" for meshi in Exk 16 10, "I gathered thee about with fine linen [šēhah], and covered thee with silk [meshi]," and in the similar passage, Ezk 16 13.

Silk is produced by all Lepidoptera, butterflies and moths, but it is of great economic importance only in the Chinese silkworm, Bombyx mori, whose larva, a yellowish-white caterpillar from 2 to 3 in. long, feeds on the leaves of the mulberry (Morus). A pair of large glands on the two sides of the stomach secrete a viscous fluid, which is conveyed by ducts to an orifice under the mouth. On issuing into the air, the fine stream is hardened into the silk fiber, which the caterpillar spins into a cocoon. Within the cocoon the caterpillar is presently transformed into the chrysalis or pupa. The cocoons from which silk is to be spun are subjected to heat which kills the pupae and prevents them from being transformed into the perfect insects or moths, which would otherwise damage the cocoons as they made their exit.

The raising of silkworms, and the spinning and weaving of silk are now important industries in Syria, though the insect was unknown in Bible times. It was introduced to the Mediterranean region from China centuries after Christ. Coarse silk is produced from the Chinese oak silk-moth, Saturnia pernici, and from the Japanese oak silk-moth, Saturnia yama-mak. The silkworm moth of Syria and Pal is Saturnia pyri, from which silk has also been spun, but not commercially. See, further, WEAVING.

ALFRED ÉLY DAY

SILLA, sił'a (N.2, sil'a; B, Ṭallā, Ga'id, A, Γαλλάδης, Gaiddád): Josiah was assassinated by his servants "at the house of Millo" on the way that he "goeth down to Silla." (2 K 12 20). Wherever Beth-millo stood, Silla was evidently in the valley below it; but nothing is known of what it was or where it stood.

SILOAM, si-lō'am, si-lō'äm, SILOAH, si-lō'a, SHELAI, shē'la, SHILÔAH, shi-lō'a: (1) הַשִּׁלֹחַ, mā ha-shilōh (šilôh or shillôh) is a passive form and means "sent" or "conducted," "the waters of [the] Shiloh." (Isa 8 6). (2) הַשִּׁלֹא, bērēkhāth ha-shelâ, "the pool of [the] Shelah." (AV "Siloah") (Neh 3 15). (3) מִנְּהַל שִׁלֹא, mīnḥāl shilōa, "the hills of Siloam." (Isa 8 6). (4) מִנְּהַל שִׁלֹא, mīnḥâl shilōa, "the tower of Siloam" (Lk 13 4).

Although the name is chiefly used in the OT and Jos as the name of certain "waters," the surviving name today, Silvan, is that of a fairly prosperous village which extends along the steep east side of the Kidron valley from a little N. of the "Virgin's Fountain" as far as Bvr Eyyâb. The greater part of the village, the older and better built section, belongs to Moslem fellahin who cultivate the well-watered gardens in the valley and on the hill slopes opposite, but a southern part has recently been built in an extremely primitive manner by Yemeni Jews, immigrants from South Arabia, and still farther S., in the commencement of the Wady en Nâr, is the wretched settlement of the lepers. How long the site of Siloam has been occupied it is impossible to say. The village is mentioned in the 9th cent. in the Arab Muktadius. The numerous rock cuttings, steps, houses, caves, etc., some of which have at times served as chapels, show that the site has been much inhabited in the past, and at one period at least by hermits. The mention of "those eighteen, upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, and killed them!" (Lk 13 4) certainly suggests that there was a settlement there in NT times, although some writers consider that this may have reference to some tower on the city walls near the Pool of Siloam.

Opposite to the main part of Siloâh is the "Virgin's Fount," ancient Gihon (q.v.), whose waters are practically monopolized by the villagers. It is the waters of this spring which are referred to in the Aqueduct Isa 8 6b. "Forasmuch as these people have refused the waters of Shiloah that go softly, ... now therefore, behold, the Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the River."
Siloam, the explicit statement of Jos (Bl, V, iv, 1) that the fountain of Siloam, which he says was a plentiful spring of sweet water, was at the mouth of the Tyropoön would make us sure.

A little below this pool, at the very mouth of el-Wad, is a dry pool, now a vegetable garden, known as Birket el Hamra, "the red pool." For many years the sewage of Jerusalem found its way to this spot, but when in 1604 an ancient city sewer was rediscovered (see PEFS, 1904, 392-94), the sewage was diverted and the pool to the east which was sold with this property surrounded it with a wall. Although this is no longer a pool, there is no doubt but that it was once a pool because the great and massive dam which Bliss excavated here (see JERUSALEM, VI, 5) had clearly been made original in order to support a large concrete aqueduct which was constructed from Gihon along the side of the Kidron valley before Hezekiah’s great tunnel. If this is correct (and excavations are needed here to confirm this theory), then this may be the “lower pool” referred to in Isa 22 9, the waters of which Hezekiah stopped, and perhaps, too, that described in the same passage as the “old pool.”

The earliest known Heb inscription of any length was accidentally discovered near the lower end of the Siloam aqueduct in 1880, and reported by Dr. Schick. It was found upon Siloam a rock-smoothed surface about 27 in. square, some 15 ft. from the mouth of the aqueduct; it was about 3 ft. above the bottom of the channel on the east side. The inscription consisted of six large letters of Heb, and has been traced by Professor Sayce as follows:

(1) Behold the excavation. Now this is the history of the tunnel: while the excavators were still lifting up
(2) The pick toward each other, and while there were yet three cubits* to be broken through, the voice of the one called
(3) This prophet, for there was an [? ] access in the rock on the west. They rose up . . . they struck on the west of the
(4) Excavation; the excavators struck, each to meet the other, pick to pick. And there flowed
(5) The waters from their outlet to the pool for a thousand, two hundred cubits
(6) Of a cubit, was the height of the rock over the head of the excavators . . .

It is only a roughly scratched inscription of the nature of a graffito; the flowing nature of the writing is fully explained by Dr. Reisner’s recent discovery of the same at Samaria, and a modern judaean view of the Hebrew and ink. It is not an official inscription, and consequently there is no kingly name and no date, but the prevalent view that it was made by the work people who carried Hezekiah’s great work (2 K 20 20) is now further confirmed by the character of the Heb in the crescents which Reisner dates as of the time of Ahub.

Unfortunately this priceless monument of antiquity was violently removed from its place by some miscreants. The fragments have been collected and are now placed together in the Constantinople museum. Fortunately several excellent “squeezes” as well as transcriptions were made before the inscription was broken up, so that the damage done is to be regretted rather on sentimental than on literary grounds. E. W. G. MASTERTON

SILOAM, TOWER IN. See JERUSALEM; SILOAM.

SILOVUS, sil-vō's (Σιλοβοῦς, Silouanos [2 Cor 1 19]). See SILES.

SILVER, sil'ver (σιλβή, silβή; ἀργυρόν, argyron, ἀργυρός, argyros): Silver was known in the earliest historic times. Specimens of early Egypt and Bab silver work testify to the skill of the ancient silversmiths. In Pal, silver objects have been found antedating the occupation of the land by
the Hebrews. This metal was used for making all kinds of ornamental objects. In the mound of Gezer were found bowls, vases, ladles, balsam-pins, rings and bracelets of silver. The rings and settings for scarabs or seals were commonly of this metal. The first mention of silver in the Bible is in Gen 13:2, where it says that Abraham was rich in cattle, in silver and gold. At that time it was commonly used in exchange in the form of bars or other shapes. Coins of that metal were of a much later date (Gen 20:16; 23:15; 24:53; 37:28, etc.). booty was collected in silver (Jos 6:19); tribute was paid in the same (1 K 15:19). It was also used for jewelry (Gen 44:2). The Children of Israel systematically despooled the Egyptians of their silver before the exodus (Ex 3:22; 11:2; 12:35, etc.). Ex 20:23 implies that idols were made of it. It was largely used in the fittings of the tabernacle (Ex 26:8) and later of the temple (2 Ch 2:7). It is likely that the ancient supply of silver came from the mountains of Asia Minor where it is still found in abundance associated with lead as argentiferous galena, and with copper sulphide. The Turkish government mines this silver on shares with the natives. The Samiitt bowls, vases, ladles, and caskets were unusually worked. Later Phoenians shipped quantities of it from Greece and Spain. The Arabian sources are doubtful (2 Ch 9:14). Although silver does not tarnish readily in the air, it does corrode badly in the limestone soil of Pal and Syria. This probably partly accounts for the small number of objects of this metal found. On the site of the ancient jewellers’ shops of Tyre the writer found objects of gold, bronze, lead, iron, but none of silver. 

Figurative: Silver is to be as stones in Jerus (1 K 10:27) typified great abundance (cf Job 3:15; 22:25; 27:16; also Isa 60:17; Zec 9:3). The trying of men’s hearts was compared to the refining of silver (Ps 66:10; Isa 48:10). Jeh’s words were as pure as silver refined seven times (Ps 12:6). The gaining of understanding is better than the gaining of silver (Prov 3:14; of 8:19; 10:19; 16:16; 22:11). Silver become cross denoted deterioration (Isa 1:22; Jer 6:30). Breast and arms of silver was interpreted by Daniel to mean the interior kingdom to follow Nebuchadnezzar’s (Dan 2:32, 39).

In the NT, reference should be made esp. to Acts 19:24; Jas 5:3; Rev 18:12. James A. Patch

SILVERLING, sil’vér-ling (σκῦρον, ἑλέφθ keoph [Isa 7:23]): ‘A thousand of silver’ means a thousand shekels. See Piece of Silver.

SILVERSMITH, sil’vér-smith (ἄγρυκόποσ, argurókôpoś): Mentioned only once (Acts 19:24), where reference is made to Demetrius, a leading member of the silversmiths’ guild of Ephesus.

SIMALCUE, si-mal-ku’ē: AV = RV IMALCUE (q.v.).

SIMEON, sim’ē-on (σήμεων, shámōn; Σημέων, Simeón, Simeon): the Heb root is from šmâ, šâmâr, “to hear” (Gen 29:33); some modern scholars [Hitzig, W. R. Smith, Stade] derive it from Arâb, simâ, “the offspring of the hyena and female wolf?”

In Gen 29:33; 30:18-21; 35:23, Simeon is given as full brother to Reuben, Levi, Judah, Issachar and Zebulun, the son of Leah; and in Gen 46:29 Simeon is the brother of Levi and Dinah. He was let as a hostage in Egypt by orders of Joseph (Gen 42:24; 43:23).

In the “blessing” of the dying Jacob, Simeon and Levi are linked together:

1. The Patriarch: “Simeon and Levi are brethren, Violent avengers of their oxen and their asses;”

Biblical: Unto their assembly, my glory, he not thou united;

Data: For in their anger they slew a man, in their self-will they killed an ox.

Curst be their anger, for it was fierce; And their wrath, for it was cruel:

Will divide them in Jacob, And scatter them in Israel” (Gen 49:5-7).

Whatever view may be taken of the events of Gen 34:25 (and some would see in it “a tradition of the settlement of Jacob which belongs to a cycle quite independent of the descent into Egypt and the Exodus”), it is clear that we have here a reference to it and the suggestion that the subsequent history of the tribe, and its eventual absorption in Judah, was the result of violence. In the same way the priestly Levites became distributed throughout the other tribes without any tribal inheritance of their own (Dt 18:1; Josh 13:14). From the mention (Gen 46:10; Ex 6:15) of Shaul as being the son of a Canaanite woman, it may be supposed that the tribe was a pastoral one partly furnished with silver.

The “blessing of Moses” (Dt 33) is not mentioned at all in the Heb text, although in some MSS of LXX the latter half of ver 6 is made to apply to him: “Let Simeon be a small company.” The history of the tribe is scanty and raises many problems. Of the many theories advanced to meet them it cannot be said that any one answers all difficulties.

In the wilderness of Sinai the Simeonites camped beside the Reubenites (Nu 2:12; 10:19); it was Simeon, a member of one of the leading families of this tribe, who was slain in battle (Nu 21:23).

2. The Tribe in Scripture 26:14). The statistics in Nu 1:22f, where the Simeonites are given as 59,300, compared with the 20 census (Nu 26:14), where the numbers are 22,200, indicate a diminishing tribe. Some have connected this with the sin of Zinzi.

At the recital of the land at Mt. Gerizim, Simeon is mentioned last among those that are to come up to give the blessings (Dt 27:12). In the conquest of Canaan “Judah said unto Simeon his brother, Come up with me into my lot, that we may fight against the Canaanites; and I likewise will go with thee into thy lot.” So Simeon went with himself” (Jgs 1:3; cf ver 17). Many scholars find in Gen 34 a tribal attempt on the part of the Simeonites to gain possession of Shechem; if this is so, Judah did not assist, and the utter failure may have been a cause of Simeon’s subsequent dependence upon, and final absorption in, Judah.

In Jgs 4 and 5 Simeon is never mentioned. In the settlement of the land there is no account of how Simeon established himself in his territory (except the scanty reference in Jgs 1:5), but “their inheritance was apportioned among the midst of the inheritance of the children of Judah” (Josh 19:1); this is accounted for (ver 9), “for the portion of the children of Judah was too much for them.” Nevertheless we find there the very cities which are apportioned to Simeon, allotted to Judah (Josh 15:21-22; Neh 11:29). It is suggested (in 1 Ch 4:31) that the independent possession of these cities ceased in the time of David. David sent spoil to several Simeonite towns (1 S 30:26), and in 1 Ch 12:29, etc. it is ros: 34:24, etc. Simeonite warriors came to David in Hebron. In 1 Ch 27:16 we have mention of a ruler of the Simeonites, Shophathiah, son of Maacah.
SIMEON (Niger, m'j'yr): AV in Acts 13 1, RV "Simeon" (q.v.).

SIMEONITES, sim'ē-ōn'ī-tes. See Simeon.

SIMILITUDE, si-mil'i-ā-tud: In AV means either "an exact facsimile" (Ps 106 20 AV, RV "likeness"; Rom 6 14, etc), or else "the form itself" (Nu 12 8; Dt 4 12.15.16 for "form" [so RV]); cf "likeness." ERV has retained the word in 2 Ch 4 3; Dn 10 16 (ERV "likeness"), while the AV and RV have used "form." It has been supposed by many authorities that the name Sh'm/N occurs in the list of places plundered by Thothmes III (see Petrie, Hist., XI, 104; also Hommel, Assyrian Inscriptions, 208; Sayce, Early Heb Traditions, 392). In the 7th cent. we have a doubtful reference in an inscription of Esar-haddon relating his Egyptian campaign when a city Ap-kū is mentioned as in the country of Shu-me-n(a), which may possibly be a reference to Simeon. The survival of the name so late, if true, is strange, in the light of what we gather from the Bible about the tribe. (For discussion of both of these inscriptions, with references to the lit., see BB, coll. 4238-30.)

The city of Simeon as given in Josh 19 2-6 and 1 Ch 4 32.31 are (the names in parentheses are variations in the latter reference):

4. The Beer-sheba, Moladah, Hazar-shual, of Simeon Territory Balash (Diblah), Azem (AV) (Ezeem), Eتلad Edrei, Hormah, Ziklag, Beth-marcahah, Beth-susah (Hazar Susim), Beth-leboath (Beth-biri), Sharuhen (Sharaum) (Etam), Ain Rimmon, Ether (Tochen), Ashan—in all, 16 cities in Josh and 17 in 1 Ch. Ashan (1 Ch 6 17) is the only city not assigned to the priests. It is written wrongly as "Ain" in Josh 21 16. All the above cities, with certain variations in form, and with the exception of Etam in 1 Ch 4 32, which is probably a mistake, occur in the list of the cities of Judah (Josh 15 26-32.42). Ziklag is mentioned (1 S 27 6) as being the private property of the kings of Judah from the days of David, who received it from Achiab, king of Gath.

For the situation of these cities, so far as is known, see under their names. It is clear that they were all situated in the southwestern part of Pal, and that Simeon had no definite territorial boundaries, but isolated cities, with their villages, among those of the people of Judah.

E. W. MASTERMAN

SIMEON (צִיְמֵהָא, shim'ēha; סִיְמֶא, Sīmē'ā): (1) The 2d son of Jacob by Leah (see separate art.).

(2) Great-grandfather of Judas Maccabaeus (1 Mac 2 1).

(3) A man in Judas and at the conclave of the nation of Isc. When the infant Jesus was brought into the Temple, he took Him into his arms and blessed God in words which are famous as the Nunc dimittis. Simeon bestowed his blessing on the wondering father and mother (Lk 2 25.34). Legend has made him the son of Hillel and father of Gamaliel I, but this has no historical basis.

(4) An ancestor of Jesus (Lk 3 30); RV "Simeon, the Just".

(5) RV "Simeon": one of the prophets and teachers in the Christian community at Antioch. He is also called Niger, which was the gentle name he had assumed, Simeon being Heb. He was associated with Sts. Paul and Barnabas for their missionary work (Acts 13 1.2). Nothing more is known of him.

(6) RV "Simeon": the Heb name of Simon Peter (Acts 16 14). S. F. HUNTER

SIMILITUDE, si-mil'i-ā-tud: In AV means either "an exact facsimile" (Ps 106 20 AV, RV "likeness"; Rom 6 14, etc), or else "the form itself" (Nu 12 8; Dt 4 12.15.16 for "form" [so RV]); cf "likeness." ERV has retained the word in 2 Ch 4 3; Dn 10 16 (ERV "likeness"), while the AV and RV have used "form." It has been supposed by many authorities that the name Sh'm/N occurs in the list of places plundered by Thothmes III (see Petrie, Hist., XI, 104; also Hommel, Assyrian Inscriptions, 208; Sayce, Early Heb Traditions, 392). In the 7th cent. we have a doubtful reference in an inscription of Esar-haddon relating his Egyptian campaign when a city Ap-kū is mentioned as in the country of Shu-me-n(a), which may possibly be a reference to Simeon. The survival of the name so late, if true, is strange, in the light of what we gather from the Bible about the tribe. (For discussion of both of these inscriptions, with references to the lit., see BB, coll. 4238-30.)

The city of Simeon as given in Josh 19 2-6 and 1 Ch 4 32.31 are (the names in parentheses are variations in the latter reference):
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SIMEON (צִיְמֵהָא, shim'ēha; סִיְמֶא, Sīmē'ā): (1) The 2d son of Jacob by Leah (see separate art.).

(2) Great-grandfather of Judas Maccabaeus (1 Mac 2 1).

(3) A man in Judas and at the conclave of the nation of Isc. When the infant Jesus was brought into the Temple, he took Him into his arms and blessed God in words which are famous as the Nunc dimittis. Simeon bestowed his blessing on the wondering father and mother (Lk 2 25.34). Legend has made him the son of Hillel and father of Gamaliel I, but this has no historical basis.

(4) An ancestor of Jesus (Lk 3 30); RV "Simeon, the Just".

(5) RV "Simeon": one of the prophets and teachers in the Christian community at Antioch. He is also called Niger, which was the gentle name he had assumed, Simeon being Heb. He was associated with Sts. Paul and Barnabas for their missionary work (Acts 13 1.2). Nothing more is known of him.

(6) RV "Simeon": the Heb name of Simon Peter (Acts 16 14). S. F. HUNTER
the head of the Hasmonaean dynasty. "The signi-
ificance of Simon's administration consists in this,
that he completed the work of Jonathan and left
the Jewish people absolutely independent of Syria" (Schürer).

See MACCABEUS, II, 4.

(4) Simon high priest, son of Onias I, whom he succeeded c 300 BC. He was one of the last of the Great Synagogue, and to him is attributed the saying, "On three things the world depends—
the Law, worship and the showing of kindness.
According to Jos (Ant, XII, i, 5) this Simon was
called "the dust" (aEkeidikios), "on account of
his piety and his benevolent disposition toward
his countrymen."

Many authorities (Herzfeld, Derenbourg, Stanley,
Cheyne) assert that Jos is wrong in attaching this
epitaph to Simon I instead of Simon II. Schürer is not
sure on this question. But the Talmud passage which
Derenbourg cites means the opposite of what Benjamin,
viz. it is intended to show how splendid and holy were
the days of Simon (ha-cadik) compared with the later
days. Besides, Jos is more likely to have known the
truth on this matter than these later authorities.
The same uncertainty obtains as to whether the eulogium
in Sir 50 1 ff of "the great priest" refers to Simon I or
Simon II. Schürer and others refer it to Simon II. It
is more likely to refer to the Simon I who was famous
as "the Just," and consequently to Simon I. Besides
we know little of the achievements of Simon II to entitle
him to such praise. The building operations mentioned
would suit the time of Simon I better, as Ptolemy cap-
tivated himself with a probably destroyed detached
temple. The Talmud states that this Simon (and not Jaddua)
mot Alexander the Great.

(5) Simon II, high priest, son of Onias II and
 grandson of Simon I and father of Onias III, flourished
about the end of the 3rd cent. BC, and was
succeeded by his son Onias III c 198 BC. Jos
says that this Simon in the conflict of the sons of
 Joseph sided with the elder sons against Hyrcanus
the dinner-jar. Schürer (probably incorrectly) thinks
that he is the Simon praised in Sir 50 1 ff. See (2)
above (3 Macce 2 1; Jos, Ant, XII, iv, 10).

(4) Simon, a Benjamite, guardian of the temple,
who, having quarreled with the high priest Onia III,
inaugurated Appolonius of the untold sums of money
in the temple treasury. Appolonius laid the matter
before the king Seleucus IV, who sent Heliodorus
to remove the money. An apparnyr prevented
Heliodorus from accomplishing his task (2 Macce
3 4 ff). It is further reported, that Simon conse-
trated his attention on Onias. He is spoken of as
brother of the renegade Menelaus (4 23). Of his
end we know nothing.

(5) Simon Chossameus (B [and Suet], ὁ καθήμενος,
Chossameus, A, Ἀκοσμάως, C, Ἀκοσμάως, O, Ἀκοσμάως,
who had married "strange wives" (1 Esd 9 32). Simon apparently
is "Shimeon" (shim'ôn) of the sons of Harim (Ezr 10 31); Chossameus
is probably a corrupt standing in the place of, but
not resembling, any of the three names: Benjamin,
Malluch, Shamraiah, which Eed emits from the Ezr
list.

S. ANGUS

SIMON, sim'ôn (Σίμων, Simōn):
(1) Simon Peter. See Peter (Simon).

(2) Another of the Twelve, Simon, the "Cana-
aean" (Mt 10 4; Mk 3 18), "the Zealot" (Lk 6
15; Acts 1 13). See CANAANEAN.

(3) One of the brethren of Jesus (Mt 13 55;
Mk 6 3). See BROTHERS OF THE LORD.

(4) The "leper" in Bethany (Jn 11 1), whose house
a woman poured a huge cup of precious ointment upon
the head of Jesus (Mt 26 6; Mk 14 3). He had
probably been healed by Jesus; in that case his
ungracious behavior was not consistent with due
gratitude. However, he was healed, the title
referred to his present position in the town, a lepers
were ostracized by law.

(5) A Pharisee in whose house a woman, "a
sinner," wet the feet of Jesus with her tears, and

SIMEON, SIMON MAGUS, mā'gus (Σίμων, Simōn, Gr
form of Heb שמעון, šim'ôn). Gesenius gives the meaning
of the Heb word as "hearing with acceptance"; it is formed from שמע, šā'ma, "to hear":

1. Simon, a Magician
2. Simon and the Apostles
(1) Simon and Philip
(2) Simon and Peter and John
3. The Magicians and the Gospel
4. Testimony of Early Christian Writers
5. Sources of Legendary History
6. Traditions of His Death
7. The Simonians
8. Was Simon the Originator of Gnosticism?

The name or term "Magus" is not given to him in
the NT; but it is used to designate or particularize
him on account of the inci-

1. Simon, baptized and "dared" recorded in Acts 8 9-24, for

a. a Magician, though the word "Magus" does not occur; yet in ver 9 the present participle

magoi (magus) is used, and is tr. both in AV and in RV,

"used sorcery." Simon accordingly was a sorcerer,
he "bewitched" the people of Samaria (AV). In
ver 11 it is also said that "of long time he had
amazed" them "with his sorceries" (magieia).

b. The "claim", given to Simon; he carried the claim that he was a "great one"; and this claim was acknowledged
by the Samaritans, for previous to the introduction of the
gospel into Samaria, "they all gave heed [to him],
"from the least to the greatest, saying, This
man is that power of God which is called Great"
(10).

(1) It so happened, however, that Philip the
deacon and evangelist went down from Jerus
to Samaria, and "proclaimed unto them the Christ" (ver 5); and as the result of the
proclamation of the gospel, the Apostles
many were gathered into the Chris-
tian church. Many miracles also were
performed by Philip, sick persons cured, and
demons cast out, and Simon fell under the influence
of all these things, both of the preaching and of

the "signs." So great was the impression now made
upon Simon that he "believed" (ver 13). This
means, at least, that he saw that Philip was able
in the name of Jesus Christ to display powers
greater than anything he himself was acquainted
with: Philip's power was greater by far than
Simon's. He therefore came forward as one of the new
converts, and was baptized. After his baptism
he continued with Philip. The signs which ac-
company the works of the gospel to this city did not cease, and Simon seeing them "was amazed." The
word denoting Simon's amazement at the "signs" brought by Philip is the same as that used to express how the people of Samaria had been
amazed at Simon’s sorceries. It is an indication of the nature of the faith which he possessed in the gospel—wondering amazement at a new phenomenon not yet understood, not repentance or trust in Christ.

(2) As having reached Jerusalem, the events which had occurred in Samaria, the apostles sent Peter and John to establish the work there. These two apostles prayed that they might receive the Holy Ghost, which they had not yet received. And when they had laid their hands upon the converts, the Spirit was given to them. At this early period in the history of the church the Holy Ghost was bestowed in a visible manner which showed itself in such miraculous gifts as are described in Acts 2. Simon saw what had taken place, and, instead of joining the company of those who had truly repented and trusted Christ, he came forward with the same amazement as he had previously shown, and offered money to Peter and John, if they would impart to him the power of giving the Holy Ghost to others. Peter instantly rebuked this bold and ungodly request, and did so with such sternness as to cause Simon to ask that the judgment threatened by the apostle might not fall upon him.

It is not strange to find the gospel brought into direct conflict with magicians, for in the 1st and 2d cent. there were a multitude of such persons who pretended to possess supernatural powers, and which they and the Gospel flattered the sinful inclinations of the human heart, and fell in with men’s current ways of thinking, and required no self-renunciation at all. For these reasons the magicians found a ready belief on the part of many. The emperor Tiberius, in his later years, had a host of magicians in constant attendance upon him. Elymas, with whom Paul came in contact in Cyprus “endeavored a multitude of the multitude of a statue, was dug up in the Tiber at the spot described by Tacitus; and on it were seen the words Semonti Secundus, the Sabine, 545. It seems probable that Justin was mistaken in what he said about a statue having been erected in honor of Simon Magus. It is incredible that the folly should ever be carried to such an extent as that a statue should be erected, and it seems probable that a decree was “calling Simon Magus among the dei Romani” (Neander, History of Church History, 188). This shows the source of the error into which Justin had fallen.

There are many stories told by some of the early Christian writers regarding Simon Magus, which are of such a nature as to be incredible. Some of them are improbable in the extreme and border on the impossible.

(3) Jerome, who proceeds to quote from writings of Simon, represents him as employing these words in reference to himself: “I am the Word of God. I am the Emperor. I am all there is of God.” (Mansel, The Gnostic Heretics, 82). Tertullian (Mansel, I., 82) writes regarding him: “Simon, having purchased a certain woman named Helen, who had been a prostitute in the city of Tyre, carried her about with him, and said that she was his first conception, or that she was destined to the conception of all things, by whom, in the beginning, he conceived the thought of making for the angels and men. Thus this conception proceeded forth from him, and knowing her father’s wishes, she descended to the lower world, and produced the spirits and powers of this world, which were to be the models that this world was made. But after she had produced them, she was reached by the chief angel, and they were unwilling to be considered the offspring of any other being: for he himself was entirely unknown by Helen; but his descent by conception was detected by those powers and angels which were put forth from her, and suffered every insult from them that she might not return upward to her father: and this went so far that she was even confined within a human body, and for ages passed into another female body, as it were, when she was born into another. He said also that she was that Helen, on whose account the Trojan war was fought. . . .” Furthermore, we find that the supreme source of their prophecies under the inspiration of those angels who had obtained the word of Simon and Magus Paul, was a prudent man” (Acts 13, 7 AV). Elymas was one of those magicians, and he endeavored to turn away the deputy from the faith. Luke expressly calls this man “magus,” Elymas the magus (Acts 13, 8 c.).

(1) The story of Simon Magus does not close with what is narrated in the Acts, for the early Christian writers have much to say in regard to him. The martyr, himself a Samaritan, states that Simon Magus was a “Samaritan from the village called Gittus.” Justin Martyr states that, in the reign of Claudius Caesar, Simon was worshipped as a god at Rome on account of his magical powers, and that a statue had been erected to him, on the island in the river Tiber, with the inscription Simoni Deo Sancto, that is, “To Simon the sacred god.” Curiously enough, in the year 1574, a stone which appears to be part of the pedestal of a statue, was dug up in the Tiber at the spot described by Tacitus; and on it were seen the words Semonti Secundus, the Sabine, 545. It seems probable that Justin was mistaken in what he said about a statue having been erected in honor of Simon Magus. It is incredible that the folly should ever be carried to such an extent as that a statue should be erected, and it seems probable that a decree was “calling Simon Magus among the dei Romani” (Neander, History of Church History, 188). This shows the source of the error into which Justin had fallen.

There are many stories told by some of the early Christian writers regarding Simon Magus, which are of such a nature as to be incredible. Some of them are improbable in the extreme and border on the impossible.

(3) Jerome, who proceeds to quote from writings of Simon, represents him as employing these words in reference to himself: “I am the Word of God. I am the Emperor. I am all there is of God.” (Mansel, The Gnostic Heretics, 82). Tertullian (Mansel, I., 82) writes regarding him: “Simon, having purchased a certain woman named Helen, who had been a prostitute in the city of Tyre, carried her about with him, and said that she was his first conception, or that she was destined to the conception of all things, by whom, in the beginning, he conceived the thought of making for the angels and men. Thus this conception proceeded forth from him, and knowing her father’s wishes, she descended to the lower world, and produced the spirits and powers of this world, which were to be the models that this world was made. But after she had produced them, she was reached by the chief angel, and they were unwilling to be considered the offspring of any other being: for he himself was entirely unknown by Helen; but his descent by conception was detected by those powers and angels which were put forth from her, and suffered every insult from them that she might not return upward to her father: and this went so far that she was even confined within a human body, and for ages passed into another female body, as it were, when she was born into another. He said also that she was that Helen, on whose account the Trojan war was fought. . . .” Furthermore, we find that the supreme source of their prophecies under the inspiration of those angels who had obtained the word of Simon and Magus Paul, was a prudent man” (Acts 13, 7 AV). Elymas was one of those magicians, and he endeavored to turn away the deputy from the faith. Luke expressly calls this man “magus,” Elymas the magus (Acts 13, 8 c.).

(1) The story of Simon Magus does not close with what is narrated in the Acts, for the early Christian writers have much to say in regard to him. The martyr, himself a Samaritan, states that Simon Magus was a “Samaritan from the village called Gittus.” Justin Martyr states that, in the reign of Claudius Caesar, Simon was worshipped as a god at Rome on account of his magical powers, and that a statue had
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Simon Magus
Simon the Zealot

lasts for three days, Simon maintaining that there are two gods, and that the God of the O.T. is an imperfect being. Simon Magus withdraws to Tyre and then to Sidon. Peter follows Simon from place to place, countering his sorceries, and instructing the people. At Laodicea a second disputation takes place between the apostle and Simon on the same subjects.

The Homilies are not a Christian protest against Gnosticism, but merely that of one gnostic school or sect against another, the Ebionite against the Marcionite. The Deity of Christ is denied, and He is regarded as one of the Jewish prophets.

In the legends Simon is represented as constantly opposing Peter, who ultimately discredit and vanquishes him. These legends occur in more forms than one, the earlier form selecting Antioch as the place where Simon was discomfited by the apostle and where he also died; the later tradition chooses Rome for these events.

One tradition tells how the magician ordered his followers to bury him in a grave, promising that if this were done, he would rise again on the third day. They did as he wished and buried him; but this time death was the end of him, for he did not rise again.

Simon is said to have met his death at Rome, after an especially renowned altercation with Peter. During this final controversy with the apostle, Simon had raised himself in the air by the help of evil spirits, and in answer to the prayer of Peter and Paul he was dashed to the ground and killed.

According to another form of this tradition, Simon proposed to give the Roman emperor a proof of his power by flying off to God. He succeeded, it is said, in flying for a certain distance over Rome, but in answer to the prayer of Peter he fell and broke one of his legs. This tradition accounts for his end by saying that the people stoned him to death.

The Simonians, the Simonians or followers of Simon, were an eclectic sect, who, in one time, to have adopted tenets and opinions derived from paganism, at another, from Judaism and the beliefs of the Samaritans, and at another still, from Christianity. Sometimes they seem to have been ascetics; at others they are wild soffers at moral law. They regarded Simon Magus as their Christ, or at least as a form of Christ, the redeemer of the world, who had manifested Himself also in Jesus. The Simonians were one of the minor gnostic sects and were carried away both from the doctrine and from the ethical spirit of the Christian faith.

Simon denies that the followers of Simon were Christians in any sense. The words of Origen are, "It escapes the notice of Celsus that the Simonians do not in any way acknowledge Jesus as the Son of God, but they call Simon the Power of God." In the time of Origen the followers of Simon had dwindled in number to such a degree that he writes, "I do not think it possible to find that all the followers of Simon in the whole world are more than thirty: and perhaps I have said more than there really are." (Contr. Cel., 1.27, quoted by Alford, G.T. Book 8, Acts 8)

Irenaeus also has much to say regarding Simon and his followers. He makes the legendary Simon, identical with the magician of Acts 8, makes him also the third to the list of the twelve, and says that it was from him that Gnosticism sprang. The account which he gives of the Simonians shows that by the time Irenaeus lived, their system had decayed into Gnosticism; but this fact does not justify Irenaeus in the assertion that Simon of Acts 8 is the originator of the gnostic system. The early Christian writers took this view, and regarded Simon Magus as the founder of Gnosticism. Perhaps they were right, "but from the very little authentic information we possess, it is impossible to ascertain how far he was identified with their tenets" (Alford, N.T. II, 50).

It may be that there is a substratum of fact, of such a nature that future investigation and discovery will justify these early Christian writers in their judgment, and will show that Simon Magus is not to be overlooked as one of the sources from which Gnosticism sprang. The exact origin of Gnosticism is certainly difficult to trace, but there is little or no indication that it arose from the incidents narrated in Acts 8. It cannot be denied that a connection is possible, and may have existed between the two, that is between Simon Magus and some of the gnostic here-sies; but the facts of history show widespread tendencies at work, during and even before the Apostolic age, which aptly account for the rise of Gnosticism. These are found e.g. in the Alexandrian philosophy, and in the tenets of the false teachers at Colossae and in other places. These philosophical and theosophical ideas commingled with the influences of Zoroaster, of Persia, and of Buddhism from India, and these tendencies and influences, taken in conjunction, were the sources of the various heresies known by the name of Gnosticism. See Gnosticism.

JOHN RUTHERFORD

SIMON PETER. See Peter, Simon.

SIMON THE CANAANITE, OR CANANAEN, OR ZEALOT (Σίμων Καναναῖος, Simon Kananaotos; ΣΠΕ, kananaios; the Jerosaus A.D. 6; Acts 1:13; Origen): One of the Twelve Apostles. This Simon was also named "the Canaanite" (Mt. 10:4; Mk. 3:18 AV) or "the Canaanite" (Mt. 10:4; Mk. 3:18 RV) or "Zealotes" (Lk. 6:15; Acts 1:13 AV) or "the Zealot" (Lk. 6:15; Acts 1:13 RV).

He was one of the Twelve Apostles. He was a Galilean, to whom the designation "Cananeean" is regarded as of political rather than of geographical significance (cf. St. Luke's rendering). The Zealots were a faction, headed by Judas of Galilee, who, "in the days of the enrolment" (cf. Acts 5:37; Lk. 2:1.2) bitterly opposed the threatened increase of taxation at the census of Quirinus, and would have hastened by the sword the fulfillment of Messianic prophecy.

Simon has been identified with Simon the brother of Jesus (Mk. 6:3; Mt. 13:55), but there are also reasons in favor of identifying him with Nathanael.

Thus (1) all the arguments adduced in favor of the Bartholomew-Nathanael identification (see Nathanael) can equally be applied to that of Simon-Nathanael, except the second. But the second is of no account, since the Philip-Bartholomew connection in the Synoptists occurs merely in the apostolic lists, while in St. John it is narrative. Further, in the Synoptists, Philip is connected in the narrative, not with Bartholomew but with Andrew.

(2) The identity is definitely stated in the Genealogies of the Twelve Apostles (see Nathanael). Simon is the "preaching of Simon, son of Cleopas" (cf. Budge, II, 70) in the genealogy (Mt. 1:13) because Simon was the father of Cleopas, who was the husband of Mary, mother of James the Less and of John the son of Zebedee (Heb. III, xi, 32; IV, xxii) also refers to a Simon who succeeded James as bishop of Jerusalem and suffered martyrdom under Trajan under (see Heschong, pp. 325-328). It is therefore a case: Simon a son of Cleopas.
A fairly exact definition of sin based on Bib. data would be that sin is the transgression of the law of God (1 Jn 3 4). Ordinarilysin is defined simply as “the transgression of the law,” but the idea of God is so completely the essential conception of sin in the entire Bib. revelation that we can best define sin as disobedience to the law of God. It will be seen that primarily sin is an act, but from the very beginning it has been known that acts have effects, not only in the outward world of things and persons, but also upon the inner life.

2. Affects the Inner Life

Hence, we reach the special exception, not only that sin is profoundly inner in its consequences, but that its effects reach outward also to the system in which practically involves the race. Around these various aspects of doctrine differing systems of theology have sprung up.

Students of all schools are agreed that we have in the OT story of the fall of Adam an eternally true account of the way sin comes into the world (Gen 3 1–6). The question is the full not so much as to the literal historic matter-of-factness of the narrative, as to its essentially psychological truthfulness. The essential thought of the narrative it that both Adam and Eve disobeyed an express command of God. The seductiveness of temptation is nowhere more forcefully stated than in this narrative. The fruit of the tree is pleasant to look upon; it is good to eat; it is to be desired to make one wise; moreover, the tempter moves upon the woman by the method of the half truth (see Adam in the OT).

God had said that disobedience to the command would bring death; the tempter urged that disobedience should lead to life, implying that the command of God had meant that death would immediately follow the eating of the forbidden fruit. In the story the various avenues of approach of sin to the human heart are graphically suggested, but after the seduction of evil has thus been set forth, the fact remains that both transgressors knew they were transgressing (Gen 3 24). Of course, the story is told in simple, naïve fashion, but its pers-
5. Freedom of Man

This is a concept implicit in the idea of freedom of choice and the possibility of having a direct relationship with God. It has been interpreted in different ways over time, with some theologians and philosophers believing in a free will and others in predestination. The Bible acknowledges the existence of evil and the temptation of man, but it also highlights the importance of moral and spiritual choices.

6. Transgression against Light

Transgression against light is related to the idea of conscience and awareness of right and wrong. According to the Bible, transgressions are often a result of a lack of understanding or knowledge of the will of God. The conscience is a moral warning system within the individual, reminding them of what is right and what is wrong. It is through this conscience that the knowledge of good and evil is imparted to man (Gen 3:5).

7. Inwardness of the Moral Law

The moral law is inward, as it is a reflection of the moral law, and the conscience. The Bible speaks of the conscience as a reflection of the moral law, which is a reflection of the will of God. The conscience is a warning system that functions as a mirror to the moral law.

The conscience is a warning system that functions as a mirror to the moral law.

The conscience is a warning system that functions as a mirror to the moral law.
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God who looks chiefly at the heart and judges men by the inner motive.

(3) Jesus.—In the teaching of Jesus the emphasis upon the inner spirit as the essential factor in the moral life came to its climax. Jesus honored the Law, but he pushed the keeping of the Law back from the mere performance of externals to the inner stirrings of motives. It is not merely the actual commission of adultery, for example, that is sin: it is the lustful desire which leads to the evil glance; it is not merely the actual killing of the man that is murder; it is the spirit of hatred which makes the thought of murder welcome (Mt 5:21-27). Paul caught the spirit of Jesus and carried the thought of Jesus out into more elaborate and formal statements. There is a law of the inner life with which man should bind himself, and this law is the law of Christ's life itself (Rom 8:1-4). While both Jesus and Paul recognized the place of the formal codes in the moral life of individuals and societies, they sought a great service for righteousness in setting on high the obligations upon the inner spirit. The follower of Christ is to guard the inmost thoughts of his heart. The commandments are not always precepts which can be given articulated statement; they are rather instincts and intuitions and glimmers must be followed, even when we cannot give them full statement.

From this standpoint we are able to discern something of the force of the Bib. teaching as to whether sin is to be looked upon as negative or positive, as the absence of goodness or as the mere absence of goodness.

8. Sin as negative

Positive Force

The man who sins is one who does not keep the Law. This, however, is hardly the full Bib. conception. Of course, the man who does not keep the Law is a sinner, but the idea of transgression is very often that of a positive refusal to keep the commandment and a breaking of the commandment. Two courses are set before men, one good, the other evil. The evil course is, in a sense, something positive in itself. The evil man does not stand still; he moves as truly as the good man moves; he becomes a positive force for evil. In all our discussions we must keep clearly in mind the truth that evil is not something existing in and apart from man. Biblical Scriptures deal with evil men, and the evil men are as positive as their natures permit them to be. In this sense of the word sin does run a course of positive destruction. In the thought, e.g., of the writer who made necessary the Flood, we have a positive state of evil contaminating almost the whole world (Gen 6:11). It would be absurd to characterize the world in the midst of which Noah lived as merely a negative world. The world was positively set toward evil. And so, in later writings, Paul's thought of Rom society is of a world of sinful men moving with increasing velocity toward the destruction of themselves and of all around them through doing evil. It is impossible to believe that Rom 1 conceives of sin merely in negative terms. We repeat, we do not do full justice to the Bib. conception when we speak of sin merely in negative terms. If we may be permitted to use a present-day illustration, we may say that in the Bib. thought sinful men are like the destructive forces in the world of Nature which must be removed before there can be peace and health for human life. For example, science today has much to say concerning gaseous forces which affect human life. A large part of modern scientific effort has been to rid the world of these gasses, or at least to cleanse human surroundings from their contaminating touch. The man who sterilizes the human environment so that these forces cannot touch men does in one sense a merely negative work; in another sense, however, his work makes possible the positive development of the forces which make for health.

It is from this thought of the positiveness of sin that we are to approach the problem of the hereditary transmission of evil. The

9. Heredity Bib. teaching has often been misinterpreted at this point. Apart from certain passages, esp. those of St. Paul, which set forth the practically universal contamination of sin (e.g. Rom 5:18, etc.), there is nothing in the Scriptures to suggest the idea that men are born into the world under a weight of guilt. We hold fast to the idea of God as a God of justice and love. There is no way of reconciling these attributes with the condemnation of human souls before they have themselves transgressed. Of course much theological teaching moves on the assumption that the tendencies to evil are so great that the souls will necessarily transgress, but we must keep clearly in mind the difference between a tendency to evil and the actual commission of evil. Modern scientific research reinforces the conception that the children of sinful parents, whose sins have been such as to impress their lives throughout, will very soon manifest symptoms of evil tendency. Even in this case, however, we must distinguish between the psychological and moral. The child may be given a wrong tendency from birth, not only by hereditary transmission, but by the imitation of sinful parents; yet the question of personal responsibility is altogether another matter. Modern society has come to recognize something of the force of this distinction. In dealing with extreme cases of this kind, the question of the personal guilt of the child is often disregarded in our literature. The sum total of experience round about the child an environment that will correct the abnormal tendency. But there can be little gainsaying the fact that the presence of sin in the life of the parent may go as far as to mark the life of the child with the sinful tendency.

The positive force of sinful life also appears in the effect of sin upon the environment of men. It is not necessary for us to believe that all the physical universe was cursed in one and all of its beginning. Scriptures deal with evil men, and the evil men are as positive as their natures permit them to be. In this sense of the word sin does run a course of positive destruction. In the thought, e.g., of the writer who made necessary the Flood, we have a positive state of evil contaminating almost the whole world (Gen 6:11). It would be absurd to characterize the world in the midst of which Noah lived as merely a negative world. The world was positively set toward evil. And so, in later writings, Paul's thought of Rom society is of a world of sinful men moving with increasing velocity toward the destruction of themselves and of all around them through doing evil. It is impossible to believe that Rom 1 conceives of sin merely in negative terms. We repeat, we do not do full justice to the Bib. conception when we speak of sin merely in negative terms. If we may be permitted to use a present-day illustration, we may say that in the Bib. thought sinful men are like the destructive forces in the world of Nature which must be removed before there can be peace and health for human life. For example, science today has much to say concerning gaseous forces which affect human life. A large part of modern scientific effort has been to rid the world of these gasses, or at least to cleanse human surroundings from their contaminating touch. The man who sterilizes the human environment so that these forces cannot
forces. No one can deny that evil men can use physical forces for evil purposes, and that evil men can make bad social forces, but both these forces, can be used for good as well as for evil. "The whole creation groans 'laboring in pain' waiting for the redemption at the hands of the sons of God (Rom 8 19-23).

In the thought of Jesus, righteousness is life. Jesus came that men might have life (Jn 10 10).

11. Redemption

It must follow therefore that in His thought sin is death, or rather it is the positive course of transgression which makes toward death (Jn 5 24).

But man is to cease to do evil and to learn to do well. He is to face about and walk in a different direction; he is to be born from above (Jn 3 3), and surrender himself to the forces which beat upon him from above rather than to those which urge upon him from below (Rom 12 2). From the realization of the positive both of sin and of righteousness, we see the need of a positive force which is to bring men from sin to righteousness (Jn 3 3-8).

Of course, in what we have said of the positive nature of sin we would not deny that there are multitudes of men whose evil consists in their passive attitude; the consequence is repentance. Multitudes of men may not be lost, in the sense that they are breaking the more obvious of the commandments. They are lost, in the sense that they are drifting about, or that they are existing in a condition of inertia, with no great insight into any spiritual ideals. But the problem even here is to find a force strong enough and positive enough to bring such persons to themselves and to God. In any case the Scriptures lay stress upon the seriousness of the problem constituted by sin. The Bible is occupied on redemption. Repentance from sin is thought of as carrying with it redemption from all other calamities. If the kingdom of God and of His righteousness can be seized, all other things will follow with the seizure (Mt 6 33).

12. Life in Christ

The work of Christ is set before us as chiefly a work of redemption from sin. A keen student once observed that almost all failures to take an adequate view of the person of Christ can be traced to a failure to realize adequately the seriousness of sin. The problem of sin is a problem of something that is lost. A life set toward sin is a problem which may well tax the resources of the Almighty. Lives cannot be transformed merely by precept. The only effective force is the force of a Divine life which will reach and change human lives (see Redeemer).

We are thus in a position to see something of the positivity of the life that must be in Christ if He is to be a Saviour from sin. That positive must be powerful enough to make men feel that in some real sense God Himself has come to their rescue (Rom 8 32-39). For the problem of salvation from sin is manifold. Sin long persisted in begets evil habits, and the habits must be broken. Sin lays the conscience under a load of distress, for the only need of a sense of forgiveness. Sin blinds and paralyzes the faculties to such a degree that only the mightiest of tonic forces can bring back health and strength. And the problem is often more serious than this. The presence of evil in the world, the seriousness in the sight of a Holy God to be Himself, because of His very holiness, must be under stumbinous obligation to aid us to the utmost for the redemption of men. Out of the thought of the disturbance which sin makes in the heart of God, we see something of the reason for the doctrine that in the cross of Christ God was discharging a debt to Himself and to the whole world; for the insistence also that in the cross there is opened up a fountain of life, which, if accepted by sinful men, will heal and restore them.

It is with this seriousness of sin before us that we must think of forgiveness from sin. We can understand the reality of sin, it must be forgiven.

13. Repentance

It is given only on condition that men seek forgiveness in the name of the highest manifestation of holiness which they have known. For those who have heard the preaching of the cross and have seen something of the real meaning of that preaching, the way to forgiveness is in the name of the cross. In the name of a holiness which men would make their own, if they could; in the name of an ideal of holy love which men of themselves cannot reach, but which they forever strive after, they seek forgiveness. But the forgiveness is to be taken seriously. In both the OT and NT repentance is not merely a changed attitude of mind. It is an attitude which shows its sincerity by willingness to do everything possible to undo the evil which the sinner has wrought (Lk 19 8).

If there is any consequence of the sinner's own sin which the sinner can himself make right, the sinner must in himself genuinely repent and make that consequence right. In one sense forgiveness is not altogether something done once for all. The seductiveness of sin is so great that there is need of humble and continuous watching. While anything like a morbid introspection is unscriptural, constant alertness to keep to the straight and narrow path is everywhere enjoined as an obligation (Gal 6 1).

The forgiveness is in the Scriptures which will warrant the idea that forgiveness is to be conceived of in such fashion as would teach that the consequences of sin are easily forgiven and quickly eliminated. Change in the attitude of a sinner necessarily means change in the attitude of God. The sinner and God, however, are persons, and the Scriptures always speak of the problem of sin after a completely personal fashion. The changed attitude affects the personal standing of the sinner in the sight of God. But God is the person who creates and carries on a moral universe. In carrying on that universe He must keep personal relations with Himself, and of the things that he must do, in their proper place as the constitutional principles of the universe. While the father welcomes back the prodigal to the restored personal relations with himself, he cannot, in the full sense, blot out the fact that the prodigal has sinned against the rights of the universe. Personal forgiveness may be complete, but the elimination of the consequences of the evil life is possible only through the long lines of healing work at work. The man who has sinned against his body can find restoration from the consequences of the sin only in the forces which make for bodily healing. So also with the mind and will. The mind which has thought evil must be cured of its tendency to think evil. To be sure the curative processes may come almost instantly through the upheaval of a great experience; but not, is the long consideration that the processes may have to work through long years (see Sanctification). The will which has been given to sin may feel the stirring of sin after the life of forgiveness has begun. All this is a manifestation, not only of the power of sin, but of the constitutional morality of the universe. Forgiveness must not be interpreted in such terms as to make the transgression of the Law of God in any sense a light or trivial offence. But, on the other hand, we must not set any limit to the work of the cross of God. With the removal of the power which makes for evil the possibility of development in real human experience is before the life (see Forgiveness). The word of the Master is that He came that they may have life, and may have it
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abundantly” (Jn 10 10). Sin is serious, because it thwarts life. Sin is given so large a place in the thought of the Bib. writers simply because it blocks the channel of that movement toward the fullest life which the Scriptures teach is the aim of God in placing men in the world. God conceived of as the Father in Heaven. Sin has a deeply disturbing effect in restraining the relations between the Father and the sons and of preventing the proper development of the life of the sons. See further, Ethics, 1, 3, (2); Ethics of Jesus, 1, 2; Guilt; Johannine Theology, V, 1; Paul the Apostle; Pauline Theology; Redemption, etc.

LITERATURE.—Tennent, Origin and Propagation of Sin; Hyde, Sin and Its Forgiveness; chapter on “Incarnation and Atonement” in Bowne’s Studies in Christianity; Stevens, Christian Doctrine of Salvation; Clarke, Christian Doctrine of God; various treatises on Systematic Theology.

FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL

SIN, sin (太阳城, gin; “clay or mud”), Σένων, Seneä, τὰν, Tana; A city of Egypt mentioned only in Ezek. 30:15,16. This seems to be a pure Sem name. The ancient Egypt name, if the place ever had one such, is unknown. Pelusium (or Pelusiac, Pelusian) also meant “the clayey or muddy town.” The Pelusine mouth of the Nile was “the muddy mouth.” and the modern Arab name of this mouth has the same significance. These facts make it practically certain that the Vulg is correct in identifying S. with Pelusium. But although Pelusium appears very frequently in ancient history, its exact location is still not entirely certain. The list of cities mentioned in Ezek in connection with S. furnishes no clue to its location. From other historical notices it seems to have been a frontier city. Rameses II built a wall from S. to Pelopoli, probably by the aid of Heb slaves (Diodorus Siculus, cf. Budge, Hist of Egypt, V, 90), to protect the eastern frontier. S. was a meeting-place of Egypt with her enemies who came to attack her, many great battles being fought at or near this place. Sennerchir and Cambyses both fought Egypt near Pelusium (Herod. ii.141; iii.10-13). Antiochus IV defeated the Egyptians here (Budge, VIII, 23), and the Romans under Gabinius defeated the Egyptians in the same neighborhood. Pelusium was also accessible from the sea, or very near a seaport, for Pompey after the disaster at Pharsalia fled into Egypt, sailing for Pelusium. These historical notices of Pelusium make its usual identification with the ruins near el-Kantara, a station on the Suez Canal 29 miles S. of Port Said, most probable. “S., the stronghold of Egypt,” in the words of Ezek (30:15), would thus refer to its inaccessibility because of swamps which served as impassable moats. The wall on the S. and the sea on the N. also protected it on either flank. M. G. KYLE

SIN AGAINST THE HOLY GHOST (SPIRIT).
See Blasphemy.

SIN, MAN OF. See Man of Sin.

SIN MONEY. See Sacrifice in the OT.

SIN OFFERING. See Sacrifice.

SIN, WILDERNESS OF. See Wanderings of Israel.

SINA, sîn: In Acts 7:38 AV, RV “Sinai” (q.v.).

SINAI, sînî, sînî-ê (太阳城, ginêy; A, Σινά, Sinâ, B, Σίνα, Scind): The name comes probably from a root meaning “to shine,” which occurs in Syr., and which in Nab is found in the name Sinai for “the moon.” The old explanation, “clayey,” is inappropriate to any place in the Sinaitic desert, though it might apply to Sin (Ezek 30:15,16) or Pelusium; even there, however, the applicability is doubtful. The desert of Sin (Ex 16:1; 17:1; Nu 33:11 f) lay between Sinai and the Gulf of Suez, and may have been named from the “glare” of its white chalk. But at Sinai “the glory of Jeh was like devouring fire on the top of the mount in the eyes of the children of Israel” (Ex 24:17); and, indeed, the glory of the Lord still dyes the crags of Jebel Musa (the “mountain of Moses”) with fiery red, reflected from its red granite and pink gneiss rocks, long after the shadows have fallen on the plain beneath. Sinai is mentioned, as a desert and a mountain, in 35 passages of the OT. In 17 passages the same desert and mountain are called “Horeb,” or “the waste.” This term is chiefly used in Dt, though Sinai also occurs (Dt 33:2). In the other books of the Pent, Sinai is the usual name, though Horeb also occurs (Ex 3:1; 17:6; 33:6), applying both to the “Mount of God” and to the desert of Rephidim, some 20 miles to the N.W. The indications of position, in various passages of the Pent, favor the identification with the traditional site, which has become generally accepted by all these explorers who have carefully considered the subject, though two other theories may need notice. Moses fled to the land of Midian (or “empty land”), which lay E. of the Sinaitic peninsula
(Nu 22:47; 26:31), and when he wandered with his flocks to Horeb (Ex 3:1) he is said to have reached the west side of the desert. In another note (Dt 1:2) we read that the distance was "eleven days' journey from Horeb by the way of Mount Seir unto Kadesh-barnea" or Petra (see WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL), the distance being about 145 miles, or 14 miles of daily march, though Israel—with its flocks, women and children—made 16 marches between these points. Sinai again is described as being distant from Egypt "three days' journey into the wilderness" (Ex 5:3), the actual route being 117 miles, which Israel accomplished in 10 journeys. But, for Arabs not encumbered with families and herds, this distance could still be covered by an average march of 39 miles daily, on riding camels, or even, if necessary, on foot. These distances will not, however, allow of our placing Sinai farther E. than Jebel Mısra. Lofty mountains, in all parts of the world, have always been sacred and regarded as the mysterious abode of God; and Jos says that Sinai is "the highest of all the mountains thereabout," and again is "the highest of all the mountains that are in that country, and is not only very difficult to be ascended by men, on account of its vast altitude, but because of the sharpness of its precipices: nay, indeed, it cannot be looked at without pain of the eyes, and besides this it was terrible and inaccessible, on account of the rumor that passed about, that God dwelt there" (Ant. II. xii, 1; III. v. 1). Evidently in his time Sinai was supposed to be one of the peaks of the great granitic block called et Tih—a term applying to any lofty mountain. This block has its highest peak in Jebel Kāturā (so named from a legend of St. Catherine of Egypt), rising 8,550 ft. above the sea. N.E. of this is Jebel Mısra (7,370 ft.), which, though less high, is more conspicuous because of the open plain called er Rūḩah ("the wide") to its N.W. This plain is about 4 miles long and has a width of over a mile, so that it forms, as Dr. E. Robinson (Bib. Res., 1838, i, 89) seems to have been the first to note, a natural camp at the foot of the mountain, large enough for the probable numbers (see Exouos, 3) of Israel.

Jebel Mısra has two main tops, that to the S.E. being crowned by a chapel. The other, divided by gorges into three precipitous crags, has the Convent to its N., and is called Rū fís-Safūkh, or "the willow top." N. of the Convent is the lower top of Jebel el Deir ("mountain of the monastery"). These heights were accurately determined by Royal Engineer surveyors in 1868 (Sir C. Wilson, Ordnance Survey Jebel Mısra of Sinai); and, though it is impossible to say which of the peaks Moses ascended, yet they are all much higher than any mountains in the Sinaitic desert, or in Midian. The highest tops in the Tih desert to the N. are not much over 4,000 ft. Those in Midian, E. of Elath, rise only to 4,200 ft. Even Jebel Serbāl, 20 miles W. of Sinai—a ridge with many crags, running 3 miles in length—is at its highest only 6,750 ft. above the sea. Horeb is not recorded to have been visited by any of the Hebrews after Moses, excepting by Elijah (1 K 19:8) in a time of storm. In favor of the traditional site it may also be observed that clouds suddenly formed, or lasting for days (Ex 14:15), are apt to cap very lofty mountains. The Hebrews reached Sinai about the end of May (Ex 19:1).
and, on the 3d day, "there were thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the mount" (ver 16). Such storms occur as a rule in the Sinaiite desert only in December and January, but thunderstorms are not unknown in Pal even in May.

A constant tradition fixing the site is traceable back to the 4th cent. AD. Eusebius and Jerome (Onom. s.v. "Choreb") place Horeb near Paran, which in their time was Evidence placed (Onom. s.v. "Raphidim") in Wady Feiran. Anchorites lived at Paran, and at Sinai at least as early as 365 AD, and neighborhood of Jebel Masa would, I think, bear comparison with many mountain districts where the peoples take no regard to its supply of water. There is also no other district in the Peninsula which affords such excellent pasturage.

This is important, as Israel encamped near Sinai from the end of May till April of the next year. There is also a well on the lower slope of Jebel Masa itself, where the ascent begins.

Another theory, put forward by Mr. Baker Greene (The Heb Mountain from Egypt, and Sinai, by Dr. Sayce (Higher Criticism, 1894, 268).

7. Greene's Theory

Mr. Greene supposed Elaha (Ex 15 27) to be Elath (Dt 3 8), now 'Ajlun at the head of the Gulf of Akaba. Sinai was thus a Gulf before was some unknown mountain in Midian. But in this case Israel would in 4 days (see Ex 15 22-23-27) have traveled a distance of 200 miles to reach Edin, which cannot but be regarded as quite impossible for the Hebrews when accompanied by women, children, flocks and herds.

C. R. CONDER

SINCERE, sin'-sr. SINCERITY, sin-ser'-ti (םֶשֶן, śêmēn; ἀπόφρασις, apōfrasís, ἀλήθεια, elikhreieia): "Sincerity" occurs once in the OT as the tr of śêmēn (complete, "entire," "sincere," etc (Josh 24 14; the same word is tr "sincerity" (Jes 9 16,19, RV "uprightly"). Four different words are rendered "sincere," "sincerely," "sincerity," in the NT: αδοξα, "without guile," "unadulterated," "desire the more pure milk of the word" (1 Pet 2 2 AV, RV "the spiritual") ARV "Gr, belonging to the reason;" of Rom 12 1, "ERV's "reasonable") "milk which is without guile, with no other purpose but to nourish and benefit the soul (Alford); ἀγνός, "without blame," "pure," "preach Christ... not sincerely" (Phil 1 17); ἀφθονία, "without corruption" (Eph 6, 24 AV, "that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, ARV "with a love incorruptible," m "in incorruption.") See Rom 2 7; ERV "uncorrupted" ARV "uncorruptible... sincerity," RV "uncorrupted") ; γνάθος, "not spurious" (2 Cor 8 8); elikhreieis, lit., judged of in the sunlight, hence, "clear," "manifest" (Phil 1 10); elikhreia, with same meaning, is tr "sincerity" (1 Cor 5 6; 2 Cor 1 12; 2 17).

RV has "sincerity" for "pure" (2 Pet 3 1), "sincerely" for "clearly" (Job 33 3).

In Wind 7 25 we have elikhreies in the description of Wisdom as a "pure influence," RV "clear influence."

W. L. WALKER

SINEW, sin'w (םנ, qith [Job 10 11, etc];

The tendons and sinews of the body are uniformly (7 t) thus called. "Therefore the children of Israel eat not the sinew of the hip which is upon the hollow of the thigh: unto this day: because he touched the hollow of Jacob's thigh in the sinew of the hip" (Gen 32 32). In the poetical description of Behemoth (hippopotamus) it is said: "He moveth his tail like a cedar: the sinews of his thighs are knit together" (Job 40 17). The prophet Ezekiel saw in his vision (37 6.8) that the dry bones were gathered together, that they were covered with sinews, flesh and skin, and that they were revived by the spirit of the Lord. In figurative language the neck of the ox or ox-steer is compared to an "iron sinew" (Isa 48 4). AV "my sinews take no rest" (확'_DELETED_ 17) has been corrected by RV into "the pains that gnaw me take no rest," but the earlier version has been retained in the margin.

H. L. E. LURING

SINGERS, sing'erz, SINGING, singing: Singing seems to have become a regular profession at a quite early date among the Hebrews. David had his troupe of singing men and singing women" at Jerusalem (2 S 19 35), and no doubt Solomon did to their numbers. Isa 25 16 suggests that it was not uncommon for foreign female minstrels of question-
able character to be heard making "sweet melody," singing songs along the streets and highways of Judaea. Nor was the worship of the temple left to the usually incompetent and inconstant leadership of laymen. The elaborate regulations drawn up for the constitution of the temple orchestra and chorus are referred to under Musac (q.v.). It has been inferred from Ezr 2 65 that women were included among the temple singers, but this is erroneous, as the musicians there mentioned were all classed as priests, to be evil, festivals, etc. The temple choir consisted exclusively of Levites, one essential qualification of an active member of that order being a good voice.

Of the vocal method of the Hebrews we know nothing. Wellhausen imagines that he can detect one of the singers, in the portrayal of an Assyrian band, compressing his throat in order to produce a vibrato; and it is quite possible that in other respects as well as this, ancient and modern oriental vocalization resembled each other. But that is about all that can be said.

On the other hand, we cannot repeat too often that we are quite unable to identify any intervals, scales, or keys having been used by ancient Israel. Even those who hold that the early church took the Gregorian "tones" from the synagogue, confess that it was "certainly not without considerable modifications." And, of course, there was not the slightest affinity between the Heb and the Anglican chant. See Music; Praise; Song; Temple.

JAMES MILLAR

SINGING, sin'g-l. EYE: Mt 6 22 f. || Lk 11 34: "If therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light; but if it be double, thy whole body shall be full of darkness." "Single" and "evil" here represent ἀρετής, haploïs, and πονερός, ponéros. Poneros elsewhere in the NT means "wicked"; haplous occurs only here in the NT, but is very common in ordinary Gr and always has the meaning "simple." But in view of the context, most commentators take haplous here as meaning "normal," "healthy," and ponérōs as "diseased," so rendering "Just as physical enlighten- ment depends on the condition of the eye, so spiritual enlightenment depend on the condition of the heart." This is natural enough, but it is not satisfactory, as it gives to haplous a unique sense and to ponēros a sense unique in the 73 NT examples of the word. Moreover, the single eye is found in Mt 20 15; Mk 7 22, where it means "jealousy" or "covetousness." With ponēros= "covetous," haplous would= "generous"; and this rendition gives excellent sense in Mt, where the further context deals with love of money. Yet in Lk it is meaningless, where the context is of a different sort, a fact perhaps indicating that Lk has placed the saying in a bad context. Or the Gr tr of Christ's words used by Matthew and Luke may have taken the moral terms haplous and ponēros to translate physical terms ("healthy" and "diseased") employed in the original Aramaic.

The Syriac version of Lk 11 36 may perhaps contain a trace of an older rendering. See Jülicher, Die Gleichnisse Jesu, I, 98-108.

SINGULAR, sin'g-ler: "Pertaining to the single person," "individual," and so sometimes "unusual," "remarkable." So Wisd 14 18, AV "the singular diligence of the artificer" (φιλοσοφία, philosofía, "love of honor," RV "ambition"). In Lk 27 2 by AV "when a man shall have a singular vow," and RV seems to have understood a "personal" or "private" vow. RV has "accomplish a vow," with in "make a special vow." Cf the same phrase (γαθήνθ [γαθήθ] neither) used of the Nazirite vow in Nu 6 2.

SINFIM, sî'nîm, sin'tîm, LAND OF (אֲרֵכָא יַעַנְתָּא, ʼereq sīnīm; יָעַנְתָּא פַּרֵס, ʼyānīn Pesār): The name occurs in Isaiah's prophecy of the return of the people from distant lands: "Lo, these shall come from far: and, lo, these from the north and from the west, and these from the land of Sinim" (49 22). The land is clearly far off, and it must be sought either in the S. or in the E. LXX points to an eastern country. Many scholars have favored identification with China, the classical Sinae. It seems improbable that Jews had already found their way to China; but from very early times trade relations were established with the Parthian-Parthian way of Arabia and the Pers Gulf; and the name may have been used by the prophet simply as suggesting extreme remoteness. Against this view are Dillmann (Comm. on Isa), Duhm, Cheyne and others. Some have suggested places in the S.: e.g. Sin (Peleusim, Ezk 30 15) and Syene (Cheyne, Intro to Isa, 275). But these seem to be too near.

In harmony with his reconstruction of Bib. history, Cheyne finally concludes that the reference here is to the return from a captivity in S. Arabia (S., RV s.v.). While no certain decision is possible, probability points to the E., and China cannot be quite ruled out. See art. "China," Enc Brit., 1850.

SINITES, sî'ntîs (קִנְיָם, qînîyām): A Cypriote people mentioned in Gen 10 17; 1 Ch 1 12. The identification is uncertain. Jerome mentions a ruined city Sin, near Arka, at the foot of Lebanon.

SINLESSNESS, sin'les-nēs: The 15th Anglican article ("Of Christ Alone without Sin") may be quoted as a true summary of Scripture teaching on sinlessness: "Christ in the truth of our nature was made like unto us in all things, sin only excepted, from which He was clearly [prourus] void, both in His flesh and in His spirit. . . . Sin, as Saint John saith, was not in Him. But all we the rest, though baptised, and born again in Christ, yet offend in many things; and, if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves."

Here the sinlessness of the Incarnate Son is affirmed. It are not only an elaborate effort to show that this is the affirmation of 1. Christ. Scripture. It is not only, as we are Sinless reminded above, definitely taught there. Yet more is it implied in the mysterious and essentially human condition of the Lord's evidently total immunity from the "sense of sin," His freedom from inward discord or imperfection, from the slightest discontent with self. It is not too much to say that this representation is self-evident of its truth. Had it been the invention of worshipping disciples, we may say with confidence that they (supposed thus capable of "free handling") would have been certain to betray some moral aberrations in their por- trature of their Master. They must have failed to put before us the profound ethical paradox of the person who, on the one hand, enjoys penitence and (with a tenderness infinitely deep) loves the penitent, and, on the other hand, is never for a moment penitent himself, and who all the while has proved, from the first, a supreme moral and spiritual magnet, "drawing all men to him." Meanwhile the Scripture represents the sinlessness of the Incarnate Lord as no mere automatic or effortless condition. He is sensitive to temptation, to a degree which makes it easy to us to actual experience (we are not here considering the matter sub specie aeternitatis), lies in the perfect fidelity to the Father of a will, exercised under human conditions, filled absolutely with the Holy Spirit, willingly received.
On the other hand, "we the rest," contemplated as true believers, are warned by the general teaching of Scripture never to affirm sinlessness as our condition. There are passages in 2. Saints Not Sinless (Jn 3:9, 5:19) which affirm of the regenerate man that he "sinnoch not." But it seems obvious to remark that such words, taken without context and balance, would prove too much; they would make the smallest sinner of sin a tremendous evidence against the person's regeneration at all. It would seem that such words practically mean that sin and the regenerate character are diametrical opposites, so that sinning is out of character, not in the man as such, but in the Christian as such. And the practical result is an unconquerable aversion and opposition in the regenerate will toward all known sin, and a readiness as sensitive as possible for confession of failure. Meanwhile such passages as 1 Jn are, to the unbiased reader, an urgent warning of the peril of affirming our perfect purity of will and character. But then, on the other hand, Scripture abounds in both precepts and promises bearing on the fact that in Christ and by the power of His Spirit, received by faith into a watchful soul, our weakness can be seen and transformed that a moral purification and emancipation is possible for the weakest Christian, which, compared with the best efforts of unregenerate nature, is a "more than conqueror" over evil (see e.g. 2 Cor 12:9, 16; Gal 2:20; Eph 6:16; Jude ver 24). See further鹛

HANDLEY DUNELM

SINNERS, sin'ers (ἱνερτίς, ἱνερτία; ἀμαρτυρολός, ἀμαρτυρολία), "devoted to sin," "erring one": In the NT, in addition to its ordinary significance of one that sins (Lk 5:8; 13:2; Rom 6:19; 1 Tim 1:15; He 7:27), the term is applied to those who lived in disregard of ceremonial prescription (Mt 9:10–11; Mk 2:15; Lk 5:30; Gal 2:15); to those stained with certain definite vices or crimes, as the publicans (Lk 15:2; 18:13; 19:7); to the heathen (Mt 26:45; Gal 2:15; cf Tob 13:6; 1 Mac 1:34; 2 Mac 2:48, 62); to the preeminently sinful (Mt 6:38; Jn 9:24, 31; Gal 2:17; 1 Tim 1:9; Jude ver 15). It was the Jewish term for a woman of ill-name (Lk 7:37; cf Mt 21:32, where it is stated that such had come even to the temple (Jer 8:21) also). For the general bibl. conception of the term, see SINNERS.

S. M. O. EVANS

Sion, sión (Σιών, Σίων; Σιφών, Σιφών), (1) A name given to Mt. Hermon in Dt 4:48. The name may mean "promontory" or "peak," and may have denoted the highest or snow-capped horn of the mountain as seen from the S. It may, however, be a scribal error for Sirion, the name by which the mountain was known to the Zidonians. Siry takes it in this sense, which, however, may be a correction of the Heb. It is possible that this name, like Senir, may have applied to some distinct part of the Hermon Range. (2) Mt. Sion; see ZION.

SIPHOMOTH, sip'omoth, sip'moth (סיפםות, סיפםות [Ginsburg], סיפםות, סיפםות [Botz]; סיפאן, סיפאן). One of the titles to which David presents from Ziklag (1 S 30:28). It occurs between Aroer and Eshtemoa, so it must have been somewhere in Southern Judah. The site has not been recovered. Zabdi the Shiphiite (1 Ch 27:27) may quite probably have been a native of this place.

SIPPAI, sip'ia, sip'ia. See SAPIE.

SIR, sîr: In the OT this word in Gen 43:20 AV (אֶשִּׁירָה) is changed in RV into "my lord." In the NT the word sometimes represents ἱερός, ἱερός, as in Acts 7:26; 14:15; 19:25, etc; more frequently σάμχος, σάμχος, "lord," as in Mt 13:27; 21:30; 27:36; Jn 4 11.15.19.40 (RVRm "lord"); 20:15. In Rev 7:14, RV renders "my lord."
II. Canonicity. — Though older than both Dale and Est, this book was never admitted into the Jewish Canon. There are numerous quotations from it, however, in Talmud and Midrash, and Ben Sira is simply a list in Zunz, Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge, 101 ff.; Delitzsch, Zur Geschichte der jüd. Poëtie, 204 ff.; Schechter, JQR, III, 882–706; Cowley and Neubauer, The Original Heb of a Portion of Eccles., xxix–xxx. It is not referred to explicitly in Scripture, yet it is always cited by Jewish and Christian writers with respect and perhaps sometimes as Scripture. It forms a part of the Vulgate of the Trinité Council and therefore of the Romanist Canon; but the Protestant churches have never received it in canonical estimation, though the bulk of modern Protestant scholars set a much higher value upon it than they do upon many books in the Protestant Canon (Ch, Est, etc.). It was accepted as of canonical rank by Augustine and by the Councils of Hippo (1st canon, 315) and Carthage (287), yet it is not omitted from the lists of accepted books given by Melito (c. 150 AD), Origen, in the Apost. Canons and in the list of the Councils of Laodicea (334 and 351). Jerome writes in Libri Sacri, "Let the church read these two books [Wisdom and Sir] for the instruction of the people, not for establishing the authority of the dogmas of the church."

It suffered in the respect of many because it was not usually connected with a great name; cf. the so-called "Old Testament of the Peshitta." It is referred to frequently in the Ep. of Jas (1:2–4; cf. Sir 2:1–5; Jas 1:5–6; cf. Sir 1:12; 41:22; 51:13 ff.; Jas 1:8 "doubly minded"; cf. Sir 1:28, etc.). The book is often cited in the works of the Fathers ( Clem. Alex., Origen, Augustine, etc.) and in the Apos. Const. with the formula that introduces Scripture passages: "The Scriptures says," etc. The Reformers valued Sir highly, and parts of it have been incorporated into the Anglican Prayer-book.

III. Contents. — It is quite impossible in the book as a whole to determine the thought of its author, for the mind moves lightly from topic to topic, recurring frequently to the same theme and repeating not seldom the same idea. It is, however, too much to say with Sonntag (De Jesu Sirecideae, etc.) that the book is a Farrago of sayings with no connection, or with Berthold that the "work is but a rhapsody," for the whole is informed and controlled by one master thought, the supreme value to everyone of Wisdom. By this last the writer means the Jewish religion as conceived by enlightened Jews toward the beginning of the 2d cent. BC, and as reflected in the Law of Moses (see 24:23–31), and in a less degree in the books of the Prophets and in the other writings (see Prologue). The book follows the lines of the canonical Book of Prov, and is made up of short pithy sayings with no connection, of a kind largely conjured up in the mind of the author, but in part composed, and all informed and governed by the dominant note of the book: true Wisdom, the chief end of man. Most of the book is poetical in form, and even in the prose parts the parallelism of Heb poetry is found. Many unsuccessful attempts have been made to trace a definite continuous line of reasoning in the book, but the vital differences in the schemes proposed suggest what an examination of the book itself confirms, that the compiler and author put his materials together with less regard to logical connection, though he never loses sight of his main theme — Wisdom the chief thing.

Kethborn (Enzyklop., 50 ff.) divides the book into three parts (chs 1–21, 22–49, 50–50), and maintains that at first each of these was a separate work, united subsequently in one collection. The three parts are: 

1. Religious Observances (1–15). The Hebrew preface (1:1–7) sets forth the object of the book, which is to show that the works of God's children are how they live in the world (Wisdom 1:1–7); that there are three parts of the work, and that the solution to the problem is to be found in the works of God's children. The work is divided into three, Schütz into twelve, Fritzsche (Enzyklop., xxix, 169, 170), and Ryssel (op. cit., 240) into seven. Ebersheim (op. cit., 204) writes, "We can trace three main divisions in the book, the first part (1:1–11) is about the divine power; the second part (12–18) is about the wise; the third part (19–21) is about the foolish."

2. Religious Teachings (16–35). The book is divided into sections, each section of which contains a number of sayings. The sections are divided into three parts, each part containing a number of sections. The sections are: (i) The power of wisdom (16–20); (ii) The power of knowledge (21–26); (iii) The power of understanding (27–35).

3. Religious Exhortations (36–49). The book is divided into sections, each section of which contains a number of sayings. The sections are divided into three parts, each part containing a number of sections. The sections are: (i) The power of wisdom (36–40); (ii) The power of knowledge (41–42); (iii) The power of understanding (43–49).

IV. Teaching. — In general it may be said that the principles enunciated in this book agree with those of the Wisdom school of Palestinian Judaism about 200 BC, though there is not a word in the book about a Messianic hope or the setting up of a Messianic kingdom. None of the views characteristic of Alexandrian Judaism and absent from the teaching of Palestinian Judaism are to be found in this book, though some of them at least are represented in Wiel (see Wisnom of Solomon, 161, Excur.). The chief exponents of the Alexandrian school are Philo, I, 18 ff. (On the immortality of the soul) and Deane (Ezpos, II, v, 334 ff.) and others have shown. The outstanding features of Alexandrianism are the allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures, its conception of the mystical view of the world, and its acceptance of the doctrine of mediating powers between man and God and its adoption of purely Gt ideas. None of these can be traced in Sir. The Hebrews never developed a theoretical or speculative theology or philosophy; all their teaching was gathered out of their experience of the duties that men owed to God and to one another; the hopes that they cherished and the fears by which they were animated. This is the only philosophy which the Bible and the so-called Apoc teach, and it is seen at its highest point in the so-called Wisdom Literature (qv.). The main lines of the teaching of Sir may be set out as follows, under the three heads of religion, morals, and manners.

(1) God. — The view of God given in this book agrees generally with that put forth by the later Jewish theologians, who, from the 1st century BC, onwards, regarded the God of this book as the God of the OT prophets. God is present everywhere (16:17–29); He created the world (16:1–26); He made man intelligent and supreme over all flesh. The expressions used are no doubt modeled on Gen 1, and it may fairly be inferred that creation out of nothing is meant. Wisn, on the other hand, teaches that the Alexandrian doctrine (half) is eternal and that the Creator's work consisted of fashioning, adapting, and beautifying. The world is a creature of God, not (as in Philo, etc)
an emanation from Him. Yet is He compassionate and forgiving (17:24 f). His works are past finding out (18:2 f); but His compassion is upon all flesh (18:13), i.e. upon those who accept His chastening and seek to do His will (18:14). In 43:27 God is said to be "the all" (τὸ ἀναλλότριον), which signifies that He pervades and is the ground of everything. It is not Alexanderian pantheism that is taught. Gfrörer and others take a contrary view.

(2) Revelation.—In harmony with other products of the "Wisdom Men," Sir sets aside upon natural men their revealed in the instincts, reason and conscience of man as well as by the sun, moon, stars, etc. Yet Sir gives far more prominence than Prov to the idea that the Divine Will is specially made known in the Law of Moses (24:22; 45:1-4). We do not meet once with the word "law" in Ecc, nor law in the technical sense (Law of Moses) in either Job, Wis or Prov. In the last-named it is simply one of many synonyms denoting "Wisdom." In Sir the word occurs over 20 times, not, however, always, even in the "Wisdom" (70 of verses). It is used, in the sense of the "five books" (Pent). It generally includes in its connotation also "the prophecies and the rest of the books" (Prologue); see 32 (LXX 35) 24; 33 (LXX 36) 1-3. The passage to the wrong exercise of man's free will. Men can, if they like, keep the commandments, and when they break from them they are themselves alone to be blamed (15:14-17). Yet it was through a woman (Eve) that sin entered the world and by death (25:24; cf 1 Tim 2:14). See Rom 5 12 where "one man," strictly "human being" (ver 14, "Adam"), is made the first cause of sin. But nowhere in Sir is the doctrine of original sin taught.

(4) Predestination.—Notwithstanding the prominence given to "free will" (see [3], above), Sir teaches the doctrine of predestination, for God has determined that some men should be high and some low, some blessed and others cursed (35:10 f). Thus the whole of Ecc 21:27 (it occurs nowhere else in the Apoc) denotes one's own wicked heart, as the parallelism shows.

(5) Salvation.—There is no salvation except by way of good works on man's part (14:16 f) and forgiveness on God's (17:24-32). The only atonement is through one's own good works (6:5 f), honoring parents (32:14 f), almsgiving, etc (3:30; 17:19 f). There is no objective atonement ("expiation," "atone-ment," etc) for the "sins" (the Gr. ἁμαρτίαι, κακίστακαταί) in the great LXX text for the Heb "טב, kipper, "to atone").

(6) Sacrifice.—The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to God (34:18 f), though He Himself appointed sacrifices and first-fruits (45:20 f), and when the righteous offer sacrifices to God they are accepted and remembered in the time to come (35:1-12).

(8) Feasts.—Festivals as well as seasons are ordained by God to be observed by man (39 [LXX 36] 8 f; cf Gen 1:14).

(9) Prayer.—The duty of prayer is often pointed out (37:15, etc), the necessary preparation defined (17:25; 18:20-23), and its successful issue promised (35:17). There must be no vain repetitions (7:14; cf Mt 6:7), nor should there be an unheartedness in the matter (5:10; cf Jas 1:6). Men are to pray in sickness (38:9), but all the same the physician should be consulted and his advice followed (39:12 f). Sir nowhere more clearly expresses his belief in angels or uses language which implies such a belief. For "an angel [πῶς ἄγγελοι, ὁ ἄγγελος] destroyed them" the Heb of the original passage (2 K 19:35) has ἄγγελος, μπαγγέλαιον, "plague," and so the Syr, though the LXX (followed by the Vulg) has "angel."

(11) Eschatology.—Nowhere in this book is the doctrine of a future life taught, and the whole teaching of the book leaves no place for such a doctrine. Men will not indeed reward or punish according to their conduct, but to this world (see 2:10 f; 9:12; 11:26 f). The retribution is, however, not confined to the individuals in their lifetime; it extends to their children and involves their own glorious or inglorious name after death (see 15:8; 40:13; 41:11-13). A passage concerning Gehenna (7:17) is undoubtedly spurious and is lacking in the Syr, Ethiopic, etc. Since the book is silent as to a future life, it is of necessity silent on the question of a resurrection. Nothing is hinted as to a life beyond the grave, even in 41:1-4, where the author deprecates the fear of death. In these matters Sir agrees with the Pent and the prophetic and poetical books of the OT (Psalms, Job, etc), none of which give any intimation of a life beyond the grave and nothing is said of the Messianic hope which must have been entertained largely by Palestinian Jews living in the author's time, though in 36 (LXX 33) 1-17 the writer prays for the restoration of Israel and Jesus, i.e. R. H. Charles "Eschatics Eschatologica," 65), for the bringing in of the Messianic kingdom.

(12) Sirach's doctrine of Wisdom.—For a general discussion of the rise and development of the concept of Wisdom in the OT and in the Apoc see Palestinian Literature, the last section of which what the word implies in Sir is all that can here be attempted. It is in chs 1 and 24 that Ben Sira's doctrine is chiefly contained.

Wisdom is from God: He created it and it must therefore have a separate existence. Yet it is dependent on Him. It is omnipresent, though it dwells in a peculiar sense with all flesh. The root and beginning of Wisdom, its fulness and crown, are the fear of God (1:16.18.21); so that only the obedient and pious possess it (1:10.26); indeed Wisdom is identified with the fear of the Lord and the observance of the Law (19:20); it is even made one with the Law of Moses (24:23), i.e. it consists of practical principles, of precepts regulating the life.

In this doctrine of Wisdom we have a parallelism, principles of reason and Jewish particularism as the teaching of the revealed Law. We have the first in 24:21; the second in 24:23-34. Have we in this chapter, as in Prov, nothing outside the teaching of the Palestinian Judaism? Gfrörer (II, 18 f) denies this, maintaining that the whole of ch 24 was written by an Alexandrian Jew and adopted unchanged by Ben Sira. But what is there in this chapter which an orthodox, well-informed Palestinian Jew of Ben Sira's time might not well have written? It is quite another question whether this whole conception of Wisdom in the so-called Wisdom books is not due, in some measure, to Gr, though not Alexandrian, influence, unless indeed the Gr influence came by way of Alexandria. In the philosophy of Socrates, and in a less exclusive sense in that of Plato and Aristotle, the good man is the wise man. Cheyne (Job and Sol, 190) goes probably too far when he says, "By Gr philosophy Sirach, as far as we can see, was wholly uninfluenced."

The ethical principle of Sir is not Deism or individual utilitarianism, as is that of Prov and the OT generally, though in the Ps and Morals in the prophetic writings gratitude to God for the love He has shown and the kind acts He has performed has been an endless appeal to grace. Moreover, the individual point of view is reached only in the late parts of the OT. In the older OT books, as in Plato, etc.
it is the state that constitutes the unit, not the individual human being. The rewards and penalties of conduct, good or bad, belong law forbade the taking of money by any form (see Century Bible, "Ezra," etc., 198). "A slip on a pavement is better than a slip with the tongue," so guard thy mouth (20 18); "He that is wise in words shall advance himself; and one that is prudent will please great men" (20 27). The writer has the common untrained mind, that of the ploughman, carpenter and the like, has little capacity for dealing with problems of the intellect (38 24-34).

V. Literary Form.—The bulk of the book is poetic in form, abounding in that parallelism which characterizes Heb poetry, though it is less antithetic and regular than in Prov. No definite author has been claimed for this presentation, though Bickell, Margoliouth and others maintain the contrary (see Poetry, Hebrew). Even in the prose parts parallelism is found. The only strophic arrangement is that suggested by similarity of subject-matter.

Bickell (Zeitschr. f. katholische Theol., 1882) tr 51 1-20 back into Hebrew, though it is antithetic poetic prose, and Taylor supports this view by an examination of the lately discovered fragments of the Heb text (see Theol. Woch., vol. 1, 1885, p. 435). After 51 12 of the Gr and other versions, the Heb text has a ps 13 of 15; the Ps 136; but the Heb Vg of 51 1-20 does not favor Bickell's view, nor does the ps, found only in the Heb, lend much support to what either Bickell or Taylor says.

Space precludes detailed proofs.

VI. Author.—The proper name of the author was Jesus (Jesus, Gr Ιωσήβ), the family name being Ben Sirah. The full name would be therefore "Jesus Ben Sira." The full name would be "Jesus of the Talmud and other Jewish writings.

Sirach he is known as "Ben Sira," lit. "son [or descendant?] of Sira." Who Sira was is unknown. No other book in the Apoc gives the name of the author as the author. In the best Gr MSS (BNA) of 50 27, the author's name appears as Ιωσήβ όν Σερηκ "Ελεαζώρ ὁ ἕρωαντος Σερηκ Ελεαζόρ από Ηνεκολομετούς, "Jesus the son of Sirach [son of Eleazar the Jerusalemite]." In the last two words S has by a copist's error, δ ἐλεάζωρ δ Ἡσιάκος, ο ἱερεύς ὁ ἑρωολομετούς, "the Solomon-like priest." The Heb text of 50 27 and 50 30 gives the following genealogy: Simeon son of Jesus, son of Sirach, son of Sira, son of Sirach, son and not of Sira, and so he is called by Saadia; see HDB (Nestle) and EB, II, 1165 (Toyn). We know nothing of Ben Sira beyond what can be gathered from the book itself. He was a resident in Pal (24 10 f), an orthodox Jew, well read in at least Jewish lit., a shrewd observer of life, with a philosophical bent, though true to the national faith. He had traveled far and seen much (34 11 f). His interests were too general and his outlook too wide to allow of his being either a priest or a scribe.

Many suppositions have been put forward as to the author's identity:

1. Jesus, the person of the temple
2. Simeon, the son of Jesus
3. The writer of the temple to the author.

(1) That the author was a priest: so in cod. S (50 27).
In 7 29 12 ff there are numerous references to sacrifices in the book. In 45 6-26 he has a long passage praising the professional leper of the temple. Yet on the whole Ben Sira does not write any passages in that form. (2) That he was a high priest: so Synegloss (Chron. ed Dindorf, 1 525) through a misunderstanding of a passage in Eusebius. But the teaching and temper of the book make this supposition more improbable than the last.

(3) That he was a physician: an inference drawn from 31 14 ff and other references to a professional of the body (10 10). But this is a very small foundation on which to build so great an edifice.

(4) That he was one of the 72 translators (LXX): so Lapide (Comm.), Calmet, Goldschayer, a wholly unsubstantiated hypothesis.

(5) No one of course believes that Solomon wrote the book, though many of the early Fathers held that he was the author of the five Wisdom Books, Prov, Eccl, Cant, Sir and Wisd.

VII. Unity and Integrity.—There is on the whole, such a uniformity in the style and teaching of the book that most scholars agree in ascribing the whole book (except the Prologue, which is the work of the translator) to one hand. This does not mean that he composed every line; he must have adopted current sayings, written and oral, and this will account for the apparent contradictions, as about becoming surety (29 14), and refusing to be surety (16 5; 29 18); and in 29 15 the Ps 136; but the Heb Vg of 51 1-20 does not favor Bickell's view, nor does the ps, found only in the Heb, lend much support to what either Bickell or Taylor says.

Space precludes detailed proofs.

VI. Author.—The proper name of the author was Jesus (Jesus, Gr Ιωσήβ), the family name being Ben Sirah. The full name would be therefore "Jesus Ben Sira." The full name would be "Jesus of the Talmud and other Jewish writings.

Sirach he is known as "Ben Sira," lit. "son [or descendant?] of Sira." Who Sira was is unknown. No other book in the Apoc gives the name of the author as the author. In the best Gr MSS (BNA) of 50 27, the author's name appears as Ιωσήβ όν Σερηκ "Ελεαζώρ ὁ ἕρωαντος Σερηκ Ελεαζόρ από Ηνεκολομετούς, "Jesus the son of Sirach [son of Eleazar the Jerusalemite]." In the last two words S has by a copist's error, δ ἐλεάζωρ δ Ἡσιάκος, ο ἱερεύς ὁ ἑρωολομετούς, "the Solomon-like priest." The Heb text of 50 27 and 50 30 gives the following genealogy: Simeon son of Jesus, son of Sirach, son of Sira, son of Sirach, son and not of Sira, and so he is called by Saadia; see HDB (Nestle) and EB, II, 1165 (Toyn). We know nothing of Ben Sira beyond what can be gathered from the book itself. He was a resident in Pal (24 10 f), an orthodox Jew, well read in at least Jewish lit., a shrewd observer of life, with a philosophical bent, though true to the national faith. He had traveled far and seen much (34 11 f). His interests were too general and his outlook too wide to allow of his being either a priest or a scribe.

Many suppositions have been put forward as to the author's identity:

1. Jesus, the person of the temple
2. Simeon, the son of Jesus
3. The writer of the temple to the author.

(1) That the author was a priest: so in cod. S (50 27).
In 7 29 12 ff there are numerous references to sacrifices in the book. In 45 6-26 he has a long passage praising the professional leper of the body. Yet on the whole Ben Sira does not write any passages in that form. (2) That he was a high priest: so Synegloss (Chron. ed Dindorf, 1 525) through a misunderstanding of a passage in Eusebius. But the teaching and temper of the book make this supposition more improbable than the last.

(3) That he was a physician: an inference drawn from 31 14 ff and other references to a professional of the body (10 10). But this is a very small foundation on which to build so great an edifice.

(4) That he was one of the 72 translators (LXX): so Lapide (Comm.), Calmet, Goldschayer, a wholly unsubstantiated hypothesis.

(5) No one of course believes that Solomon wrote the book, though many of the early Fathers held that he was the author of the five Wisdom Books, Prov, Eccl, Cant, Sir and Wisd.

VII. Unity and Integrity.—There is on the whole, such a uniformity in the style and teaching of the book that most scholars agree in ascribing the whole book (except the Prologue, which is the work of the translator) to one hand. This does not mean that he composed every line; he must have adopted current sayings, written and oral, and this will account for the apparent contradictions, as about becoming surety (29 14), and refusing to be surety (16 5; 29 18); and in 29 15 the
40 1–11), etc. But in these seeming opposites we have probably no more than complementary principles, the whole making up the complete truth. Nothing is more manifest in the book than the all-pervading thought of one dominant mind. Some have denied the genuineness of ch 51, but the evidence is at least inductive. There is nothing in this chapter inconsistent with the rest of the book.

In the recently discovered fragments of Heb text there is a statement that is lost in the Gr text and is of the kind EV which seems a copy of Ps 136. It is absent from the YSS and is not in the MSS. But in the Heb and Gr texts there are undoubted additions and omissions. There are, in the Gr, frequent glosses by Christian editors that are other changes (by the translators) in the direction of the Alexandrian Judaism; see Speaker’s *Apostles* and *Paul*.

**VIII. Date.**—In the book itself there is one mark of definite date (50.1), and in the Prologue there is another. Unfortunately both are ambiguous. In the Prologue the translator, whose grandfather is called (or even ancestor) *Gr* πρέσβειος, πρέσβης wrote the book (the younger Sirachides, as he is called), says that he reached Egypt, where he found and *tr* this book in the reign of Euergetes, king of Egypt. But there were two Grb kings called Euergetes, viz. Ptolemy Euergetes, or Euergetes I (247–222 BC), and Ptolemy VII Physcon, or Euergetes II (218–198 BC). Sirachides mentions the greater ones whose names he praises, Simon the high priest, son of Onias, who is named last in the list and lived probably near the time of the elder Sirachides. But there were two high priests named Simon and each of them was a son of Onias, viz. Simon I, son of Onias I (c. 310–290 BC), and Simon II, son of Onias II (c. 218–198 BC). Scholars differ as to which Euergetes is meant in the Prologue and which Simon in 50.1.

The conclusions to which the evidence has brought the present writer are these: (1) that Simon I (d. 290 BC) is the high priest meant; (2) that Ptolemy VII Physcon (218–198 BC) is the Euergetes meant.

**1. Most Probable Views**

(1) In favor of the first proposition are the following:

(a) The book must have been written some time after the death of Simon, for in the meantime an artificial fame had gathered around the name, and the very allusion to him as a hero of the past makes it clear that he had been long dead. Assuming that Simon I wrote in the 3rd cent. BC, as seems likely, it is a reasonable conclusion that the original Heb work was composed somewhat later than 250 BC. If Simon II is the man intended, the book could hardly have been composed before 150 BC, an impossible date; see below.

(b) In the list of great men in chs 44–50 the praises of Simon (50.1 f.) are sung after those of Nehemiah (49.13), suggesting that the space of time between them was not very great.

(c) The “Simon the Just” of Jos was certainly Simon I, he being so called, this Jewish historian says (*Ant*, XII, ii, 5), on account of his piety and kindness.

(d) It is probable that the “Simon the Just” of the Mischna (Abb 1.2) is also Simon I, though this is not certain. It is said of him that he was one of the last members of the great synagogue and in the Talm he is the hero of many glorifying legends. The so-called great synagogue never really existed, but the data assigned to it in which tradition shows that Simon I is Simon I that is thought of.

(e) In the Syr VS (Pesh) 60.23 reads thus: “Let it [peace] be established with Simon the Just,” etc. Some MSS have “Simon the Kind.” This text may of course be wrong; but Graetz and Eilersheim say that its insertion by the translators given to Simon I by Jos (op. cit.), the Mish and by Jewish tradition generally.

(f) The only references to Simon II in Jewish history and tradition depict him in an unfavorable light. In 2 Macc 9:8–18 he is the artist to whom the temple was given to Simon I by Jos (op. cit.), the Mish and by Jewish tradition generally.

(g) The high priest Simon is said (50.1–13) to have repaired the temple and fortified the city. Eilersheim says that the temple and city stood in need of what is here described in the time of Simon I, but not at the time of Simon II. Ptolemy VII Physcon (247–222 BC) in his wars with Demetrius destroyed many fortifications in Pal to prevent their falling into the hands of the enemy, among which Acco, Joppa, Gaza are named, and it is natural to think that the capital and its sanctuary were included. This is, however, but a priori reasoning, and Degen- bourg argues that Simon II must be meant, since according to Jos (*Ant*, XII, iii, 3) Antiochus the Great (223–187 BC) wrote a letter in which he undertakes to bring back the city and temple of Jerusalem which had been destroyed. This is not, however, to say that Simon II or anyone else did, at that time, restore either.

(h) Of the numerous errors in the Gr text some at least seem due to the fact that the VS in that language was made so long after the composition of the original Heb that the sense of several Heb words had become lost among the Alexandrian Jews. If we assume that the Simon of ch 50 was Simon I (d. 290 BC), we must next ask what the Heb version was like about 250 BC; if we further assume that the Euergetes of the Prologue was Ptolemy VII (d. 198 BC), there is a reasonable space of time to allow the sense of the Heb to be lost in many instances (see Halévy, *Rev. Sem.*, July, 1899). It must be admitted that there is no decisive evidence on one side or the other, but the balance weighs in favor of Simon I in the opinion of the present writer.

(2) That the Euergetes of the Prologue in whose reign the translation was made must have been Ptolemy VII Physcon, or Euergetes II, seems proved by the translator’s statement that he came to Egypt in the 38th year, *tē τοῦ Ἐυρέγετον βασιλέα, επί τοῦ Ἐυρέγετον βασιλέα*, i.e. almost certainly of the reign of Euergetes II. Simon I was the betrayer of the temple. Did Sirachides have for giving his own age? Now Euergetes I reigned but 25 years, but Euergetes II (Physcon) reigned in all 54 years, from 170 to 145 BC as regent with his father, and from 145 to 116 BC as sole monarch. If we accept this interpretation of the above words, the question is settled. Westcott, however (*DB*, 1863, I, 479, n. c), says “the words can only mean that the translator in his 38th year came to Egypt during the reign of Euergetes.” The other rendering adopted by Eichhorn is, he adds, “absolutely set at variance with the grammatical structure of the sentence.” In the second ed of *DB* (1898) this note has become expunged, and the article as edited by D. S. Margoliouth (I, 541) teaches the contrary view, which is now accepted by nearly all scholars (Schürer, etc.). We may therefore assume that the original Heb book was composed about 240–200 BC, or some 50 or more years after the death of Simon I, and that the translation was made about 150 BC, if the younger Sirachides came to Cyprus in 132 BC, and he gives us to understand in the Prologue that he *tr* the Heb work of his grandfather almost immediately after reaching that country. If Simon II (d. 198 BC) is meant in ch 50, we are compelled to assume for Simon I a date for the Heb of 145–130 BC in order to allow time for the growth of the halo of legend which had gathered about Simon. The trans-
lation must, in that case, have been completed some 20 years after the composition of the Heb, a conclusion which the evidence opposes. The teaching of the book belongs to 200 BC, or slightly earlier. The doctrine of the resurrection taught in Dn 165 BC is ignored in Sir, as it has not yet become a Jewish doctrine.

1. That the Eusebius of the Prologue and the Simon of ch 50 are in both cases the first so called. So Hug, Scholz, Wet, Kol, Ebersheim (Spokesman's Art and many others). The book was accordingly written after 250 BC, perhaps some 200 years later, and its translation was made some time after 220 BC, say 200 BC.

2. That Eusebius II (d. 116 BC) and Eusebius III are the very persons referred to. So Eichhorn, De Wette, Ewald. Franz Delitz, Hisig, Schürer.

3. Hitzig (Psalms, 1836, II, 118) made the original work a product of the Maccabean period—an impossible supposition, for the book says nothing at all about the Maccabees. Moreover, the priestly house of Zadok is praised in this book (chs 50, etc). It was held in little respect during the time of the Maccabean wars, owing to the sympathy it showed toward the Hellenizing party.

IX. Original Languages.—Even before the discovery of the substantial fragments of what is probably the original Heb text of this book, the scholarly world had reached the conclusion that Sir was composed in Hebrew in Heb. (1) The fact of a Heb original is definitely stated in the Prologue.

(2) Jerome (Proef, in vers. Libri Soli) says that he had seen the Heb original—the same text probably that underlies the fragments recently published, though we cannot be sure of this. (3) Citations apparently from the same Heb text are made not seldom in Talmudic and rabbinic literature. (4) There are some word-play in the text which is in the Gr are lost, but which reappear in the discovered Heb text, e.g., (43 8) ἀὰρ κατὰ τὸ δόμα αὐτῆς ἑτούν ἐκατορματίζει (read ἐκατορματίζειν), ἡ μήν κατὰ τὸ δόμα αὐτῆς ετέιν αὐτομανείν (read αὐτομανείν), “the moon according to its name reneweth itself”; the Heb words for “moon” and “renew itself” come from one root, as we said in English—what of course is not English “the moon moons itself.” There are other cases where mistakes and omissions in the Gr are explained by a reference to the newly found Heb text.

The strongly supported conjecture of former years that the book was composed in Heb was turned into a practical certainty through the discovery of the Heb text, but it is clear that the Heb is not that of the Gr. There are other cases where mistakes and omissions in the Gr are explained by a reference to the newly found Heb text.

(1) He refers to words in Heb which in that language are senseless, and he endeavors to show that they are disguised Pers words. As a matter of fact, he misuses the copies of the text which are wholly wrong or the word is indecipherable.

(2) There do appear to be Pers glosses, but they are not of the original text, and there can be no reasonable doubt that they are due to a Pers reader or copyist.

(3) There are many cases in which the Heb can be proved to be a better and older text than the Gr or Sir (see König, Expos T, XI, 170 f).

(4) As regards the character of the language, it may be said that in syntax it agrees in the main with the classical Heb of the OT, but its vocabulary links it with the latest OT books. Thus we have the use of the “waw-consecutive” with the imperfect (43 23; 44 9.23; 45 21, etc) and with the perfect (42 1.8.11), though the use of the simple waw with both tenses occurs also. This mixed usage is exactly what we find us in the latest part of the OT (Ecc, Est, etc). As regards vocabulary, the word הָפַךְ, הָפַךְ, has the sense of “thing,” “matter,” in 20 9, as in Ecc 3 1; 5 7; 8 6. In general it may be said that the Heb is that of early post-Bib times.

Margoliouth holds that the extant Heb VS is no older than the 11th cent., which is impossible. The mistake is due to confounding the age of the MSS with that of the VS they contain.

(5) It is nevertheless admitted that in some cases the Syr or the Gr or both together preserve an older and correcter text than the Heb, but this because the latter has sometimes been miscopied and intentionally changed.

(6) The numerous Hebraisms in the Gr VS which in the Heb have their original expression point to the same conclusion—that this Heb text is the original form.

Margoliouth has been answered by Smend (TLZ, 1889, col. 506), König (Expos T, X, 1890-1900), Nöddke (ZATW, XX, 81-94), and by many others. Bickell (Zeitschrift für katholische Theol., III, 387 ff) holds also that the Heb Sir extant is a tr from the Gr or Syr or both.

X. Versions.—The LXX tr was made from the Heb direct; it is fairly correct, though in all the extant MSS the text is very corrupt in several places. (1) The text occurs in the uncials B S C and part of A fairly free from glosses, though abounding in obvious errors. (2) The text is found in a much purer form in cod. V and also in Sin and part of A. All extant Gr MSS except the late cursive 248 seem to go back to one original MS, since in all of them the two sections 30 25—33 15 and 33 16—36 11 have changed places, so that 33 16—36 11 follows 30 24 and 30 25—33 15 comes after 36 11. Most scholars accept the explanation of Fritzke (Exeg. Handbuch zu den Pesh. V, 211) that the two versions (of which these two parts (of similar size) were written got mixed, the worse one being put first. On the other hand, the cursive 248 (14th cent.) has these sections in their proper order, and the same is true of the Syr, Pesh., etc. The Sept vs. the Complutensian Polyglot (which follows throughout 248 and not the uncials) and EV which is made from this Polyglot. The superiority of 248 to the older MS (B S A C V) is seen in other parts of the Gr text. In the other Gr MSS, 3 25 is omitted, as it is by Edersheim and most commentators before the discovery of the Heb text. But this last supports 248 in retaining the verse, and it is now generally kept. In 43 23 “islands” is properly rendered by Vulg, Syr, 23 and the Heb, but older Gr MS read “Jesus, who in the latest part of Dn’s life Jesus planted them” (in the Heb text the last word is replaced by “and Jesus planted them”). The other MSS have a text which yields no sense in 43 26: EV “By reason of him his end hath successes.” The Gr of 248 and the Heb give this sense: “The angel is equipped for his task,” etc.

The Syr (Pesh) VS is now almost universally acknowledged to have been made from the Heb, of which, on the whole, it is a faithful rendering. In some places, however, it agrees with the LXX against the Heb, probably under the influence of the inaccurate idea that the Gr text is the original one. In the VS the two sections 30 25—33 5 and 33 16—36 11
are in proper order, as in the Heb, a fresh proof that the Syr is not tr from the Gr.

The Vulg agrees with the Old Lat which follows the LXVX closely. Lapidus, Sabatier and Bengel tried to argue that the Syr was based on the lost original Heb, but the evidence they supply falls far short of proof, and recently discovered Heb fragments show that they were wrong. The two sections transposed in the LXV (except 248) are also transposed in the Lat, showing that the latter is based on the Gr text.

The Lat text of both Sir and Wis according to the cod. Amiant is given by Lagarde in his Mittheilungen, I, 234–35. This closely follows the Gr text.

AV follows the cursives and often repeats their errors. RV tries to impress the reader with the uniqueness of the Heb text, and thus often departs from the Heb.

4. English

3 19 is retained by AV but omitted by RV. For the latter clause of the verse ("mysteries are revealed unto the meek"), AV is supported by cod. 214, while the Heb and RV both read. Both should be corrected by the Heb in 7 26 and 38 1. 15.

For fuller details concerning VSS see Speaker's Apoc, II, 23–32 (Edersheim); Kautzsch, Die Apok. des AT, I, 242 ff (Ryswell), and the art. by Nestle in 1906, I 43.

LITERATURE. In addition to books mentioned under Apoc and in the course of the present art., note the following:

(1) The text of the Heb fragments: For accounts of the discovery and decipherments of these see HDB, IV, 540 ff (Nestle); Bible Polyglotte (Vulgate), V. 4 A: R. Schürer, GJV, III, 221 ff. The text of the Heb as yet known is given in the following: R. Strack, Die Spruche Jesu, etc. (with notes and glossary), Leipzig, 1903; Isaac Levi, The Heb Text of Ecceziasitiques (with notes and commentary), Leiden, 1898; Julius L. 314, S. C. Smend, The Weissheit des Jesus Sirach, Heb and Deutsch (with notes and glossary), Berlin, 1906. The Heb appears also in the Bible Polyglotte, ed F. Vigouroux, with the LXX, Vulg and a French translation in 6 columns. (No other Polyglot has appeared since the discovery of this Heb.)

There are texts in Heb, Syr, Gr and Eng., and also useful notes and tables in The Original Heb of Sir 39 15–49 11, byCowles and Neubauer, Oxford, 1897. Still later and fuller is The Wisdom of Ben Sira in Heb and Eng., with notes on the Heb by Schechter and Taylor, Cambridge, 1899.

(2) Commentaries: The works of Fritzsch (1858), who notes the evidence of the Syr and ignores the Heb idiom in the book, and of Bissell (1880) and Ederhein (1901) are of no importance for the study of the Heb fragments. The last-named shows both learning and ingenuity in tracking the Heb idiom and in explaining difficult words; but the following odd are not based upon the Heb. They take full note of the Heb text as far as discovered:

J. C. Gall, L'ancien et le nouveau Jesu-Sira traduit et commenté, Paris, 1898, 1901; Ryswell in Kautzsch's Apok. des AT, I, 290–473, exceedingly valuable, esp. for the text and introduction, but he takes account of the Heb fragments published by Cowles and Neubauer only in this book. His treatment of the Heb parts published after he wrote, see further articles by him in Stud. u. Krit., 1908, 180 ff; Knabenhaur, Commentarii in Ecclesiasticum, Paris, 1902; Peters, Der jüngst wieder aufgefundene hebräische Text des Buches Ecclesiasticus, 1902 (cf the notice by Smend, TIL, II, 1903, 72–77); Smend, Die Weissheit des Jesus Sirach erläutert und erneuert in der modernen Sprache, Berlin, 1906. One account is, of course, the Apok. of Dr. R. Strack, which is a full edition of the text of the Sira (cf his Apok. des AT, I, 290–473) and is printed in the Schweizer dictionary, series 2.

The New Oxford Apoc (Intro and Notes), ed. by R. H. Charles (1913), contains a full intro and comm. J. H. Hart has published separately a critical edition of cod. 248, in which he collates the principal authorities, MS and printed.

Of the Dict. articles those in HDB (Nestle, strong in the critical, but weak and defective on the historical and exegetical side); ER (C. H. Toy, sound and well balanced); see also Jew Enc (Israel Levi) and Enc Brit (W. Bancroft), who supply detailed registers. The literature see HDB (Nestle); Jew Enc, "Sirach" (Israel Levi); and esp. Schürer, GJV, III, 219 ff.

SIRACH, THE ALPHABET OF: Usually called the Alphabet of Ben Sira. The compilation so designated consists of two lists of proverbs, 22 in A, 29 in B, arranged according to each case its alphabet acrostics. Each of these proverbs is followed by a haggadah comm., with legends and tales, many of them indecent. Some of the proverbs in the Alphabet are probably genuine compositions by Ben Sira and are quoted as such in the Talm., but in their present form the Alphabets are at least as late as the 11th cent. AD.

LITERATURE.—The only complete copy of the text known is in the British Museum, the copy in the Bodleian being defective. Steinheil in his editor's preface (1854) states that he has only a portion of this last with critical notes (Alphabeticum Syriacitcs, Berlin, 1854). Cowley and Neubauer (The Original Heb of a Portion of Erasrus), besides giving a general account of this work, add a tr into Eng. of the Aram. proverbs. George (Ben Sira, The Alphabet of), Dr. Louis Ginsberg (New York) also gives a tr of the 22 Aram. proverbs with useful remarks after each. The work is known in Yiddish (often, Judaeo-Spanish, Fr. and Ger., but never, so far, completely into English.

T. WITTON DAVIES
The daghar, (2) "diplomacy," (3) "cunning" (4) used, (5) "eloquent." An used possible Jn 11:23, (6) "to overthrow after Sheshan" BDB, Commentators or concerning church, 19 "Phoebe, our sister" (6) Confederate cities are conceived of as sisters (Ezk 16 45 ff). 7 'Adōth is used of objects which go in pairs, as curtains, each 'coupled to its sister" (Ex 26 36), and of wings in pairs (Ezk 1 8; 3 13); (8) of virtues or conditions, with which one is closely associated "say unto wisdom, thou art my sister" (Prov 7 4; cf Job 17 14); (9) of a lover concerning his wife, as a term of endearment (Cant 4 9 ff; 5 11; 8 8). In the NT, ἀδελφός, adelphē, used (1) in sense of physical blood kinship (Mt 12 50; 13 56; 19 28; Lk 10 39 ff; 14 26; Jn 11 f f; 19 25; Acts 23 16); (2) of fellow-members in Christ: "Phoebe, our sister" (Rom 16 1; see also 1 Cor 7 15; 1 Tim 5 1; Jas 2 13); (3) possibly, of a church, "thy elect sister" (2 Jn ver 13). See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

Edward Bagby Pollard

SISTER’s SON: AV translates rightly (1) דָּבָר, ben-'āḏōthō (Gen 29 13); and (2) וָסָּה דָּבָר, hūsā ḫēds 'āḏēphēs (Acts 25 16), and wrongly, (3) ἀδελφός, anēsphēs (Col 4 10), where, without doubt, the real meaning is "cousin," as in RV. See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

SITH, sīth: An Anglo-Saxon word meaning "afterward, "since" (Ezk 35 6 AV and ERV, ARV "since").

SITHRI, sīthīʾ (ʾīṣēthīʾ, sīthīʾ): A grandson of Kohath (Ex 6 22).

SITNAH, sītīnā (ʾīṣīnāh, "hated," "hostility"); ʾāḵārīa, echītīra): The name of the second of the two wells dug by the herdsmen of Isaac, the cause of further "envy" with the herdsmen of Gerer (Gen 26 21, in "That is, "Envy"). The site is unknown, but Palaeo (P Ekh, 15) provides an echo of the name in Sheshet or Ruhebeh, the name of a small valley near Ruhebeh. See REHOBOTH.

SITTING, sītīng (ʾīṣūn, yāshābāh, "to sit down or still," "sitting," "to brood, "latch"; ʾāḏēphō, kathēzkōmai, "to sit down," āḏēphōn, and, kēnōmēi, "to lie back," "recline"). The favorite position of Job (Mal 3:2, Mt 9 9; 28 55 [cf 5 1; Lk 4 20; 5 3]; Mk 14 18; Lk 18 35; Jn 2 14, etc).

"In Ps people sit at all kinds of work: the carpenter saws, planes, and hews with his hand-axe, sitting upon the ground or upon the plank he is planing. The washerwoman sits by the tub, and, in a word, no one stands where it is possible to sit... On the low shop-counter the tumbled saloonmen squat in the midst of the gay wares" (L, II, 144, 275; III, 72, 75).

Figurative: (1) To sit with denotes intimate fellowship (Ps 1 1; 26 5; Lk 13 29; Rev 3 21); (2) to sit in the dust indicates poverty and contempt (Isa 47 1, "writhe, ignorance of things" [4 16] and trouble (Mic 7 8); (3) to sit on thrones denotes authority, judgment, and glory (Mt 19 28).

M. O. Evans

SIVAN, sīvān, sīvān, (7) sīvān: AV Sisamai): A Judahite, of the descendants of the daughter of Sheshan and Jarha, his Egyg servant (1 Ch 2 40). Commentators have compared the name to סים, sīm, a Phoen god (cf Rudolph Kittel, Comm. ad loc.; BDB, s.v.).

SISMAI, sīmāʾ (ʾīṣēmāʾ, sīmāy; AV Sisamai): A Judahite, of the descendants of the daughter of Sheshan and Jarha, his Egyg servant (1 Ch 2 40). Commentators have compared the name to סים, sīm, a Phoen god (cf Rudolph Kittel, Comm. ad loc.; BDB, s.v.).

SISTERS, sīstērz (ʾīṣērēz, ʿāḏōthēz): Used repeatedly in the OT of a female (1) having the same parents as another; or (2) having one parent in common, with another, half-sister (Gen 20 12; Lev 18 9), and also (3) of a female belonging to the same family or clan as another, so akinswoman (Gen 24 60; Job 42 11); (4) also of a woman of the same country (Nu 25 18). 5 (Figuratively, the two kingdoms, Israel and Judah, are sisters (Ezk 23 7 ff). 6 Confederate cities are conceived of as sisters (Ezk 16 45 ff). 7 ʿāḏōth is used of objects which go in pairs, as curtains, each ‘coupled to its sister’ (Ex 26 36), and of wings in pairs (Ezk 1 8; 3 13); (8) of virtues or conditions, with which one is closely associated "say unto wisdom, thou art my sister" (Prov 7 4; cf Job 17 14); (9) of a lover concerning his wife, as a term of endearment (Cant 4 9 ff; 5 11; 8 8). In the NT, ἀδελφός, adelphē, used (1) in sense of physical blood kinship (Mt 12 50; 13 56; 19 28; Lk 10 39 ff; 14 26; Jn 11 f f; 19 25; Acts 23 16); (2) of fellow-members in Christ: "Phoebe, our sister" (Rom 16 1; see also 1 Cor 7 15; 1 Tim 5 1; Jas 2 13); (3) possibly, of a church, "thy elect sister" (2 Jn ver 13). See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

Edward Bagby Pollard

SISTER’s SON: AV translates rightly (1) דָּבָר, ben-āḏōthō (Gen 29 13); and (2) וָסָּה דָּבָר, hūsā ḫēds 'āḏēphēs (Acts 25 16), and wrongly, (3) ἀδελφός, anēsphēs (Col 4 10), where, without doubt, the real meaning is "cousin," as in RV. See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

SITH, sīth: An Anglo-Saxon word meaning "afterward, "since" (Ezk 35 6 AV and ERV, ARV "since").

SITHRI, sīthīʾ (ʾīṣēthīʾ, sīthīʾ): A grandson of Kohath (Ex 6 22).

SITNAH, sītīnā (ʾīṣīnāh, "hated," "hostility"); ʾāḵārīa, echītīra): The name of the second of the two wells dug by the herdsmen of Isaac, the cause of further "envy" with the herdsmen of Gerer (Gen 26 21, in "That is, "Envy"). The site is unknown, but Palaeo (P Ekh, 15) provides an echo of the name in Sheshet or Ruhebeh, the name of a small valley near Ruhebeh. See REHOBOTH.

SITTING, sītīng (ʾīṣūn, yāshābāh, "to sit down or still," "sitting," "to brood, "latch"; ʾāḏēphō, kathēzkōmai, "to sit down," āḏēphōn, and, kēnōmēi, "to lie back," "recline"). The favorite position of Job (Mal 3:2, Mt 9 9; 28 55 [cf 5 1; Lk 4 20; 5 3]; Mk 14 18; Lk 18 35; Jn 2 14, etc).

"In Ps people sit at all kinds of work: the carpenter saws, planes, and hews with his hand-axe, sitting upon the ground or upon the plank he is planing. The washerwoman sits by the tub, and, in a word, no one stands where it is possible to sit... On the low shop-counter the tumbled saloonmen squat in the midst of the gay wares" (L, II, 144, 275; III, 72, 75).

Figurative: (1) To sit with denotes intimate fellowship (Ps 1 1; 26 5; Lk 13 29; Rev 3 21); (2) to sit in the dust indicates poverty and contempt (Isa 47 1, "writhe, ignorance of things" [4 16] and trouble (Mic 7 8); (3) to sit on thrones denotes authority, judgment, and glory (Mt 19 28).

M. O. Evans

SIVAN, sīvān, sīvān, (7) sīvān: AV Sisamai): A Judahite, of the descendants of the daughter of Sheshan and Jarha, his Egyg servant (1 Ch 2 40). Commentators have compared the name to סים, sīm, a Phoen god (cf Rudolph Kittel, Comm. ad loc.; BDB, s.v.).

SISMAI, sīmāʾ (ʾīṣēmāʾ, sīmāy; AV Sisamai): A Judahite, of the descendants of the daughter of Sheshan and Jarha, his Egyg servant (1 Ch 2 40). Commentators have compared the name to סים, sīm, a Phoen god (cf Rudolph Kittel, Comm. ad loc.; BDB, s.v.).
Literal: The word 'šar' designates the skin of both men and animals, the latter both raw and in tanned condition: 'Jeh God made for Adam and for his wife coats of skin [šar], and clothed them' (Gen 3 21). 'She put the skins [šar] of the kids of the goats upon her, and upon the satchel of the mouth of his neck' (27 16); 'Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?' (Jer 13 23). The Heb geolah is found in the sense of human skin: "I have sewed sackcloth upon my skin, and have laid my horn in the dust" (Job 18 15).

Figurative: To escape by the skin of the teeth' is a narrow expression (Job 19 20). Satan says in his calumny of Job: "Skin for skin, yea, all that a man hath will he give for his life' (2 4). The idea here is, that a man will endure or do the worst, even as it were the flaying of his body, to save his life. The RV has replaced 'skin' as the tr of the Heb bsdr by 'flesh': "My bones cleave to my flesh" (Ps 102 5). "The bars of his skin" is a poetical expression for "the members of his body" in Job 13 13 m, where the text interprets rather than translates the animal.

Skins served for purposes of clothing from an early date (Gen 3 21). In later days they were the raiment of prophets and hermits (Zec 13 4; He 11 37). LXX translates ἔπιπαντα, 'o'dereth, 'the mantle' of Elijah (1 K 19 13 19; 2 K 2 8 13 f); with rab'v, or 'sheepskin, the word in the LXX is being derived from these passages. It is not unlikely that the raiment of John the Baptist made of camel's hair' and the 'leather girdle about his loins' are identical with the rough garb of OT prophets. The skins of cattle were largely employed for technical uses: 'rams' skins and badgers' skins' are esp. mentioned in the construction of the tabernacle as material for the waterproof covering of the roof (Ex 25 5; Nu 4 8 10 f).

RV, rejecting the tr 'badgers'skins,' substitutes 'sealskins' and adds 'porpoise skins' in the margin. There is little doubt that the rendering of the AV is indeed incorrect. The Heb name of the animal (b̄b̄k̄t̄) is the same as the Arab بَكَبَكَة b̄k̄k̄; which means the dolphin and the 'sea-cow' or halibut of the Red Sea, of which genus there are two species even now extant (H. tabernacul. Kjns, and H. Helgricli Ehr.). It is probable that the Hebrew words have been confounded throughout time with marine animal's seals, porpoises, dolphins and halibutes, under the same expression. See SEALSkins.

In Ezk 16 10 we find these skins mentioned as materials for elegant robes, and as the Arabs of the Red Sea littoral use the same material in the manufacture of sandals. A quaint use was made of skins in the making of skin bottles, the kurbeh or kirbeh of modern Arabia. We find a great variety of Heb expressions, which possibly designated special varieties, all of which were rendered כֶּבֶת, b̄k̄k̄, in LXX and the NT (ἡμεθ, h̄meθ, ἱμάθ, ἵμαθ, πόδα, nōdā, nōdāh, nōbēl, nōbēlē, nōbēlēh, nōbēlēh, πόλις, πόλις, πόλις, nōbēlēh, πόλις, b̄k̄b̄k̄, b̄k̄b̄k̄, b̄k̄b̄k̄, b̄k̄b̄k̄, b̄k̄b̄k̄). RV has rendered the Gr χιλβος in the NT by 'wine skin' (Mt 9 17; Mc 2 22; Lk 5 37) with the marginal addition 'that is, skins used as bottles.' These skin bottles were made with the skins of goats, sheep, oxen or buffaloes; the former had more or less the shape of the figures of the animals, the holes of the extremities being closed by tying or sewing, and the neck of the skin being closed by a tap or a plug, while the larger ones were sewn together in various shapes. As a rule only the inside of the skin was tanned, the skin turned inside out, and the fluid or semi-fluid filled in, e.g. water, milk, butter, cheese. The hairy inside was not considered as in any way injurious to the contents. Only in the case of wine- and oil-skins was it thought advantageous to tan the skins inside and out.

SLANDER, slân'dér (substan. ṣâbêb, ṣâbêb; 'slander'; ḫâdâbâs, ḫâdâbâs; 'slanderer'; yb. 271, rûgâd, 'to sink about' as a talebearer. ṣâbêb, ṣâbêb, 'to use the tongue,' 'to slanderer;' ḫâdâbâs, ḫâdâbâs, 'to caluminate,' 'to slanderer;' and other words): Slander (etymologically a doublet of 'scandal,' from OFr. ecaudade, Lat scandalum, 'stumbling-block') is an accusation maliciously uttered, with the purpose or effect of damaging the reputation of another. As a rule it is a false charge (Mt 5 11); but it may be a truth circulated insidiously and with a hostile purpose (e.g. Dn 3 8, 'brought accusation against,' where LXX has ḫâdâbâs, 'slanderer;' Lk 16 1, the same Gr word). Warnings, condemnations and complaints in reference to this sin are very frequent, both in the OT and NT. Mischievous 'tale-bearing' or 'whispering' is condemned (Lev 19 16; Ezk 22 9). There are repeated warnings against evil-speaking (as in Ps 34 13; Prov 15 1; Eph 4 31; Col 3 8; Jas 4 11; 1 Pet 3 10), which is the cause of such sin with strife between man and man (Prov 16 27 30), and which recoils on the speaker himself to his destruction (Ps 105 10; 140 11). Esp. is false witness, which is 'slander carried into a court of justice,' to be condemned and punished (Ex 20 16;
Slaves, slavery, slaver-i:
1. Acquiring of Slaves
2. Hebrews as War Captives
3. Freedom of Slaves
4. Rights of Slaves
5. Rights of Slave Masters
6. The NT Conception

Literature

The origin of the term "slave" is traced to the Ger. *sklave*, meaning a captive of the Slavonic race who had been forced into servitude (cf Slav; Fr. esclave, Dutch *slab*, Swedish *slaf*, Spanish *esclavo*). The word "slave" occurs only in Jer 2 14 and in Rev 18 13, where it is suggested by the context and not expressed in the original languages (Heb יִתְחָלָת בָּרִית, "one born in the bond"); Gr * slaves, "body"). However, the Heb word *בָּרִית, in the OT and the Gr word ἡδος, doulos, in the NT more properly might have been trd "slave" instead of "servant" or "bondservant," understanding though that the slavery of Judaism was not the cruel system of Greece, Rome and later nations. The principal term for the servant under *free service*, the slave, *obligatory, restricted service.*

Scripture statement rather than philological study must form the basis of this article. We shall notice how slaves could be secured, sold and redeemed; also their rights and their masters' rights; confining the study to OT Scripture, noting in conclusion the NT conception. The word "slave" in this art. refers to the Heb slave unless otherwise designated.

Slaves might be acquired in the following ways, viz.:

1. Bought.—There are many instances of buying slaves (Lev 25 39 ff). Heb slavery broke into the ranks of every human relationship: a father could sell his daughter (Ex 21 7; Neh 5 5); a widow's children might be sold to pay their father's debt (2 K 2 11); a man could sell himself (Lev 25 39:47); a woman could sell herself (Dt 15 12.13.17), etc. Prices paid were somewhat indefinite. According to Ex 21 29 thirty shekels was a standard price, but Lev 27 3–7 gives a scale of from 3 to 50 shekels according to age and sex, with a provision for an appeal to the priest in case of undue price (ver 3). The price set is the price set for a young man (ver 5), and this corresponds with the sum paid for Joseph (Gen 27 28).

But in 2 Mace 8 the price on the average is 90 for a talent, i.e. 40 shekels each. The ransom of an entire talent for a single man (1 K 20 39) means that the sum paid (far more than that of a slave) was set on this particular captive.

There were certain limitations on the right of sale (Ex 21 7 ff).

(2) *Exchange.*—Slaves, i.e. non-Heb slaves, might be traded for other slaves, or provision of slaves.

(3) *Satisfaction of debt.*—It is probable that a debtor, reduced to extremity, could offer himself in payment of his debt (Lev 25 39), though this was forbidden in the Törath Kehunah, cf 'Ogar Yisrael, vii.292. That a creditor could sell into slavery a debtor or any of his family, or make them his own slaves, has some foundation in the statement of the poor widow whose pathetic cry reached the ears of the prophet Elisha: "Thy servant my husband is dead; . . . . and the creditor is come to take unto him my two children to be bondmen" (2 K 4 1).

(4) Gift.—The non-Heb slave, and possibly the Heb slave, could be acquired as a gift (Gen 29 24).

(5) *Inheritance.*—Children could inherit non-Heb slaves as their own possession.

(6) *Voluntary surrender.*—In the case of a slave's release in the seventh year there was allowed a willing choice of indefinite slavery. The ceremony at such a time is interesting: "Then his master shall bring him unto the judges [m], and shall bring him to the door, or unto the door-post; and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl; and he shall serve him for ever" (Ex 21 6). A pierced ear probably meant obedience to the master's voice. History, however, does not record a single instance in which such a case occurred.

(7) *Arrest.*—"If the thief be found breaking in, . . . . he shall make restitution: if he have nothing, then he shall be sold for his theft" (Ex 22 2.5).

(8) *Birth.*—The children of slaves, born within the master's house of a wife given to the slave there, became slaves, and could be held, even if the father went free (Ex 21 4; cf Lev 25 51).

(9) *Capture in war.*—Thousands of men, women and children were taken in war as captives and reduced, sometimes, to menial slavery. Such slavery, however, was more humane than wholesale butchery according to the customs of earlier times (Nu 31 7–35). Males were usually slain and females kept for slavery and concubinage (Dt 20 11.14). Captive slaves and bought slaves, "from nations round about," forced moral ruin into Israel's early civilization. See *Siege*, 3.

The two principal sources of slave supply were poverty in peace and plunder in war.

The Hebrews themselves were held as captive slaves at various times by (1) Phoenicians (the greatest slave traders of ancient times), (2) Phils, (3) Syrians (2 K as War 5 2 ff), (4) Egyptians, and (5) Romans. Captives There must have been thousands subjected to severest slavery. See also *Egypt; Israel; Pharaoh; Servant*, etc.

The freedom of slaves was possible in the following ways:

(1) By redemption.—Manumission by the consent of Slaves Hebrews. The slave's freedom might be bought, the price depending on (a) the nearest to the seventh year or the Jubilee year, (b) the first purchase price, and (c) personal consideration, as was the legal authority of the one in bondage. A slave could be redeemed as follows:
the practice of slavery in the ancient Near East. The article discusses the laws and rights of slaves, including their treatment, the duration of their service, and the conditions under which they could be freed. It also examines the relationship between masters and slaves, highlighting the power imbalance and the role of law in regulating this relationship. The article concludes with a reflection on the historical and ethical implications of slavery, emphasizing the importance of understanding its complex dynamics and the impact it had on society.
pation other than in the Sabbathal and Jubilee years was evidently the right of masters; (6) to circumscribe slaves, both Jew and Gentile, within his own household (Gen 17:13-22:7); (7) to sell, give away, or trade slaves (Gen 29:24). According to Tórah Kóháním a Hev servant could be sold only under certain conditions (See 1, [1]); (8) to own male and female slaves, though not unto death (Ex 21:20); (9) to marry a slave himself, or give his female slaves in marriage to others (1 Ch 2:35); (10) to marry to a daughter of a slave (1 Ch 2:34 f); (11) to purchase slaves in foreign markets (Lev 25:44); (12) to keep the persons so purchased as a slave; the right way slave from a foreign master (Dt 23:15-16). See 3, [5]; (13) to enslave or sell a caught thief (Gen 44:8-33; Ex 22:3); (14) to hold, in perpetuity, non-Heb slaves (Lev 25:46); (15) to seek advice of slaves (1 S 15:14). The reference here is open to doubt. See 4, [6]; (16) to demand service (Gen 14:14; 24).

Throughout OT times the rights of both slaves and masters varied, and in general the above may be considered the model. In later times Zedekiah, covenanted with the Hebrews never again to enslave their own brothers, but they broke the covenant (Jer 34:8).

There were slaves during NT times. The church issued no edict sweeping away this custom of the old Judaism, but the gospel of Christ with its warm, penetrating love-Conception message mitigated the harshness of ancient times and melted cruelty into kindness. The equality, justice and love of Christ's teachings changed the whole attitude of man to man and man to servant. This spirit of brotherhood quickened the conscience of the age, leaped the walls of Judaism, and penetrated the remoter regions. The great apostle proclaimed this truth: "There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, . . . ye all are one in Christ Jesus" (Gal 3:28). The Christian slaves and masters are both exhort in Paul's letters to live godly lives and make Christ-like their relations on the one to the other—obedience to masters and forbearance with slaves. "Bondservants [m], be obedient unto your masters, . . . as bondservants [m] of Christ. And . . . ye masters, . . . forbear threatening: their Master is in heaven, and there is no respect of persons with him" (Eph 6:5-9).

Christ was a reformer, but not an anarchist. His gospel was dynamic but not dynamic. It was even, electric with power, but permeated with love. Christian life and teaching were against Judaistic slavery, Rom slavery and any form of human slavery. The love of His gospel and the light of His life were destined, in time, to make human emancipation earth-wide and human brotherhood as universal as His own benign presence.

LITERATURE—Nowack, Hev Arch.; Ewald, Allerthrûmer, III, 280-88; Grünfeld, Die Stellung des Sklaven bei den Juden, nach bibl. und talmud. Quellen, Berlin, 1880; Meijer, freedmen, masters, and the slaves of the Batak; Mandel, Das Sklavenrecht des AT, 1855; Kühn, L'Esclavage dans le Bible et le Talmud, 1867; Sayce, Social Life among the Assyrians and Babylonians; Lane, Manners and Customs of modern Egyptians, 200, 1900; Thompson, LB; McCurdy, HPM, 1894; Trumbull, Studies in Oriental Social Life, 1894. There is a wealth of material in the Talmudic tractate Kiddushin (pp. 17-22).

WILLIAM EDWARD RAPFETTY

SLAYING, slâyng (by spear, dart, or sword). See PENISHMENTS.

SLEEP, slēp: Represents many words in Heb and Gr. For the noun the most common are ðrûth, šēnâth, and ðros, húnos; for the vb., ðwûf, ðyâkên, ðwûf, ðâkîkhûb, and kæthèdôs, kæthèdôs. The figura-
tives use for death (Dt 31:16, etc) and sluggishness (Eph 5:14, etc) are very obvious. See DREAMS.

SLEEP, DEEP (םי, târdêmâh, vb. ד, ráthâm, from a root meaning "to be dead"): The vb. ráthâm has no further meaning than "to be fast asleep" (Jgs 4:21; Jon 1:5), but AV used "deep sleep" as a tr only in Dnl 8:18; 10:9, where a sleep supernaturally caused (a "trance") is meant (of "dead sleep" in Ps 76:6). RV's insertion of "deep sleep" in place of AV's "fast asleep" in Jgs 4:21 is consequently unfortunate. The noun târdêmâh has the same meaning of "trance" in Gen 21:15; 22:12; 1 S 4:11; Job 4:14; Ps 33:19; 19:15; Is 29:10, it is used figuratively of torpor. In Acts 20:9 (hûnos bathâs), heavy natural sleep is meant.

B U R T O N S C O T T E A S T O N

SLEEVES, slēvz (Gen 37:3). See DRESS.

SLEIGHT, slít: No connection with "slight," but from the same root as "sly" and so = "cunning." So in Eph 4:14, "sleight of men," for σύπλεγμα, κυβέλα, "dice-playing" (of "cubegs"); "gamblers' tricks," "trickery."

SLIME, Slim, SLIME PITS, slim'pits (םי, hênâr; LXV ðfôpôlôs, ðsphôlos; Vulg: bitumen; RVm: "bitumen"); cf Arab. `hımûr, "bitu-

men"; and cf ðrûm, hómoer, "clay," "mortar"): In the account of the ark in Gen 6:14, ðfôp, kôphâr (LXX ðfôpôlôs, ðsphôlos; Vulg: bitumen; cf Arab. `hımûr, "clay"), "pitch") does not necessarily denote vegetable pitch, but may well mean bitumen. The same may be said of ðfôf, zepkETH, "pitch" (cf Arab. târît, "pitch") in Ex 2:3 and Isa 34:9. The word "slime" occurs in the following passages: "And they had brick for stone, and slime had they for mortar" (Gen 11:3); "Now the vale of Siddim was full of slime pits" (Gen 14:10, m "bitumen pits"); "She took for him an ark of têlûa, and daubed it with slime and with pitch" (Ex 2:3).

Bitumen is a hydrocarbon allied to petroleum and natural gas. It is a lustrous black solid, breaking with a conchoidal fracture, burning with a yellow flame, and melting when ignited. It is probably derived from natural gas and petroleum by processes of oxidation and evaporation, and its occurrence may be taken as a sign that other hydrocarbons are or have been present in the strata. It is found in small lumps and larger masses in the cretaceous limestone on the west side of the Dead Sea, and there is reason to believe that considerable quantities of it rise to the surface of the Dead Sea during earthquakes. In ancient times it was exported to Egypt to be used in embalming mummies. Important mines of it exist at Hebron near Mt. Hermon and in North Syria. Springs of liquid bituminous matter exist in Mesopotamia, where according to Herodotus and other classical writers it was used as mortar with sun-dried bricks. Various conjectures have been made as to the part played by bitumen in the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. Diodorus Siculus calls the Dead Sea láthos ðfôlîlîs, láthos asphálathîs, "lake of asphalt." See SIDON; CITIES OF THE PLAIN.

A L F R E D E D E Y

SLING. See Armor, III, 2.

SLIP: As meaning "a cutting from a plant," it is still good Eng. In this sense in Is 17:10 for
SMOKE, smōk: ’tłaed figuratively of the Divine jealousy (Dt 29:20) and anger (Ps 74:1); symbolic of the glory of the Divine holiness (Isa 5; 64; Rev 15:5).

SMYRNA, smō'rēnà (Σμύρνα, Smyrna): Smyrna, a large ancient city on the western coast of Asia Minor, at the head of a gulf which reaches 30 miles inland, was originally peopled by the Asiatics known as the Lelages. The city seems to have been taken from the Lelages by the Aeolian Greeks about 1100 BC; there still remain traces of the cyclopean masonry of that early time. In 688 BC it passed into the possession of the Ionian Greeks and was made one of the cities of the Ionian confederacy, but in 627 BC it was taken by the Lydians. During the years 301 to 281 BC, Lysimachus entirely rebuilt it on a new site to the S.W. of the earlier cities, and surrounded it by a wall. Standing, as it did, upon a good harbor, at the head of one of the chief highways to the interior, it early became a great trading-center and the chief port for the export trade. In Roman times, Smyrna was considered the most brilliant city of Asia Minor, successfully rivaling Pergamos and Ephesus. Its streets were wide and paved. Its system of coinage was old, and now about the city coins of every period are found. It was celebrated for its schools of science and medicine, and for its handsome buildings. Among them was the Homarium, for Smyrna was one of several places which claimed to be the birthplace of the poet. On the slope of Mt. Pagus was a theater which seated 20,000 spectators. In the year 23 AD a temple was built in honor of Tiberius and his mother Julia, and the Golden Street, connecting the temples of Zeus and Cybele, is said to have been the best in any ancient city. Smyrna early became a Christian city, for there was one of the Seven Churches of the Book of Rev (2:8–11). There Polycarp, the Bishop of Smyrna, was martyred though without the sanction of the Roman government. It seems that the Jews of Smyrna were more antagonistic than were the Romans to the spread of Christianity, for it is said that even on Saturday, their sacred day, they brought wood for the fire in which Polycarp was burned. His grave is still shown in a cemetery there. Like many other cities of Asia Minor, Smyrna suffered frequently, esp. during the years 178–80 AD, from earthquakes, but it always escaped entire destruction. During the Middle Ages the city was the scene of many struggles, the most fierce of which was directed by Tunur against the Christians. Tradition relates that there he built a tower, using as stones the heads of a thousand captives which he put to death, yet Smyrna was the last of the Christian cities to hold out against the Mohammedans; in 1424 it fell into

SLOPES, slōps. See Asedoth-Pisgah.

SLOW, slo: Chiefly for τάχω, 'erekh, lit. "long," in the phrase "slow to anger" (Neh 9:17, etc.). In Ex 4:10; Lk 24:25; Jas 1:19, for τάχω, kàbdhēth; πέποι, πράδας, both meaning "heavy," " sluggish," while Sir 35 uses "be slow" for ἀκρώ, ὀκτή, "hesitate." In addition, AV uses "slow" for ἄργος, ἄνευ, "inactive," in Wisd 15:15, "slow to go" (RV "helpless for walking"), and in Tit 1:12, "slow bellies" (RV "idle gluttons"). In Sir 61:24, AV has "be slow" for διονομα, διεκτέο, "be lacking" (so RV).
the hands of the Turks. It was the discovery of America and the resulting discovery of a sea route to India which ruined the Smyrna trade.

Modern Smyrna is still the largest city in Asia Minor, with a population of about 250,000, of whom half are Greek and less than one-fourth are Mohammedans. Its modern name, Izmir, is a Turkish corruption of the ancient name. Even under the Turkish government the city is progressive, and is the capital of the Aitim vilayet, and therefore the home of a governor. Several railroads follow the courses of the ancient routes into the distant interior. In its harbor ships from all parts of the world may be seen. The ancient harbor of Paul's time has been filled in, and there the modern bazaars stand. The old stadium has been destroyed to make room for modern buildings, and a large part of the ancient city lies buried, and the 40 mosques of which the city boasts. The better of the modern buildings, belonging to the government and occupied by the foreign consuls, stand along the modern quay. Traces of the ancient walls are still to be found. One of Mt. Pagus is the Ephesian gate, and the Black-gate, as the Turks call it, is near the railroad station. The castle upon Mt. Pagus, 460 ft. above the sea, dates from Byzantine times. The prosperity of Smyrna is due, not only to the harbor and the port of entry to the interior, but partly to the perfect climate of spring and autumn—the winters are cold and the summers are hot; and also to the fertility of the surrounding country. Figs, grapes, vакона, olives, sponges, cotton and turquoise are among the chief articles of trade. See also CHURCHES, SEVEN.

E. J. BANKS

SNAIL, snail (יוֹרֵשׁ, homet, RV “sand-lizard,” LXX ὑποπτα, σαῦρα, “lizard” [Lev 11 30]; [2] הַשָּׁבַרְלָל, ὕποπτος, κέρως, “wax” [Ps 88 8]): (1) Homet is 5th in the list of unclean “creeping things” in Lev 11 30, and occurs nowhere else. “Snail” is not warranted by LXX or Vulg. RV has “sand-lizard.” It may be the skink or a species of Lacerta. See LIZARD. (2) Shabbiral is tr’ “snail” in Ps 88 8: “Let them be as a snail which melteth and is not found; let them be as the mire next to the ‘snail’ which is ‘slag.’” Gesenius derives shabbelal from bedal, “to pour”; of Arab. balla, “to wet,” instancing מָכָא, lemax, “snail,” or “slag,” from מָכָה, lehbo, “to pour.” While LXX has κέρως, “wax,” Talm (.Minimum) gives מִשְׁלָה, “mire.” The trinary explanation of the passage, which is not very satisfying, is that the snail leaves a trail of mucus (i.e. it melts) as it moves along. This does not in any way cause the snail to waste away, because its glands are continually manufacturing fresh mucous. Large species of snail, Helix aspersa and Helix pomatia, are collected and eaten, boiled, by the Christians of Syria and Palestine, esp. in Lent. The Jews and Moslems declare them to be unclean and do not eat them.

ALFRED ELY DAY

SNARE, snár (תְּסַנְּא, pah; ἡδογία, págois, but σπερχόμενος, bróchois, in 1 Cor 7 35): Over half a dozen Heb words are used to indicate different methods of taking birds and animals, of which the snare (תְּסַנְּא, pah) is mentioned oftener than any other. It was a noose of hair or small bird, of wire for large birds or smaller animals. The snares were set in a favorable location and grain scattered to attract the attention of feathered creatures. They accepted the bire of good feeding and walked into the snare, not suspecting danger. For this reason the snare became particularly applicable in describing a tempting bire offered by men to lead their fellows into trouble, and the list of references is almost, all of the same nature. See Ex 10 7; 1 S 15 21; 28 Ps 11 6; 18 5; “snare” is used symbolically of anything that may kill: 91 3; 124 7; 140 5; 141 9; Prov 7 23; 13 14; 18 7; 20 23; 22 25; 29 25; Ecc 9 12. “But this is a people robbed and plundered; they are all of them smitten in holes, and they are hid in prisons; because they are for a prey, and none delivereth; for a spoil, and none saith, Restore” (Isa 42 22). Here it is specified that the snare was in a hole so covered as to conceal it. Jer 18 22 clearly indicates that the digging of a pit for a man was customary, and also the hiding of the snare for the feet. North American Indians in setting a snare usually figure on catching the bird around the neck. Jer 50 24, “I have laid a snare for thee”; Hos 9 9, “A Fowler’s snare is in all his ways”; Am 9 5 seems to indicate that the snare was set for the feet: Lk 21 34, “But take heed to yourselves, lest haply . . . that day come on you suddenly as a snare”; Rom 11 9, “Let their table be made a snare, and a trap”; 1 Cor 7 35, “not that I may cast a snare upon you”; 1 Tim 3 7, “the snare of the devil”; also 6 9, “But they that are minded to be rich fall into a temptation and a snare and many foolish and hurtful lusts, such as drown men in destruction and perdition.” See Gin; Net; Trap.

SNEEZE, sñez (עַנָּשׁ, zōrēr, Pā‘el-form עַנָּשָׁר, zǎresar): (1) “The child sneezed seven times, and the child opened his eyes” (2 K 4 35). “Sneezing,” better “snorting,” is found in the description of Leviathan (the crocodile): “His sneezings [נַפּוּץ], añtohlith flash forth light, and his eyes are like the eyelids of the morning” (Job 41 18 [Heb 10]). See NORSING.

SNOW, sñan (תַּגָּר, shelegh, יַגְּר, elagh [Dnl 7 9]; שָׁגָר, chōn): (1) Snow is not uncommon in the winter in Jerusalem, but it never reaches any depth and in many years it is not seen at all. Usually disappears, for the most part, as soon as the sun appears, though it may “hide itself” for a time in the gorge cut by a stream (Job 6 16). On lower levels than Jerusalem there is never sufficient to cover the ground, though Mandell日电“gives 10 ft. for snow” as the average fall in the air. Even at sea-level there is occasionally a sufficient fall of hail to cover the ground. A very exceptional snowfall is related in 1 Macc 13 22 at Adora (near Hebron). It was heavy enough to prevent the movement of troops. (2) The tops of the mountains of Lebanon is white with snow for most of the year, and snow may be found in large banks in the valleys and the northern slopes at any time in the summer. Mt. Hermon, 9,200 ft. high, has long streaks of snow in the valleys all through the summer. (3) The snow of the mountains is the source of the water of the springs which last throughout the drought of summer. In case the snow fails there is sure to be a lack of water in the fountains: “Shall the snow of Lebanon fail . . . or shall the cold waters that flow down from afar be dried up?” (Jer 18 14). (4) Large quantities of snow are stored in caves in the mountains in winter and are brought down to the cities in summer to be used in place of ice for cooling drinks and refrigerating purposes. (5) God’s power over the elements of Nature is often brought out in the OT: “For he saith to the snow, Fall thou on the earth!” (Job 37 6); but man cannot fathom the works of God: “Hast thou entered the treasures of the snow?” (Job 38 22). The “snowy” pit was customary, and the “fear of snow” (Prov 31 21) are figurative uses describing winter and cold. “Snow in sum-
mer" (Prov 26:1) would be most out of place, yet it might be most refreshing to the tired workmen in the time of harvest.

(6) Snow is the symbol of purity and cleanliness, giving us some of our most beautiful passages of Scripture: “Wash me and I shall be whiter than snow” (Ps 51:7); "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow" (Isa 1:18). Carrying the figure a step further, snow-water might be expected to have a special value for cleansing: "If I wash myself with snow-water" (Job 9:30). The most common use in Scripture is to denote whiteness in color and implying purity as well: “His rainment was white as snow” (Dan 7:9; Mt 28:3; Mk 9:5; Rev 1:14).

(7) The whiteness of leprosy is compared to snow (Ex 4:6; Nu 12:10; 2 K 5:27).

ALFRED H. JOY

SNUFFERS, snuf'ters. SNUFF DISHES, snuf'dishes (םֵיתָה, melkhayim, מַחַי, mahḥoth): These two utensils are three mentioned in connection with the wilderness tabernacle (Ex 35:38; 37:23; Nu 4:9). ARV prefers to read “snuffers and snuffdishes” in place of “tongs and snuffdishes” (cf. 2 Ch 4:22), the connection between the two utensils indicated by the fact that both are said to belong to the seven lamps, and were to be made out of the talent of gold which was specified as the weight of the whole (Ex 25:37–39).

The seven-branched candlestick which stood in the holy place of both tabernacle and temple was surmounted, in each of its arms, by a removable lamp in which olive oil was burnt. From the requirement of keeping these lights brilliantly burning throughout each night of the year, arose the need for snuffers and snuffdishes. By the former, the burnt portions of the wick were removed; in the latter they were deposited previous to removal. The lamps may have required to be trimmed as often as every half-hour. For this purpose a priest would enter the outer chamber "accomplishing the services" (He 9:6).

In the time of Solomon's Temple another word than melkhayim was used to describe this utensil. It is מֵיתָה, mēzammərōth, from a vb. meaning "to prune" or "trim," and is found in 1 K 7:50; 2 K 12:13; 26:14; 2 Ch 4:22; Jer 52:18. In 4 of these passages, the Eng. text reads, "its snuffers and the basins": the 5th is merely a summary of things taken to Babylon (2 K 25.14). In this constant later association of "basins" and "snuffers" it is seen that the basins referred to were used for the reception of the cast-off portions of the wicks of the seven lamps, and took the place of the snuffdishes of an earlier age. See TONGS.

W. SHAW CALDECOTT

SO, sō (סוח, soḥ), although the Heb might be pointed סוח, sōḥ, Assyr šihū, LXX σώχει, Sōgh, Sōd, Sōh; Manetho, Σωχής, Seuchōs; Lat Scewchus; Herod. [ii. 137 ff]. Saβbakkōn, Sabbakin): In all probability the "Sabaeo" of Herodotus, the Shabaka, who founded the Ethiopian dynasty, the XXVth of Egypt kings. His date is given as 715–707 BC (Flinders Petrie, History of Egypt, III, 281 ff), but we may suppose that before his accession to the throne he was entitled to be designated king, as being actually regent. To this So, Hoshen, king of Israel, made an appeal for assistance to enable him to throw off the yoke of the Assyry Shalmaneser IV (2 K 17:3 ff). But Hoshea's submission to So brought him no advantage, for Shalmaneser came up throughout all the land and laid siege to Samaria. Not long after the fall of Samaria So ventured upon an eastern campaign, and was defeated by Sargon, the successor of Shalmaneser, in the battle of Raphia in 720 BC.

LITERATURE.—Flinders Petrie, History of Egypt, III, 281 ff; McCurdy, H.F.M. I, 422; Schrader, Schreibung, COT, 1, 380. T. Nicolls

SOAP, sōp (םִפָלַס, bōrith; AV sope): Bōrith is a derivative of "בָּר, "purity," hence something which cleanses or makes pure. Soap in the modern sense, as referring to a salt of a fatty acid, for example, that produced by treating olive oil with caustic soda, was probably unknown in OT times. Even today there are districts in the interior of Syria where soap is never used. Cooking utensils, clothes, even the body are cleansed with ashes. The ashes of the household fires are carefully saved for this purpose. The cleansing material referred to in Jer 2:22 (cf. LXX ad loc., where bōrith is rendered by σάλα, pola = "gruss") and Mal 3:2 was probably the vegetable lye called in Arab. el kalī (the origin of Eng. alkali). This material, which is a mixture of crude sodium and potassium carbonates, is sold in the market in the form of greyish lumps. It is produced by burning the desert plants and adding enough water to the ashes to agglomerate them. Before the discovery of Leblanc's process large quantities of kalī were exported from Syria to Europe.

For washing clothes the women sprinkle the powdered kalī over the wet garments and then place them on a flat stone and pound them with a wooden paddle. For washing the body, oil is first smeared over the skin and then kalī rubbed on and the whole slimy mixture rinsed off with water. Kalī was also used anciently as a flux in refining precious metals (cf. Mal 3:2). At the present time many Syrian soap-makers prefer the kalī to the imported caustic soda for soap-making.

In Sus (ver 17) is a curious reference to "washing balls" (ἐμύλματα). JAMES A. PATCH

SOBER, sō'ber. SOBERITY, sō-bris'-ti. SOBERNESS, sō'b-rne'-ss (Gr adj. σοβρής, and its related nouns, σοβρειναι, σοβροινης; vbs. σοβρονεο, and σοβρονωσ, "of sound mind," "self-possessed," "without excesses of any kind," "moderate and discreet"): In Mk 6:15; Lk 8:35, "sane," said of one out of whom demons had just been cast. In the Pastoral Epistles, this virtue is esp. recommended to certain classes, because of extravagances characterizing particular periods of life, that had to be guarded against, viz. to aged men, with reference to the querulousness of old age (Tit 2:2); to young men, with reference to their sensual views of life, and their tendency to disregard consequences (Tit 2:6); enjoined upon young women, with reference to extravagance in dress and speech (Tit 2:5; 1 Tim 2:9); and, in a similar manner, commended to ministers, because of the importance of their judgment and conduct, as teachers and exemplars (1 Tim 3:2). "Words of soberness" (Acts 26:25) are contrasted with the "mania," "madness," that Festus had just declared to be the explanation of Paul's eloquence (ver 24).

In a few passages, the Gr vb. νεφάλω, and its derivative adj. νεφάλιος are used in the same sense. The word originally had a physical meaning, as opposed to drunkenness, and is thus used in 1 Thess 5:6, 8, as the foundation of the deeper meaning. Used metaphorically also in the Pastoral Ep. and 1 Pet. as "sober-minded." Eliott, on 1 Tim 3:2, distinguishes between the two words by regarding σοβρήνω as pointing to the outward exhibition of the inward virtue implied in νεφάλιος.

H. E. Jacobs

SOCHO, sō'kō: Occurs in 1 Ch 4:18, RV "Seco." See Socoh.